

CITY OF RICHLAND CENTER AND RICHLAND COUNTY

Common Council and Rules & Strategic Planning
Standing Committee

January 24, 2023

NOTICE OF JOINT MEETING

Please be advised that the Richland Center Common Council and Richland County Rules and Strategic Planning Standing Committee will convene jointly at 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, January 25th, 2023 at the Richland Center Community Center at 1050 N Orange Street.

If you have any trouble accessing the meeting, please contact Rules & Strategic Planning Committee Chair Shaun Murphy-Lopez at 608-462-3715 (phone/text) or shaun.murphy@co.richland.wi.us (email).

Agenda:

1. Call to order
2. Proof of notification
3. Agenda approval
4. Economic development agreement between Richland County and the City of Richland Center*
5. Communication regarding Symons Recreation Complex operational deficiency*
6. Adjournment

*Meeting materials for items marked with an asterisk may be found at <https://administrator.co.richland.wi.us/minutes/rules-strategic-planning.shtml>.

CC: Committee Members, County Board, Department Heads, Richland Observer, WRCO, Valley Sentinel, Courthouse Bulletin Board

A quorum may be present from other Committees, Boards, or Commissions. No committee, board or commission will exercise any responsibilities, authority or duties except for the Rules and Strategic Planning Standing Committee.

Richland County Rules & Strategic Planning Standing Committee

Agenda Item Cover

Agenda Item Name: Economic development agreement between Richland County and City of Richland Center

Department	County Board	Presented By:	Shaun Murphy-Lopez
Date of Meeting:	1/25/23	Action Needed:	Motion
Disclosure:	Open Session	Authority:	<u>B3</u>
Date submitted:	1/24/23	Referred by:	1/5/23 meeting

Recommendation and/or action language:

Motion to recommend to amending the economic development agreement between Richland County and the City of Richland Center

Background:

At the August 16, 2022 meeting of the Richland County Board, Resolution 22-91 was adopted. This resolution “*encouraged the Richland Economic Development (RED) Board to explore a public private partnership where public sources make up half and private sources make up half of the Economic Development budget, and return to the Finance and Personnel Committee with a report by October 31st, 2022.*” See Attachment 04A for the full text of the resolution.

The RED Board returned a report which recommended a 50/50 funding split between the County and City for funding. See Attachment 04B. The Ad Hoc Referendum Committee replied with a request for follow-up information, and Jasen Glasbrenner replied with answers to that information, including an offer that the City was interested in taking on 100% of the funding for economic development. See Attachment 04C.

In December 2022, the Common Council adopted a resolution issuing Richland County with a Notice of Intent to Withdraw from the agreement, effective January 1, 2023. See Attachment D. The agreement between the City and County is shown as Attachment E.

At the January 3rd meeting of the Ad Hoc Referendum Committee, the committee took action to alter the County’s planned contribution to half of the current 60% contribution (i.e., 30%). See Attachment F.

At the January 5th meeting of the Rules & Strategic Planning Committee, the committee took action to recommend a joint meeting between the City Council and Rules & Strategic Planning Committee, to discuss the City’s request to withdraw from the agreement. See Attachment 04G.

Pending the discussion at the joint meeting, it is recommended that action be taken to amend the RED agreement between the City and County.

Attachments and References:

04A County Resolution	04B RED Report
04C Referendum and ED Response	04D City Resolution
04E RED Agreement	04F Referendum Committee Minutes
04G Rules Minutes	

Financial Review:

(please check one)

Richland County Rules & Strategic Planning Standing Committee

Agenda Item Cover

	In adopted budget	Fund Number	
	Apportionment needed	Requested Fund Number	
	Other funding Source		
X	No financial impact		

Approval:

Review:

Department Head

Administrator, or Elected Office (if applicable)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the JAC shall not request any tax levy dollars, for any ambulance service operations and capital projects, for the fiscal year 2023 and beyond; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its passage and publication.

VOTE ON FOREGOING RESOLUTION
AYES _____ NOES _____

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY THE FINANCE
AND PERSONNEL STANDING COMMITTEE
(10 AUGUST 2022)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

	FOR	AGAINST
MARTY BREWER	X	
SHAUN MURPHY-LOPEZ	X	
STEVE CARROW	X	
MELISSA LUCK		
TIMOTHY GOTSCHALL	X	
DAVID TURK		
STEVE WILLIAMSON		
MARC COUEY		
GARY MANNING	X	

DEREK S. KALISH
COUNTY CLERK

DATED: AUGUST 16, 2022

Resolution No. 22 – 91 notifying the Symons Natatorium and Richland Economic Development Department of future funding reductions and directing the Symons Natatorium Board and Richland Economic Development Board to consider services, develop options and propose a recommendation on future operations was reviewed by County Administrator Langreck. Motion by Manning, second by Rynes that Resolution No. 22 - 91 be adopted. The motion carried with one opposed and resolution declared adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 22 - 91

A Resolution Notifying The Symons Natatorium And Richland Economic Development Department Of Future Funding Reductions And Directing The Symons Natatorium Board And Richland Economic Development Board To Consider Services, Develop Options And Propose A Recommendation On Future Operations.

WHEREAS, the Richland County Board Accepted the County Administrator's Financial Conditions Report that illustrated the financial challenges in maintaining all current county provided services; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County Board Adopted the County Administrator's Financial and Capital Plan that iterates the Richland County's Strategic Plan calling for prioritization of services and reductions in levy expenditures on both mandated and non-mandated services; and

WHEREAS, the Richland County has received numerous petitions and concerns regarding the elimination, reduction or displacement of such highly valued services, and recognizes the importance that these services have to the community, and is taking actions to investigate a possible transition of these services.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Richland County Board of Supervisors that the Symons Natatorium and Richland Economic Development have been identified for possible future funding reductions, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Symons Natatorium Board and Richland Economic Development Board are tasked to work in conjunction with county administration, supporting staff, and community partner to

consider services, develop and evaluate options and make a recommendation, to the County Board, on future operations of the Symons Natatorium and Richland Economic Development Department respectfully; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Symons Natatorium Board and Richland Economic Development Board are specifically tasked with the following:

Symons Natatorium Operations

1. Encouraged to explore the transfer of Symons to a non-profit organization, including research of similar non-profit models, and return to the Finance & Personnel Committee with a report by October 31st 2022.

Economic Development Operations

2. Encourage the RED board to explore a public private partnership where public sources make up half and private sources make up half of the Economic Development budget; and return to Finance and Personnel Committee with a report by October 31st 2022.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its passage and publication.

VOTE ON FOREGOING RESOLUTION
AYES _____ NOES _____

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY THE FINANCE
AND PERSONNEL STANDING COMMITTEE
(10 AUGUST 2022)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

DEREK S. KALISH
COUNTY CLERK

DATED: AUGUST 16, 2022

	FOR	AGAINST
MARTY BREWER	X	
SHAUN MURPHY-LOPEZ	X	
STEVE CARROW	X	
MELISSA LUCK		
TIMOTHY GOTSCHALL	X	
DAVID TURK		
STEVE WILLIAMSON		
MARC COUEY		
GARY MANNING	X	

Resolution No. 22 – 92 directing the Pine Valley and Child Support Standing Committee to consider services, develop options and propose a recommendation on future operations was reviewed by County Administrator Langreck. Motion by McKee, second by Williamson that Resolution No. 22 - 92 be adopted. The motion carried with one opposed and resolution declared adopted.

RESOLUTION NO. 22 - 92

A Resolution Directing The Pine Valley And Child Support Standing Committee To Consider Services, Develop Options And Propose A Recommendation On Future Operations.

WHEREAS, the Richland County Board Accepted the County Administrator's Financial Conditions Report that illustrated the financial challenges in maintaining all current county provided services; and



Response to County Board Resolution No. 22-91 Seeking Funding Options for Richland Economic Development

September 28th, 2022

Resolution No. 22-91 - A Resolution Notifying The Symons Natatorium And Richland Economic Development Department Of Future Funding Reductions And Directing The Symons Natatorium Board And Richland Economic Development Board To Consider Services, Develop Options And Propose A Recommendation On Future Operations.

The Richland Economic Development Board hereby submits this document in response to County Board Resolution No. 22-91 which provided the following direction;

"2. Encourage the RED board to explore a public private partnership where public sources make up half and private sources make up half of the Economic Development budget; and return to Finance and Personnel Committee with a report by October 31st 2022."



Summary

9/28/2022

The RED Board has conducted research and assembled information regarding four possible funding models for Richland Economic Development. For reasons outlined throughout this document, the **Unanimous Recommendation** of the Richland Economic Development Board is to retain the current model of funding with **RED funded 50% by the County and 50% by the City**. While the actual budget documents for this model shows the County funding (60%) and the City (40%), the City provides office space and other amenities which, when factored, are intended to equally spread the cost of operations at 50% / 50%.

Past economic development efforts, and now Richland Economic Development have yielded substantial positive and measurable contributions to the County's economic position. These contributions come in ways that are both direct (increased property tax base, injection of grant money) and indirect (additional sales tax, more jobs, more students in our schools, new community amenities, and a positive outlook for the future).

