AGENDA
SECURITY AND FACILITY COMMITTEE
May 18, 2017, 1:00-2:00
EOC


Notice is hereby given that a majority of the Bayfield County Board may be present at the meeting to gather information about a subject over which they have decision-making responsibility. This constitutes a meeting of the Bayfield County Board pursuant to State ex rel. Badke v. Greendale Village Bd., 173 Wis. 2d 553, 494 N.W.2d 408(1993), and must be noticed as such, although the County Board will not take any formal action at this meeting.

1. Review of Minutes of April 6, 2017
2. Review Study Scope Checklist
3. Recommendations of Consultant / Discussion and Review
4. Prioritization
5. Recommendation to Executive Committee/County Board

Any person planning to attend a Bayfield County meeting that has a disability requiring special accommodations should contact 373-6100, 24-hours before the scheduled meeting, so appropriate arrangements can be made.

cc: Bayfield County Board of Supervisors
    The Daily Press, via fax
    The County Journal, via fax
Security and Facility Group Notes April 6, 2017

In attendance:

Nikki Revak, Jeff Silbert, John Gary, Denise Tarasewicz, Craig Parks, Paul Houck, Kay Cederberg, Kim Lawton, Scott Fibert, Bruce Schwartzman, Mark Abeles-Allison, Dennis Pocernich, Paul Susienka, Judge John Anderson, Henry Pittner, Brenda Spulock (2:34pm), Griff Nordling

Reviewed notes from the last meeting.

Review of the deliverables in the contract with the consultants.

Schwartzman reviewed that they met with all departments and compiled recommendations based upon the input gathered during those meetings, along with feedback that was received after the last group meeting.

Consultants recommend that Criminal Justice should be located nearer to the legal offices and court.

Child Support office should be located in a more secured location.

Office locations and security zone diagrams with Options A & B were reviewed. Both options create a secured zone and a non-secured zone.

Comment received that there are no barriers to prevent vehicles from ramming the courthouse. Lighting around the courthouse is also identified as a concern. Comment was shared that having a courthouse security officer deters/reduces risk of incident. Sheriff clarified that the court security officer may not be on site when court is not in session. Comment that the county should consider a separate justice facility.

Lengthy discussion was held regarding the appropriate location and space needs for the Criminal Justice Program. Suggestion was made to swap the Emergency Management and/or Veteran’s Services with the Criminal Justice office.

Consultants reviewed the list of security related recommendations. Key card access was a recommendation that was supported by several in attendance. Suggestion was made that audio needs to be attached to cameras that are activated when a duress alarm is activated so that