There must be deep consideration of the fact that if the County and the City are not engaged in economic development then they are falling behind all counties and municipalities that are. This is almost universally understood, by governments, municipal and regional planning professionals, academia, and private industry alike.

Throughout the past year and a half, through numerous strategic planning efforts that have been conducted by Richland County and facilitated by Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, it has been clearly communicated that governments cannot solve their budgetary dilemmas through cuts alone. A complete action plan requires allocation of resources to economic growth. Richland Economic Development is, in fact, the primary entity that spurs on and facilitates growth for the County.

It is also critical to note that Richland Economic Development is one of the few county departments that has the capacity to generate revenues that cover all of the associated cost of the department. Once departmental costs are covered, the Economic Development Office produces profit. The RED Board has discussed and reviewed data and believes that it is reasonable to postulate that Richland Economic Development, approximately 2 years and 5 months into its current structure, has already generated enough new repeat yearly revenue for the County and City to pay 100% of its operating costs (See Exhibit B). This means that all future revenues that are generated from projects that Richland Economic Development helps facilitate should be understood to be 100% profit. These profits can now be used to fund other departments and services that are unable to produce revenue streams through their operations.

Cutting funding and jeopardizing the stability of Richland Economic Development is likely to increase the property tax burden on every land owner in the County, not reduce it.

Thank you for your thorough review and consideration of this recommendation and the documentation that is provided.



A Letter from the RED Board

August 8, 2022

RE: General Statement - Alternative Funding for Richland Economic Development

The Richland Economic Development Board, ("RED Board"), is aware of Richland County's difficult budget considerations, we understand the complexity of the situation, and we appreciate the restrictive nature of state law with regards to municipal funding for rural communities.

We understand the County is in the process of searching for funding options, and considering possible cuts across multiple departments and services, we realize the need for difficult choices, and we offer our support to everyone involved.

This letter is our direct response to any consideration of defunding the Economic Development Director position.

"Strongly Opposed."

Since the creation of this position, a joint effort between Richland County and the City of Richland Center, our community has added the new dialysis center/pharmacy building, the TechCom Building, multiple new homes, the Lone Rock Village Center Park, and the addition of an elevator to the Richland Center City Auditorium.

These projects have provided the County with increased property tax revenue, increased sales tax revenue, increased local employment opportunities, and a much-needed psychological boost for local residents, following an extended period of stagnation.

Jasen Glasbrenner, our current Economic Development Director, has been a critical player in every one of these positive developments. His expertise and experience have helped move each of these possibilities from simple ideas to tangible realities. We believe a decision by Richland County to remove support for this position would not only send a harshly negative message to worried friends and neighbors; it would also lead our community backwards, as we saw when economic development was defunded at both the city and county levels.

The RED Board strongly encourages Richland County to maintain financial support for the critically important Economic Development Director position.

Sincerely,
The RED Board



Richland Economic Development Board Report to Richland County Board and Committees on Funding Alternatives

Date: September 12, 2022

Re: Report from RED Board regarding restructuring and funding alternatives

Following are four potential models for the funding of Richland Economic Development as we move forward. The County Board requested RED to evaluate models that might work instead of the existing model. The profile for each model includes a brief description of the model, the governance, and the financing. The pros and cons of the model are stated and then a recommendation from the RED Board is included.

The four funding models below are ranked in the order of most desirable to least desirable and are as follows;

Models:

- 1) **Recommended** - RED is funded 50% by the County and 50% by the City. (This is the Current Model) - The actual budget documents for this model shows the County funding (60%) and the City (40%). However, the City provides office space and other amenities which, when factored, are intended to equalized the cost at 50% / 50%.
- 2) RED is funded 100% by the City. This models assumes that the City decision makers would agree to this concept and that funding could be identified within the City budget.
- 3) RED is funded 50% by the County and City (The Public Sector) and 50% by Private Businesses (The Commerce Sector). This model assumes businesses will be willing to give large donations and that there is a large enough pool of businesses to raise the money from.
- 4) RED becomes a Self-Funded Private Non-Profit Entity having to raise 100% of the funds necessary to operate. This model requires RED to approach all local government entities and businesses on a one on one basis to try to gain the necessary funding of operate. This model presents the highest level of risk and uncertainty to the success of RED and economic development in Richland County.

Qualifying Statement regarding the Models:

1. With regard to Model #2 - The City has not agreed to fund RED entirely if the County dropped out as a funding partner.
2. With regard to Model #3 and #4 - No private (commerce sector) businesses have been approached regarding soliciting contributions.
3. With regard to Model #4 - There have been no efforts to incorporate or file for an IRS 501(C)(3) tax exempt status.



Model #1 - Maintain the Current Model of Shared County and City Funding

Governance

At the present time the RED board has four (4) permanent representatives from government, two (2) from the City of Richland Center and two (2) from Richland County. In addition, there are 5 citizen members representing different economic sectors. There would be no change to government representation or the board structure.

Funding

There would be no change from the current funding model.

Considerations

Pros

1. The County and City would continue to fund their contributions to RED as in the past which would provide continuity. This is a role proper to government. There would not be favoritism, real or perceived, shown to any private entity or municipality.
2. The structural document will not have to be changed and approved by the Richland Center City Council and the Richland County Board of Supervisors.
3. Sector representation will remain the same.
4. The working relationship between the city and county is better than it has been for a very long time. It is important to recognize, nurture and support this improving relationship.

Cons

1. The County will have to find other areas of the budget to cut.
2. If Richland County chooses to not support RED, the lack of monetary (visible) county government support may have a negative psychological impact on businesses who wish to expand, relocate to Richland County, or start up.

Commentary

An example of the power and potential of economic development is the Bear Creek Solar Project which will provide Richland County with \$116,667 of unrestricted funds on an annual basis. It is important to note that this project is the direct result of a part-time citizen driven economic development effort which made the solar farm a reality at no cost to the taxpayers. It was completed prior to the creation of RED. This revenue stream is scheduled to start in 2023 and is expected to continue for 30 years. The revenue from this economic development effort alone exceeds the county contribution to RED with the current Richland County contribution at \$73,859.54.



The document "Net New Construction by County" (Exhibit A) indicates that Richland County has lagged all other identified counties in a 5-year average in net new construction. Iowa county leads at 1.59%. Richland County is lowest at 0.83%. This demonstrates the importance of investment in Economic Development for Richland County.

There has been noticeable new construction activity in the City of Richland Center. A positive attitude is beginning to embrace the community. The Mayor is receiving regular contacts from businesses expressing interest in the community. Much of this has started since the creation of RED. It is important for the county to recognize the importance of RED and provide financial support.

Fiber optic cable throughout rural Richland County is going to enhance lives for current residents. It will also make the area more attractive for those considering relocating. RED has played a significant role to foster installation of fiber optic cable. In addition, recent utilization of CDBG Close grants (\approx \$1.2 million) to enhance the City Auditorium and the Village of Lone Rock would not have taken place without RED.

It is critical to recognize that many economic development efforts have a cumulative effect. Stated another way, once a building is constructed and goes on the property tax rolls, the revenue generated is recurring year after year for as long as the building is in existence. This means that revenues from economic development efforts are always sustained and increasing. An economic development department is one of the few governmental departments that can operate at a consistent profit with the ability to support other departments that are unable to generate a profit.

Please see (Exhibit B) below for a brief overview of the financial involvement that RED has already had for Richland County and Richland Center. It appears that the revenues generated through economic development activity and projects are already in excess of what the County and City have invested since the inception of the department. At this point, yearly costs could be considered 100% covered by the yearly revenues that economic development efforts and RED have been substantially involved in securing. In any business model, this department would be considered for additional funding, not less.

Recommendation

The RED Board strongly recommends maintaining the current funding, governance structure and sector representation of RED.



Model #2 – RED is Funded 100% by the City

Governance

As dictated by the adopted Structural Document, the RED Board contains four seats for governmental representatives. Both the County and the City are assigned two seats each. If financial contributions were withdrawn from the County, the composition of the RED Board may change in the following ways:

1. As the County's representatives, the County Administrator and County Board Chair may be removed from their seats and lose voting authority. City representatives may fill the vacancies.
2. As the County may still have a vested interest in the work of the RED Board, their representatives may remain on the board with or without voting power.
3. The RED Board may alter their structure by reducing their size, eligibility requirements for representatives (E.g., city residents only), or disband entirely.

As the structure, composition, authority and purpose of the RED Board are set forth by the Structural Document requiring adoption by both the City and County, any significant alteration, such as the County withdrawing from the agreement, necessitates significant modifications to the Structural Document and readoption. At such time the County extricates itself, the City would set forth the prescribed governance or dissolution.

Funding

The current departmental budget for Economic Development is approximately \$130,000 per year of which the City is currently responsible for 40% or about \$56,000. The City has and will continue to provide office space and other amenities for the department.

To absorb the full cost of the Economic Development Department, the City would need to allocate approximately \$75,000 additional dollars for the first year. This would be an ongoing annual cost subject to a variable increase based on several economic factors (E.g., wage increases, inflationary impact to the cost of goods, equipment replacement, etc).

The City does not have a funding source identified for this additional expense. However, several options are available for consideration such as: reallocating funding from other department budgets, increasing fees, terminating current contributions to Symons (to be considered if funding is withdrawn by the County), requiring the Economic Development Director to seek and obtain grants allowing for administrative costs to be recovered, and so on. Given the revenue generated by the Economic Development Director has largely exceeded the actual expense of the department, all-potential funding options available to the City will be explored to ensure economic development continues within the City.

Considerations

Pros

City continues to vigorously pursue economic development without a loss of momentum.

1. Full dedication to pursuing economic development interests within the City.
2. Ongoing projects will be seen to completion.
3. The Director's time is spent on high value projects rather than fundraising.
4. Streamlined reporting process for the Director.
5. Scope of work is narrowed and strategically focused as determined by the City.
6. The County continues to receive benefit of city based economic development as about 1/3 of tax revenue generated within the City is received by the County.

Cons

1. The County may lose representation and influence on the RED Board.
2. Ongoing and future economic development projects/initiatives within the County would be at the full expense of the County. On a case-by-case basis, the City may elect to contract out the Economic Development Director to the County at an hourly rate. This may prove to be cost prohibitive depending on the scope of work contracted.
3. Independent from the County, a town or village may be compelled to utilize the services of the Economic Development Director. If so, they would be subject to paying the hourly contract rate which may be cost prohibitive.
4. Without a collaborative approach as is in effect now, the potential for relationship building and strategic planning in collaboration with the County may be impeded. Unintended side effects or inefficiencies may present themselves.
5. With less access to County officials and department heads, the exchange of information and opportunity for knowledge sharing may be diminished. Although the director's focus would be city-centric, preserving a communication pathway would be essential.
6. Potential risk of alienating entrepreneurs outside of the City.
7. Towns and villages routinely struggle gaining access to the vast number of resources that may be available to them given their part-time or volunteer status. Additionally, without the necessary technical expertise and adequate time/staffing, managing grants and other programs can be quite challenging for a part-time or volunteer staff. Removing economic development from the County may prevent towns and villages from much needed assistance and support thus impeding their goals as well as the County's.
8. Self-imposed regulation like local ordinances have a tremendous impact on economic development within a community. Without an Economic Development Director on staff, the ability to address regulatory barriers and create an environment favorable to economic development would be severely impeded within the County.



Recommendation

The RED Board does not recommend this Model. While the City would experience several benefits from a city-centric approach to economic development, the cost the County would be tremendous. The Economic Development Director has a proven track record of success within the City and County. This success has allowed the department to generate more revenue than expenses. The department provides both direct and indirect financial value and it creates no burden to the County's overall budget.

Given the importance of continued economic development throughout the entire County, and great challenges a separation would create, it is the recommendation of the RED Board to maintain the current structure and organization of the Economic Development Department. Any proposed change would create an undue burden to the entire County at large.

Model #3 – RED is funded 50% by the County and City (The Public Sector) and 50% by Private Businesses (The Commerce Sector)

Governance

The private and public governance model will include representatives from the government sector and the commerce sector. Presently the RED Board has four permanent representatives from government, two from the City and two from the County. That representation would not change unless the County discontinues funding RED. In such a case, the County may lose their seats on the RED Board and those seats could be redistributed to the City and Commerce sectors. For the sake of the commerce sector contributors, RED would likely need to be organized under a non-profit 501(C)(3) corporation.

Funding

Equalized funding would mean the RED budget of approximately \$130,000 per year would have one-half of the contributions from the government sector (\$65,000) and one-half from the commerce sector (\$65,000). This split would mean the City would be responsible for approximately \$32,500 and the County for approximately \$32,500. Each year the funds would need to be reallocated from the government sector and the commerce sector. There is also the matter of office space and equipment. This model presumes the City would continue to grant usage of office space and equipment.

Considerations

Pros

1. The County and City would significantly reduce their contributions to RED.
2. There would be greater participation financially by the commerce sector in RED. This may tend to increase the buy-in from the commerce sector.
3. RED could operate as a 501(C)(3), which has some benefits in receiving grants.
4. The operations of a 501(C)(3) would be more nimble and less encumbered by governmental regulations.

Cons

1. Funding through the commerce sector takes considerable time and resources to raise and maintain. The scarce resources of time that already tax the Economic Development Director (EDD) would be used for fundraising instead of bringing new commerce into the area.
2. The City and County would significantly decrease their investment in RED which may translate into less concern for economic development.
3. The EDD will have less opportunity to create relationships with governmental offices that will help them to streamline projects.
4. The EDD will have less capacity to influence governmental bodies and government regulations to become favorable to growth and development.
5. The potential for not raising enough funds from the commerce sector could be a reality, especially in economic downturns. In this case, there may be a struggle to continue full operations of economic development in the county.

Recommendations

The RED Board does not recommend this model. While this model of ED structure is used in some counties, and has some measure of success, it also has several limiting factors. It takes a substantial amount of time to raise and maintain funding from the commerce sector and there is a real potential that funding efforts fall short. This creates uncertainty and a potential for failure.

Model #4 - RED becomes a Self-Funded Private Non-Profit Entity having to raise 100% of the funds necessary to operate.

Governance

The Richland Economic Development Board would essentially reorganize to a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization and form a board of directors. The board of directors would be responsible for overseeing the operations and control of the newly formed non-profit.



This option will restructure the current make-up of the members and the size of the RED Board.

Funding

Funding for a non-profit economic development organization would come from private donations from local industries or individuals or from grant monies applied for and received from local, state or federal entities.

Considerations

Pros:

1. The benefit from adopting a privately funded RED Board would potentially eliminate the funding coming from the City and County funds.

Cons:

1. This type of board structure would require either the board of directors, volunteers, or the economic director to spend time generating the funding. The time spent trying to find funding sources would take away from essential time being used to cultivate and develop working relationships that directly impact economic development within our community.
2. The community tried this type of structure in the past and the experience had was a disconnect between the Economic Development and their board, the City Council, and the County Board. The ideas and visions between the 3 groups could not align and ultimately the Economic Development Board dissolved.
3. There's also a risk that funding this type of model with private donations from local industry will not succeed within our smaller community as we have fewer resources from industry than in larger communities. There's concern that either smaller businesses may not have the ability to provide funding and/or may not fully understand or have the 'buy in' to the idea of being a long-term funding source since the financial benefits are not always obtained immediately; they are gained over time as our community grows. There is a concern of a lack of long-term sustainability with this model.

Recommendation

The RED Board does not recommend this model. The RED Board's recommendation is to continue having both the county and city fund 100% of economic development to maintain the collaboration between the 3 groups and continue to build upon the successes that have develop over the past couple of years. Our current model, having the Economic Director as a liaison between the RED Board, the City, and County, has shown to have the most success in our smaller community with our current financial situation.

Exhibit A

Net New Construction by County - Increase in Richland, surrounding, and similar counties by percent.

Grant	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	1.06	1.06	0.82	1.47	1.71	5-year average 1.16%

Lafayette	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	1.35	1.35	0.91	1.16	1.93	5-year average 1.34%

Vernon	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	1.70	1.42	1.04	1.03	1.47	5-year average 1.33%

Sauk	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	1.29	0.95	1.33	1.47	1.37	5-year average 1.28%

Iowa	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	2.24	1.27	1.34	1.56	1.56	5-year average 1.59%

Crawford	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	1.13	0.96	0.74	0.73	1.16	5-year average 0.94%

Richland	2022	2021	2020	2019	2018	
	0.94	0.67	0.83	0.69	1.00	5-year average 0.83%

Exhibit A – (continued)

Net New Construction in dollars by municipal entity in Richland County, as a percent of the total, and 5-year average.

	2022		2021		2020		2019		2018	
Townships	8,560,000	70%	7,160,100	90%	6,136,000	61%	5,701,400	71%	6,952,200	61%
Villages	418,400	3%	271,700	3%	773,400	8%	(120,200)	-1%	456,400	4%
City	3,337,000	27%	525,400	7%	3,071,800	31%	2,398,100	30%	3,913,400	35%
Total	12,315,400		7,957,200		9,981,200		7,979,300		11,322,000	

5-year average NNC

Townships	6,901,960	70%
Villages	359,940	3%
City	2,649,140	27%
Total	9,911,040	

Exhibit B - Richland Economic Development Impact Tracker

Project	Total Project Value	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
CDBG Close Grant – Lone Rock Park and RC Auditorium	\$1,200,000	Increase in Sales Tax, tourism, removal of blight so property values and community attractiveness increase.	
		New Renter @ Auditorium	≈ \$3,000 / month
		2 to 5 New Jobs	
Dialysis and Pharmacy in RC	\$1,210,000	Repeat Property Tax Income every Year	≈ \$34,800
		One time Sale of Land	\$100,000
		New and retained jobs, sales tax,	
Tech Com Building	\$585,900	Repeat Property Tax Income every Year	≈ \$35,090
		One time Sale of Land	\$25,000
		New and retained jobs, sales tax	
Phoenix Center Covid Relief Grant – made aware and assisted in pursuit	\$200,000	Retained and expanded businesses and economy	
Richland Locker Grant – assisted in pursuit	\$200,000	Retained and expanded businesses and economy	
Richland Locker RLF – assisted in pursuit	\$200,000	Retained and expanded businesses and economy	
Starlite Theaters Grant – assisted in pursuit	\$43,800	Retained and expanded businesses and economy	
TIF Extension for Affordable Housing - facilitated capture of dollars for fund that can be used to improve housing in the City	≈ \$115,000	Dollars to be invested in Richland Center	\$115,000

Exhibit B – Richland Economic Development Impact Tracker (Continued)

Project / Fund	Total Project Value	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
Wedgewood Development Lots – 2 Duplexes and 1 Home	≈ \$1,000,000		
		Facilitated receipt of land by donation and then sale of land	\$63,500
		Development Agreements for Net New Construction value of ≈ \$900,000. Repeat Property Tax income every year	≈ \$35,100
WEDC Idle Sites Grant for Rockbridge Childcare Facility	≈ \$150,000	Supports families and work force / provided jobs	
Facilitated Sunshine and Giggles Childcare arrival in RC		Supports families and work force / provided jobs	
		Repeat Property Tax income every year	≈ \$7,800
Main St. Bounce Back Grants	≈ \$150,000	Facilitated the application and receipt of grants to approx. 15 businesses in Richland County.	
County Housing Authority – Lost Fund Recovery Effort	≈ \$80,000	Assisted Administrator in identifying and working to recover lost / idle funds that were defederalized	\$80,000
Bear Creek / Savion / Alliant Energy Solar Field -	\$116,000 / Year for 30+ years	This project was not developed under RED. However, revenue streams are just coming on line and this project is a direct result of focused economic development efforts of the community members on behalf of the county.	

Exhibit B – Richland Economic Development Impact Tracker (Continued)

Project / Fund	Total Project Value	Direct & Indirect Benefits	
New Dollar Tree	\$800,000	Repeat Property Tax income every year	\$23,200
		Job creation retention and sales tax revenue	
New Dunkin Donuts / ATT Store	\$750,000	Repeat Property Tax income every year	\$21,750
Panorama Building #2	\$4,500,000	Repeat Property Tax Revenue is deferred to TIF for approx. 15 years	\$145,000
Facilitation of Richland Center Stori Field Development of new housing units	\$2,400,000	Projected Repeat Property Tax income every year	\$93,600
Los Amigos – WEDC – CDI Grant effort	\$200,000	Effort is in progress	
Projects / Efforts that are in Progress that will bolster the Economy			
City Website Rebuild for Marketing and public ease of use			
City Ordinance Recodification and Rewrite for growth and planning			
City / County Tax Deed Lot Program for redevelopment and new homes			
New Single Family Home Subdivision			
Facilitated transfer of vacant lot to Cazenovia for future redevelopment			
City Redevelopment Authority Revitalization			
City Industrial Park Revitalization Project			
Several Sales leads for Industrial Park			

Exhibit B – Richland Economic Development Impact Tracker (Continued)

Projects that are in Progress that will bolster the Economy		
Facilitating USED Grant implementation with Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission - Comprehensive plans in Richland Center, Lone Rock, Boaz, Richland County Strategic Plan, Richland Center and Richland County rebranding for Workforce Retention and Attraction		
Assisting Richland Center in planning around the construction of the New Richland Center Hospital		
Environmental Protection Agency and DNR Technical Assistance Program to clear brownfields in Richland Center and Richland County for redevelopment		
Regional involvement on model for immigrant and migrant workforces of alleviate extreme workforce shortage in the county		
Assisting Richland Center in overhauling the City Planning and Zoning departments and efforts.		

Economic Impact Summary - Since the Inception of RED:

- RED has secured over \$1,700,000 in Grant dollars.
- RED is currently facilitating the process to secure over \$300,000 more in grants.
- RED has assisted in the development of projects (either complete or under construction) valued at \$5,545,900.
- RED is currently working to secure development projects valued at more than \$7,000,000
- RED has significantly contributed to the realized, or soon to be realized, year after year property tax revenues of more than \$150,000.



Exhibit B – Richland Economic Development Impact Tracker (Continued)

- RED is working to secure development projects that, if completed, will have year after year property tax revenue streams that are in excess of \$240,000.
- RED was instrumental in acquisition and or sale of land for the City that resulted in one-time revenue streams that would not have been realized otherwise; \$163,500.
- The dollar values and contributions listed above are trackable and objective. There are numerous indirect economic and financial impacts that are more difficult to quantify, but never the less very real. Examples are jobs or businesses created or saved, increased sales tax revenues, and the overall positive social and economic environment that is created when we are actively and progressively working to develop our economy.

12/2/22

To: Shaun Murphy-Lopez

Cc: Michael Breininger, Marty Brewer, Clinton Langreck, Todd Coppernoll, Ashley Oliphant

Hello everyone,

1. I have updated the research document of Green and Vernon County's economic development efforts. Vernon Economic Development Association (VEDA) information is included (see attached).
2. When I spoke with the person at Green County in regard to their private donor list, it was requested that the names not be shared in our public process. I have now added that note to the research document provided.
3. The RED Board, through the funding research and recommendation document that it has provided to the County, has outlined and ordered the systems of funding that it believes are most viable for the continued success of economic development for the County and City. According to that document the top two recommendations are to leave funding as it currently is, or secondly, for the City to assume responsibility for 100% of the funding of RED. At this time it has been publicly revealed that the City of Richland Center does have substantial interest in that model. In fact, this option has been discussed through the City of Richland Center budget process and a budget considering full funding of Economic Development has received full City Council support. It is also my understanding that there was a proposed agenda item provided to the County that would have clearly indicated the City's interest in Option #2 and would have allowed that option to be appropriately updated, discussed, and factored into the County's public decision making process. However, the agenda item that was proposed was not allowed onto the County's Rules and Strategic Planning agenda. At this point I have not become aware of why the agenda item was not accepted into the public discussion, but I would like to take this opportunity to strongly encourage that all information germane to the discussion of the funding for Economic Development and the future economic success of the City and County, be inserted into the public conversation as immediately as possible.

Thank You for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jasen Glasbrenner

From: Shaun Murphy-Lopez

Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2022 7:41 AM

To: Michael Breininger <rcfmikeb@gmail.com>

Cc: Jasen Glasbrenner <jasen.glasbrenner@co.richland.wi.us>; Marty Brewer <marty.brewer@co.richland.wi.us>; Clinton Langreck <clinton.langreck@co.richland.wi.us>

Subject: Re: Referendum Committee request for information

Hi Mike,

See my responses below **in red**.

Thanks,
Shaun

Shaun Murphy-Lopez

Richland County Board Supervisor, District 2

RC Board Vice Chair

608-462-3715

shaun.murphy@co.richland.wi.us

On Nov 22, 2022, at 10:17 AM, Michael Breininger <rcfmikeb@gmail.com> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Shaun,

Thanks for this email regarding the Referendum Ad Hoc Committee additional requests.

1. Apparently you were requesting information about a different entity in Vernon County than the one Jasen researched? The RED Board passed on the information about the Vernon County Economic Development and Tourism Coordinator who is a 100% employee of Vernon County. You are apparently asking about a different entity, VEDA? Is that Correct? **Yes.**

2. As a point of reference, neither Vernon nor Green Counties are very similar in demographics or operations to Richland County. Lafayette and Crawford would be closer to the size of Richland County.

3. Jasen stated at the RED Board meeting that the information about specific funders was not readily available and was not something the EDD of other counties was willing to share. **Did he ask Green County ED if they could share the board members who pay dues?** I'm not aware if this information is publicly available. A better measure might be the businesses that supported ED in Richland County prior to the development of the RED Board and full City and County funding. **The question from the committee was in regards to Green and Vernon Counties.** The ED entity was Community Prosperity Alliance (CPA) and the funders list is attached (the annual dollar amount is listed along with the frequency of payment). Since I was the one who solicited

many of these funds, I can say that the amount of time to raise the funds, renew commitments and communicate with funders would not be something I would be willing to do again. I spent many hours with these efforts, had many businesses say, "no" because they already gave to other causes, and spent significant time at City Council and County Board meetings. It would be an unfortunate direction to require the EDD to take up these time consuming efforts in neglect of actual ED work.

Please let me know if you are looking for something else,

Mike Breininger

On 11/22/2022 8:51 AM, Shaun Murphy-Lopez wrote:

Hi Mike,

At last evening's Referendum Ad Hoc Committee meeting, we approved a follow-up request for information regarding the Richland Economic Development Board's response to our initial request for information (see below). I've also attached your committee's initial report and response. Once your committee has a response you or Jasen can email it to me, and I will make sure it gets to the Referendum Ad Hoc Committee.

Thanks,

Shaun

Follow-up request for information (in red)

- Research from other counties that have private funding for economic development (e.g., Vernon, Green), including the amount of time it takes to raise funds and how the governing board is represented by private contributors. Thank you for providing information about Green County. The Vernon Economic Development Association (VEDA) is 100% privately

funded and can be researched through contact information at www.veda-wi.org.

- Resolution 22-91 directs the RED Board to explore half of its budget coming from private sources, which amounts to approximately \$37,000 per year. We are seeking information about how much of that amount the RED Board would like to have placed on a referendum versus a permanent reduction in the RED budget. Thank you for answering this question.
- Identify the private businesses that are supporting Economic Development in other counties such as Vernon and Green. Please answer this question.

Shaun Murphy-Lopez

Richland County Board Supervisor, [District 2](#)

RC Board Vice Chair

608-462-3715

shaun.murphy@co.richland.wi.us

10/13/2022

Call with Olivia Otte – Executive Director

Green County Economic Development Corporation - 501(c)3

Green County Population = 36,988

Approximately 69 Industrial related businesses

Richland County Population = 17,212

Approximately 24 Industrial related businesses

They are funded by Contributions ≈\$200,000 budget

- Green County ≈ \$60,440 /yr
- City of Monroe (Population 10,537) ≈ \$29,000 /yr
- City of Broadhead (Population 3,249) ≈ \$8,700 /yr
- Village of Belleville (Population 2,559) ≈ \$6,320 /yr
- Village of New Glarus (Population 2,234) ≈ \$5,760 /yr
- Village of Monticello (Population ≈ \$3,220 /yr

Total Government Contribution (6) = \$113,440 /yr

Total Private Partners (16) ≈ \$53,000 /yr

*** It was requested that the names of the private donors would not be released in our County's public forums.*

- Payroll is run through the County
- Benefits of the County
- County Provides Office Space
- County Provides IT Support
- They have the assistance of a UW Extension Agent
- They have a Project / Marketing Manager
- They are visiting every financial partner at least once per year
- They run leadership training every year that all participants can send people to
- They have an Executive Committee with 5 members that are the policy/directive setters and employers – Meetings every month
- They have a Board of Directors with around 25 people – Investor Representatives – Round Table update ever month but this group does not set directives

10/14/2022

**Call with Christina Dollhausen – Economic Development & Tourism Coordinator
Vernon County, WI – Contract Employee**

Year by Year contract – No Insurance Benefits

County Budget for the Department is \$75,000 and there is no other funding source at this time.

Wage on Contract is \$55,000

She was hired in 2018

Vernon County receives money from the Hochunk Nation and uses it to help fund Economic Development.

Vernon County Population = 30,915

3 Cities & 9 Villages

Richland County Population = 17,212

Approximately 24 Industrial related businesses

The person in the position works in the following ways:

- Acts as a liaison between Communities and the County
- Monitors grant that are available and possibly usable in the County or Municipalities.
- Tracks open buildings that are available for lease or rent.
- Works on Childcare
- Works on Workforce Housing
- Runs a tourism website for the County
- Works with Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation (WEDC) to try to secure funding and business expansion.
- Tracks tourism visitor numbers and has promoted events in their City and County.
- Works to quantify and report tourism dollars spent in the County.
- She works with the Viroqua City Administrator to try to promote development

10/29/2022

**Call with Susan Knoble – Vernon Economic Development Association Director
501(c)3 Organization**

Vernon County Population = 30,915
3 Cities & 9 Villages

Richland County Population = 17,212
Approximately 24 Industrial related businesses

- This organization is not affiliated with Vernon County Government
- The Director has no staff
- VEDA's yearly budget for wage and office is \$70,000 / year
- They own and manage the Food Enterprise Center, a 100,000 sq. ft. Industrial building on 15 acres with around 25 tenants
- VEDA has around 130 donor members. You can see a list of those donors at <https://www.veda-wi.org/Members.html>
 - These donors contribute approximately \$30,000 of the budget.
 - Viroqua contributes \$5,000 of the \$30,000.
 - The other \$40,000 is raised through grant writing.
- A substantial amount of Susan's time is spent managing the Food Enterprise Center and keeping the 501(c)3 organization funded.

*** This organization's operation seems to have very little similarity to Richland Economic Development and its financial model, if prescribed to RED, would likely drastically reduce the productivity of the RED Office.*

RESOLUTION 2022 -

**RESOLUTION BY THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF RICHLAND CENTER CREATING A
FULL-TIME POSITION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

WHEREAS, the City of Richland Center ("the City") and Richland County jointly established the position of Economic Development Director; and

WHEREAS, the City and the Richland County both contribute about equally for the position of Economic Development Director; and

WHEREAS, the Economic Development Director serves both the City and the County while reporting to and receiving direction from the Richland Economic Development Board; and

WHEREAS, Richland County has identified Economic Development as a department eligible for elimination due to their financial challenges; and

WHEREAS, Richland County has explored alternative funding mechanisms without success; and

WHEREAS, both the City and Richland County may withdraw from the Structural Document establishing the shared Economic Development Director position without penalty; and

WHEREAS, the City has experienced demonstrable value from the role of Economic Development Director and wishes to preserve the position; and

WHEREAS, the City is committed to economic development and will support these efforts by creating a full-time position for the purpose of pursuing economic development; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the members of the Common Council do hereby authorize issuing Richland County a Notice of Intent to Withdraw from the Structural Document, and the establishment of a full-time position at the City for the purpose of pursuing economic development effective January 1, 2023.

APPROVED, by the Common Council of the City of Richland Center on this 20th day of December 2022 by the following vote: AYES: _____, NOS: _____

Adopted this 20th Day of December 2022

Todd Coppernoll, Mayor

Attest:

Aaron Joyce, City Clerk / Treasurer

Richland Economic Development Board Structural Document

1. Creation of the Board of Economic Development.

There is hereby created the Board of Richland Economic Development to promote economic development within Richland Center and Richland County (collectively, the “Parties”).

A. Overview: The creation of the Richland Economic Development (RED) Board is a collaboration between three sectors: (1) City and County government, (2) the business community, and (3) the civic sector. The RED Board works to promote the progress and benefit of economic development in Richland County and Richland Center for healthy growth.

B. Definitions:

- i. Government Sector:** The Richland County Board of Supervisors and The Richland Center City Council are the governmental entities represented on the RED Board.
- ii. Commerce Sector:** Privately owned businesses or entities of commerce in Richland County who seek the economic development and well-being of the people of Richland County and Richland Center.
- iii. Civic Sector:** Community development organizations, service organizations, philanthropic and benevolent organizations that are focused on a broad interest of development and betterment of the community.

C. Mission Statement:

Fostering a Community of Opportunity, Success, and Excellence

D. Scope: The RED Board is to promote a common mission, vision, and strategic planning for economic development in Richland County and Richland Center. The RED Board will promote goodwill and invitational posturing toward the established community and the attractional population. RED will participate in and work with regional development.

E. Representation: The RED Board will be the official representative of the City of Richland Center, Richland County, the Commerce Sector, and the Civic Sector for economic development throughout Richland County. The RED Board will work to create ideas, vision, direction and focus for economic development. The RED Board will take actions to bring prosperity to Richland County. Through the Economic Development Director (EDD), the RED Board will be the point of contact for interested parties for economic investment and development and will negotiate within its designated powers to bring in potential development to the City and County. The RED Board will also inform, advise, and consult with governmental entities, businesses, civic groups, and individuals so as to promote the economic well-being of Richland County and Richland Center.

F. Composition of the RED Board:

- i. **The RED Board** shall be comprised of eleven (11) members. Of these eleven members the following representation will exist:
 - a. The County Board Chair or Vice Chair
 - b. The Mayor of Richland Center or the City Council President
 - c. The City Administrator or City Clerk if there is not an Administrator
(Non-Voting Member)
 - d. The County Administrator or County Clerk if there is not an Administrator
(Non-Voting Member)
 - e. The Civic Sector representative
 - f. Five members from the Commerce Sector
 - g. One Citizen at Large
- ii. **The Commerce Sector members** will be chosen from the following categories. There should only be one member of the RED Board that represents any of the categories at any given time.
 - a. Manufacturing/industry
 - b. Health care
 - c. Education
 - d. Chamber of Commerce
 - e. Recreation/motels/restaurants
 - f. Banking/financial
 - g. Retail
 - h. Utilities
 - i. Small businesses
 - j. Agriculture/food supply
 - k. Entrepreneurship
 - l. Villages and Towns
 - m. Forestry
- iii. **The Citizen at Large** will represent or have expertise in the areas of;
 - a. Youth/under age 25
 - b. Disadvantaged people
 - c. Non-profits
 - d. Economic and Community Development
- iv. **The Civic Sector Representative** will have experience in the following fields;
 - a. Community development organizations
 - b. Service organizations
 - c. Philanthropic and benevolent organizations that are focused on a broad interest of development and betterment of the community.
- v. **The Government Sector** will be represented exclusively by the Mayor of Richland Center or the City Council President, the Richland County Board Chair or Vice Chair, the City Administrator or Clerk, and the County Administrator or Clerk. No other representative or official from either the Richland County Board or the Richland Center City Council may serve on the RED Board.

- vi. **Qualifications:** The RED Board members will make efforts to have broad representation from the stakeholders of the various categories above who have a record of knowledge and participation in community and economic development.
- vii. **Board Member Selection:** The RED Board will recruit new members from the designated categories above. Nominations will be open for any voting member of the Board to nominate someone to the Board who fits the category designated by the Board. After examination by the RED Board or a subcommittee, the RED Board will vote to seat a new member. This process will apply to new members on a four-year rotational term or to someone who will fill a seat vacated prior to the term expiration. A member is elected to the Board by simple majority.
- viii. **Chair:** The RED Board shall choose a chair from the voting members of the RED Board annually, at the last meeting of the calendar year to be seated at the January meeting.
- ix. **Voting powers:** All members of the RED Board will be voting members except the City Administrator and County Administrator.
- x. **Terms of Office:** Each RED Board member, except the four *ex officio* government members, shall serve a term of four-years on a rotating basis. Two seats shall expire each year and one seat will expire in the fourth year of a four-year cycle. Normally scheduled Board Member selections will occur in November of each year with new members being seated at the January meeting. Board Member selections to fill seats that have been vacated prior to the end of the associated term will be filled in accordance with 1(F)(viii) above at the earliest convenience of the RED Board. Existing RED Board members may be nominated and re-elected at the discretion of the RED Board.
- xi. **Removing a RED Board Member** requires a three-quarter vote of the RED Board voting members seated.

2. **Powers, Duties, and Responsibilities of the Richland Economic Development Board.**

The Board shall have the following powers and duties and none other.

- A. **Meetings:** The RED Board shall meet at least every other month or six (6) times per year with proper public notice for a governmental meeting.
 - i. **Attendance:** RED Board members shall attend all meetings of the RED Board each year. There will be one excused absence from a meeting of the RED Board with advance notice for each voting member.
 - ii. **A quorum** shall consist of a majority of the voting members.
 - iii. **Agendas** will be set by the Chair with contributions by the RED Board Members.
 - iv. **Meeting Minutes** of the RED Board will be maintained for each RED Board meeting at the direction of the Chair and will be posted to the City and County meetings site.

- v. **Open Meeting Laws:** The RED Board is subject to Wisconsin Open Meetings Laws.
- vi. **Conduct of Meetings:** In general, and in all disputed matters, Roberts Rules of Order shall be observed. In non-binding instances, consensus may be observed.
- vii. **Voting:** Each voting member shall have one vote.
- viii. **Votes:** Votes may be taken by voice or in writing as determined by the Chair.

B. Authority: The Board advises on policies, procedures, and strategic goals for economic development for Richland Center and Richland County and measures the progress of the goals, including goals and objectives for the Economic Development Director.

C. Budget: The Board will create a budget annually to be submitted to the City of Richland Center and Richland County for approval.

- i. The budget shall identify all expenses related to the employment of the EDD and the operation of the office.
- ii. The budget shall be submitted to the County and City consistent with their respective budget deadlines.
- iii. The budget must be approved by both the County Board and the City Council before it is effective. In the event that the budget is not approved by the County Board and/or the City Council for the succeeding year, the previous year's budget shall be used until such time as both governing bodies approve the succeeding year's budget.
- iv. The RED Board shall not authorize any expenditures other than what has been approved in the budget with the exception of Private Contributions (See 4(C) below).

D. Audit: The Board shall provide an audit or accounting of its financial records annually.

E. Community Presence: The Board shall Encourage interaction with and investment in economic development for the City and the County.

F. Reporting: The Board shall report to the City Council and County Board at least annually through the EDD.

G. Town Boards: The Board shall communicate with town boards and village boards for reporting and development of professional relationships.

3. **Economic Development Director (EDD)**

The RED Board will hire and oversee an EDD who will serve the needs to Richland County and Richland Center for economic development. While Richland County will act as the employer of record, it is understood that the EDD is a shared position. The employment aspects of the position will be under the guidelines of Richland County (wages, benefits, days off, health insurance...), while the functioning of the position (priorities, efforts, work habits, expectations...) of EDD will be overseen and directed by the RED Board.

- A. EDD evaluation:** The RED Board shall complete an annual evaluation of the EDD. The RED Board may recommend to the County Administrator and the County Board discipline or termination of the EDD based on performance. The RED Board may also recommend promotion or pay increases in the budget based on the performance of the EDD.
 - B. Non-monetary contribution:** The City will provide office space and office appurtenances (internet, land line, water, sewer, electric, heat...) for the EDD.
- 4. Funding:** The budgetary funding for the EDD position and staffing will be the responsibility of the City of Richland Center and Richland County Government. Other funds may be raised privately by the RED Board or its designees.
 - A. Shared contributions:** The City and County shall contribute to the approved budget which will pay all expenses related to wages, benefits, and professional expenses of the EDD. The County shall be responsible 60% of the funding and the City shall provide 40% of the funding. On an annual basis the City will pay their portion of the funding to the County.
 - B. Fiscal agent:** The County will function as the fiscal agent for funds contributed by government entities.
 - C. Private contributions:** Private contributions will be accounted for separately from government contributions and will be expended at the discretion of the RED Board.
- 5. Responsibilities of the City**
 - A.** The City's proportional contribution of the approved budget each year for the Shared Contribution.
 - B.** Posting of the EDD services and events on the City website with a separate and designated page for economic development.
 - C.** Provide sufficient office space for the EDD.
 - D.** Provide internet, land line phone services, water, sewer, electric and heating for the EDD office space.
 - E.** Provide the City Mayor as a voting Member to the Board.
 - F.** Provide City Administrator or Clerk as the ex-officio member from the City government as a non-voting Member to the Board.
- 6. Responsibilities of the County**
 - A.** The County's proportional contribution of the approved budget each year for the Government Contribution.

- B. Posting of the EDD services and events on the County website with a separate and designated page for economic development.
- C. To be the fiscal agent of the Shared Contribution received each year.
- D. Provide the County Board Chair as a voting Member to the Board.
- E. Provide the County Administrator or Clerk as the ex-officio member from the County government as a non-voting, Advisory Member to the Board.

7. Indemnification

The County and City shall indemnify, defend and hold harmless each other from all claims arising out of this Structural Document.

8. Term

The term of this Structural Document is for ten (10) years. The term will commence upon execution of this Structural Document. The Parties shall, not less than six (6) months prior to the expiration of this Structural Document, commence a joint review of the Agreement for purposes of renewing the Structural Document or negotiating for a successor agreement. This Structural Document shall automatically renew for a period of 10 years unless otherwise agreed to by the parties.

9. Amendments

Amendments to this Structural Document shall only be made by an affirmative vote of the City Council and the County Board.

10. Termination

This Structural Document may be terminated as follows:

- A. By mutual agreement of all the parties.
- B. If one of the governmental entities fails to make its budgeted and required contribution pursuant to this Structural Document, the other governmental entity may terminate this Structural Document upon such default.
- C. Either governmental entity may withdraw from this Structural Document provided they notify the other entity in writing of that intent by serving upon the other parties a "Notice of Intent to Withdraw." Upon the service of such Notice, the parties agree to meet and confer in a reasonable manner (time, location and number of meetings) within ninety (90) days to discuss the proposed withdrawal and potential amendments to the Structural Document. After ninety (90) days from service on all of the parties of the "Notice of Intent to Withdraw," the party which served that Notice may withdraw from the Structural Document by service upon all of the parties of a written "Notice of Withdrawal."

11. Miscellaneous

- A. No Assignment. No party may assign any of its rights or obligations under this Structural Document without the prior written consent of all parties.
- B. Entire Structural Document. This Structural Document and all other documents and agreements expressly referred to herein contain the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the matters set forth herein.
- C. Waiver. No failure or delay by any party in exercising any right, power or privilege in this Structural Document shall operate as a waiver thereof.
- D. Governing Law. This Structural Document shall be construed in accordance with the internal laws of the State of Wisconsin.
- E. Neutral Construction. This Structural Document is the result of a negotiated agreement by the parties and prior to the execution of this Structural Document each party had sufficient opportunity to have review of the document by legal counsel. Nothing in this Structural Document shall be construed more strictly for or against either party because that party's attorney drafted this Structural Document or any portion thereof or attachment thereto.
- F. Originals and Counterparts. This Structural Document may be executed in any number of counterparts, each of which shall be deemed to be an original.
- G. Incorporation of Attachments. All exhibits and other documents attached hereto or referred to herein are hereby incorporated in and shall become a part of this Structural Document.
- H. Headings. Descriptive headings are for convenience only and shall not control or affect the meaning or construction of any provision of this Structural Document.
- I. Severability. In the event that one portion of this Structural Document, or the application of this Structural Document to any extent is deemed invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, then (unless in the judgment of the party adversely affected thereby such provision was a material part of the consideration for their entering into this Structural Document that without it they would not have entered into the Structural Document) the remainder of this Structural Document or the application of such provision shall be valid and enforceable to the fullest extent permitted by law.

Richland County

Referendum Ad Hoc Committee

January 3rd, 2023

The Richland County Referendum Ad Hoc Committee convened on Tuesday, January 3rd, 2023, in person and by WebEx.

Committee members present included County Board Supervisors Steve Carrow, Shaun Murphy-Lopez, Bob Frank with Dave Turk and Erin Unbehaun by WebEx.

Also in attendance was Assistant to the Administrator Cheryl Dull taking minutes, Administrator Clinton Langreck and several department heads by WebEx, county employees, general public, County Board Members and WRCO.

Not present: Kerry Severson and Mayor Todd Coppernoll

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Murphy-Lopez called the meeting to order at 9:33 a.m.
2. **Proof of Notification:** Chair Murphy-Lopez verified that the meeting had been properly noticed. Copies of the agenda were sent by email to all Committee members, County Board members, WRCO, County department heads, Richland Observer, Valley Sentinel and a copy was posted on the Courthouse Bulletin Board.
3. **Agenda Approval:** Chair Murphy-Lopez asked for approval of the agenda. Moved by Supervisor Frank to approve the agenda as presented, second by Supervisor Carrow. All voting aye, motion carried.
4. **Public Comments:** Alan Lins asked to speak. Mr. Lins introduced himself. He spoke on Economic Development and his disappointment as to the County proposing to back out of the Economic Development funding. He feels the City of Richland Center has not looked into their future plans far enough to insure that keeping the Economic Development Director will be long term without reengaging with the County.
5. **Approval of Minutes:** Chair Murphy-Lopez asked for approval of the minutes from the December 22nd meeting. Moved by Supervisor Frank to accept the minutes as presented, 2nd by Supervisor Carrow. Motion carried
6. **Guest speaker: Washington County Executive Josh Schoemann:** Chair Murphy-Lopez introduced Josh Schoemann. Mr. Schoemann reviewed Washington and Green Lake Counties and City of Princeton referendums. In Washington County, he felt the reason the referendum didn't pass was because of the increase in county government. In Princeton the referendum passed. He recommended if Richland County is going to ask for an operational levy, they need to start education sooner than later and Senator Marklein should be advised on what the levy limits have done to County's. He felt education is key, not so much with the municipal board but more with the voters, therefore the Board Members getting out in the public is key. In reference to timeline discussion, he felt a 2024 referendum with a 12 to 24-month runway was wiser to get more education out to voters prior.
7. **Draft referendum report:** Chair Murphy-Lopez reviewed 07A, the findings from research that has been completed, the results compiled from that research and the changes to correspond with the recommendation. His conclusion is that most of these short falls through 2026 can be handled with short term borrowing in reviewing the 5-year financial plan. Supervisor Frank and Turk have concerns concerning #2 on page 3. By committing to this are we limiting ourselves to our future capabilities as any access funds could be used somewhere. Administrator Langreck stated his concerns with getting a ¾ vote to enable short term borrowing each year through 2027.

Moved by Supervisor Carrow to refer the Referendum Report to the Finance & Personnel Committee for consideration at their 1/3/23 meeting, 2nd by Supervisor Frank.

Moved by Supervisor Frank to amend the report to eliminating #2 on page 3 in document 07A Executive Summary, change Richland Economic Development funding to ½ of the current reduction in document 07E, eliminate line 226.02, change line 226.03 to be \$400,000.00 on the 5-year plan and update bar chart, 2nd by Supervisor Carrow.

Roll call vote requested on motion to amend, all voting aye, motion carried.

Roll call vote requested to refer to Finance & Personnel Committee with the 4 amended changes, all voting aye, motion carried.

Floyd Bartow asked to speak. He had concerns if the voters would understand what is being proposed to be on the referendum. Chair Murphy-Lopez agreed but explained that State Statute dictates how the question is

2022 Budget Adjustments

2023-2027 Financial Planning Decision Worksheet - DRAFT: (22 December 2022)

Purpose:

This document is intended to track projected revenue and expenditure changes to allow for planned adjustments to services, staffing and operations. This document is intended to focus on the Administrator's and Finance and Personnel Committee's conversations in efforts to prioritize services and expenditures, and to help illustrate and depict the many options and variables encountered through the planning process. This document may capture some capital projects proposed for operational levy. **This document's assumptions are built off a balanced 2022 budget** (accounting for use of fund balance and onetime revenues). Impacts that create an additional burden on the tax levy are indicated with a positive number; impacts that reduce burden on the levy are indicated with a negative number. Section #1 is built on the premise of COLA increases.

SECTION #1: Forecasted Expenditure Assumptions and Commitments (Organizational Expenditures):

#	Department	Description of proposed action:	Impacts on services:	Financial Impact of Action (+/-) to levy/					Notes
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	
A.1	Pine Valley - Projecting Wage Increases	Proposing: 2023 = Step Increase (2%) + 5% CPI; 2024 = Step Increase (2%) + 5% CPI; 2025 = 4% CPI; 2026 = 3% CPI; 2027 = 3% CPI	The Counties Strategic Plan includes the goal of reaching our Carlson Market Value by 2025. Guidance from Finance and Personnel included consideration for CPI increases. These together are intended to help keep us competitive in recruitment and retention.	\$ 365,234.15	\$ 390,800.54	\$ 238,946.61	\$ 186,378.36	\$ 191,969.71	Adjustments made to the August 12th document to incorporate F+P action to return to initial 7% increase in 2023.
A.2	Pine Valley - Projecting FICA Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 7.65% Employer Contribution		\$ 27,940.41	\$ 29,896.24	\$ 18,279.42	\$ 14,257.94	\$ 14,685.68	
A.3	Pine Valley - Projecting WRS Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 6.5% Employer Contribution		\$ 23,740.22	\$ 25,402.03	\$ 15,531.53	\$ 12,114.59	\$ 12,478.03	
A.4	Pine Valley - Projecting Health Increases	Estimates in Changing to ETF Plan on 5% trend on base:	\$ 1,161,418.06	\$ 43,672.54	\$ 45,856.17	\$ 48,148.98	\$ 50,556.42	\$ 53,084.25	Adjustet projections to project a 5% increase with ETF
A.5	Pine Valley - Projecting Worker's Compensation Premium Increases	Worker's Compensation Projects on the assumption of a 4.5% increase annually		\$ 6,089.44	\$ 6,808.91	\$ 7,490.64	\$ 8,062.55	\$ 8,678.12	
A.6			Totals:	\$ 466,676.76	\$ 498,763.89	\$ 328,397.18	\$ 271,369.87	\$ 280,895.79	
A.7	Revenue and Reimbursement Absorption	Costs can be covered by revenues without impact on operational tax levy	Impacts ability of transfer of operational surplus to general fund use. Accounting for this in Section #2 "Revenues" line "ee".	\$ 466,676.76	\$ 498,763.89	\$ 328,397.18	\$ 271,369.87	\$ 280,895.79	
A.8	Total Levy Impact			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
B.1	Highway - Projecting Wage Increases	Proposing 2023 = 5%; 2024 = 5%; 2025 = 4%; 2026 = 3%; 2027 = 1.5%	Reverting to CPI estimates (minus steps) from initial proposal based on F+P action to increase back to 5% in 2023.	\$ 85,016.33	\$ 83,409.36	\$ 71,398.41	\$ 56,761.74	\$ 58,464.59	Adjustments made to the August 12th document to incorporate F+P action to move up to 5% increase in 2023.
B.2	Highway - Projecting FICA Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 7.65% Employer Contribution		\$ 6,503.75	\$ 6,380.82	\$ 5,461.98	\$ 4,342.27	\$ 4,472.54	
B.3	Highway - Projecting WRS Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 6.5% Employer Contribution		\$ 5,526.06	\$ 5,421.61	\$ 4,640.90	\$ 3,689.51	\$ 3,800.20	
B.4	Highway - Projecting Health Increases	Estimates in Changing to ETF Plan on 5% trend on base:	\$ 447,559.50	\$ 16,829.48	\$ 17,670.95	\$ 18,554.50	\$ 19,482.23	\$ 20,456.34	Adjustet projections to project a 5% increase with ETF
B.5	Highway - Projecting Worker's Comp			\$ 1,860.66	\$ 2,080.50	\$ 2,288.81	\$ 2,463.56	\$ 2,651.65	
B.6			Totals:	\$ 115,736.28	\$ 114,963.23	\$ 102,344.60	\$ 86,739.31	\$ 89,845.31	
B.7	Revenue and Reimbursement Absorption		Can be accounted for by revenues and reimbursements, but then results in reduction in maintenance or offset with borrowing. This equates to about 3 miles of resurface. This extends our life cycle plan of 50 year of full replacement, without maintaining short-term borrowing of at least \$500,000 earmarked for roads.	\$ 115,736.28	\$ 114,963.23	\$ 102,344.60	\$ 86,739.31	\$ 89,845.31	
B.8	Total Levy Impact			\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
C.1	General - Projecting Wage Increases	Proposing 2023 = 5%; 2024 = 5%; 2025 = 4%; 2026 = 3%; 2027 = 1.5%	Reverting to CPI estimates (minus steps) from initial proposal based on F+P action to increase back to 5% in 2023.	\$ 415,267.43	\$ 407,418.09	\$ 348,749.89	\$ 277,256.16	\$ 285,573.84	Adjustments made to the August 12th document to incorporate F+P action to move up to 5% increase in 2023.
C.2	General - Projecting FICA Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 7.65% Employer Contribution		\$ 31,767.96	\$ 31,167.48	\$ 26,679.37	\$ 21,210.10	\$ 21,846.40	
C.3	General - Projecting WRS Increases	Increases based on the assumption of a 6.5% Employer Contribution		\$ 26,992.38	\$ 26,482.18	\$ 22,668.74	\$ 18,021.65	\$ 18,562.30	
C.4	General - Projecting Health Increases	Estimates in Changing to ETF Plan on 5% trend on base:	\$ 1,802,347.65	\$ 67,773.27	\$ 71,161.93	\$ 74,720.03	\$ 78,456.03	\$ 82,378.83	Adjustet projections to project a 5% increase with ETF
C.5	General - Projecting Worker's Comp			\$ 8,965.01	\$ 10,024.23	\$ 11,027.88	\$ 11,869.86	\$ 12,776.13	
C.6			Totals:	\$ 550,766.05	\$ 546,253.92	\$ 483,845.91	\$ 406,813.80	\$ 421,137.50	
C.7	Revenue and Reimbursement Absorption through HHS		Not anticipating any ability to absorb additional expenses.						
C.8	Total Levy Impact	These are the individual year additional amounts, they are not the accumulated amounts to show impacts in relation to 2022 as the baseline budget.		\$ 550,766.05	\$ 546,253.92	\$ 483,845.91	\$ 406,813.80	\$ 421,137.50	
C.9	Total Cumulative Levy Impact	This line is intended to show the cumulative impact of the increases in comparison to the 2022 budget to identify needs in filling compounded gap		\$ 550,766.05	\$ 1,097,019.97	\$ 1,580,865.88	\$ 1,987,679.67	\$ 2,408,817.18	

Consider % wage overestimation on steps, not account for attrition to help buffer underage on health insurance

2022 Budget Adjustments

32.02	UW Food Services	Increase sales prices to cover expenses		\$ (52,974.00)	\$ (55,622.00)	\$ (58,403.00)	\$ (61,323.00)	\$ (64,389.00)	
Total projected impact on UW Food dept/program:				\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	

33.90	Economic Development	Response to Resolution 22-94	City is willing and eager to take on economic development entirely. This reduction accounts for some minor contribution towards some existing services	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	City Council is moving to take action
Total projected impact on Economic Dev				\$ -	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	\$ (64,840.43)	

34.01	Southwest Regional Planning Commission	Consideration for ending partnership with Southwest Regional Planning	Anticipated (\$17,500) in reduction from discontinuing membership.						
34.02	Library	Increase of \$217,605.50 in 2022 to \$217,954.22 in 2023. Equates to a \$348.72 increase.	Library Levy falls as an exemption to the levy limit statute. It impacts overall tax burden but no operational levy limit. Wis Statute 66.0602(3)(4)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Total projected impact on Southwest Regional Planning Commission:									

Total Impacts from Department Services (Adjustments and Options)				\$ (45,870.98)	\$ (372,825.31)	\$ (238,205.50)	\$ (392,792.55)	\$ (37,716.65)	
--	--	--	--	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	----------------	--

SECTION #5: Health Insurance Planning and Adjustments									
#	Department	Description of proposed action:	Impacts on services:	Financial Impact of Action (+/-) to levy/					
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	
101.01	Health Insurance	County commitment to annual dollar amount regardless of increase	Need to be mindful of ACA poverty limits on lowest paying positions + penalty						
101.04	Health Insurance	Premium share adjustment	Need to be mindful of ACA poverty limits on lowest paying positions + penalty						
101.05	Health Insurance	HRA adjustment	HRA contribution provided by the county is reduced from \$1000/\$3000F to \$500/\$1500F. The estimated liability in 2023 is \$300,000. Impact to levy expense is estimated at \$150,000 reduced levy risk. Actual impact depends on claims.	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	
	Health Insurance	Plan Design Adjustment	Change to plan by entering ETF system.	Factured into section 1					
Total Impacts from Health Insurance Planning (Adjustments and Options)				\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	\$ (81,893.07)	

SECTION#6: Options and Resources for Additional Financial Adjustments:									
#	Department	Add-in / Take-out/Amendment:	Impacts:	Financial Impact of Action (+/-) to levy/					
				2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	
201.01	Tax Deed Sales	Incorporate tax deeds sales	Projection: Could incorporate if we also incorporate making whole, liens, and fees associated. The risk on some is seen as balancing possible revenues. By statute we can only recognize a net gain after 5 years of no claim.	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
202.01	Sales Tax	Anticipated projections in sales tax compared to 2022	Not recommended at this time	\$ (35,000.00)	\$ (25,000.00)	\$ (25,000.00)	\$ (25,000.00)	\$ (25,000.00)	Amended from an estimated \$5,000 to less conservative projection. Each year remains individual and not compounded.
203.01	Interest Income	Anticipated projections in interest income from LGIP/Investment Funds	Not recommended at this time	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
204.01	Interest Income	Anticipated projections in interest income from PMA Investment Funds	This would lock some of our funds into short-term investments with return at a couple of percent: from 68K up to 75K	\$ (75,000.00)	\$ (75,000.00)	\$ (75,000.00)	\$ (75,000.00)	\$ (75,000.00)	
204.02	Property Tax	Projected property tax revenue increases from value	Reference Section number two as anticipated increased revenues from Net New Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
205.01	Wheel Tax	Amendments in projected wheel tax	Currently applying all revenues to highway road resurfacing (chip seal) for road preservation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
206.01	Undesignated Fund Spending	General Fund Balance Applied	Estimated \$268,692 in potential cash (non-asset) in staying over the 25% ratio of budgeted expenditures						
207.01	Accounting for additional fund balance return	Recognition of 2021 unaccounted revenues.	Example: HHS Revenue return, Highway Fund, Pine Valley Fund						
208.01	American Rescue Plan	Applied American Rescue Plan to 2022 operations (designated \$1,673,845.55)	Discretionary Funds that may be used for any function other than direct retirement or reduction to existing tax levy. Appropriation of funds from Public Health? - understanding that Public Health remains underfunded.	\$ (524,088.07)	\$ (574,878.74)	\$ (574,878.74)			
209.01		Additional 25,500 from Ambulance	Unless used for some other purpose						
210.01	Opioid Settlement	Utilization of Opioid Settlement Funds	Must be used towards opioid abatement projects.						

Richland County

Rules & Strategic Planning Standing Committee

January 5th, 2023

The Rules and Strategic Planning Standing Committee met on Thursday, January 5th, 2023, at 10:00 a.m. in the County Board Room at 181 W. Seminary Street via videoconference and teleconference.

Committee members present included: Committee Chair Shaun Murphy-Lopez, Ingrid Glasbrenner, Linda Gentes, Chad Cosgrove, Bob Frank, Marty Brewer with Danielle Rudersdorf and Don Seep by WebEx.

Absent: Julie Fleming.

Department heads, staff and public present were: County Administrator Clint Langreck by WebEx, Administrative Assistant Cheryl Dull, with John Couey and Josh from MIS running the teleconferencing.

1. **Call to Order** - Committee Chair Murphy-Lopez called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.
2. **Proof of Notification** - Chair Murphy-Lopez confirmed that the meeting had been properly noticed.
3. **Agenda Approval** - Moved by Supervisor Cosgrove to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Supervisor Glasbrenner. All voting aye, motion carried.
4. **Approval of minutes** – Moved by Supervisor Gentes to approve as presented, 2nd by Supervisor Frank. All voting aye, motion carried.
5. **Public comments** - Chair Murphy-Lopez invited any public to make comments. Alan Lins asked to speak to item 08b. He would like to urge the City and the RED Board that if there are any issues or concerns in the future that a joint meeting be held.
6. **Comprehensive plan RFP** – Chair Murphy-Lopez will send out the RFP's (Request for Proposal) to multiple vendors compiled from research. The cost was not specified in the RFP, vendors must provide that. Time frame requirements are specified in the RFP. Supervisor Frank, Gentes and Rudersdorf would like hard copies and if it can be available in large print Seep would like one of the Proposals. Moved by Supervisor Cosgrove to issue a Request for Proposals for services to update Richland County's comprehensive plan with the change in the request for copies, 2nd by Supervisor Glasbrenner. All voting aye, motion carried.
7. **Condolences for the family of Gaylord Deets** – Chair Murphy-Lopez reached out to the family and has prepared an Ordinance. Moved by Supervisor Gentes to recommend a resolution to the Richland County Board expressing condolences to the family of Gaylord Deets, former County Board Supervisor, 2nd by Supervisor Cosgrove. All voting aye, motion carried.
8. **Committee Structure Changes** -
 - a. **Public Safety Standing Committee name change** – Chair Murphy-Lopez reviewed that the Public Safety Committee would like their name changed. See attached minutes 08a. They have requested the name change to be "Public Safety and Judiciary Committee". Chair Murphy-Lopez also made updates the Housing Authority removing C. in purpose, Land and Zoning Standing Committee removing 4. and renumber 5-6, modifications to the Richland Economic Development Board purpose, and Rules and Strategic Planning Standing Committee adding D.

Moved by Supervisor Glasbrenner to recommend to the County Board amending the Committee Structure document to reflect several changes and refer to the Richland Economic Development Board the issue of changing the terms of the agreement between the County and City of Richland Center, 2nd by Supervisor Cosgrove. All voting aye, motion carried.
 - b. **Richland Economic Development Board committee description and agreement** – Chair Murphy-Lopez reviewed a Resolution approved by the City of Richland Center in December. After discussion and following the changes at the Finance & Personnel Standing Committee this week, it was decided to schedule a meeting with Rules and Strategic Planning Committee and the City Council, or one of their committees, concerning their request to withdraw and invite the Richland Economic Development Board.

Moved by Supervisor Frank to have a meeting with the City Council or a Committee of the Council as soon as possible arranged by the County Administrator and the City Administrator with an invitation extended to the RED Board, 2nd by Supervisor Glasbrenner. All voting aye, motion carried.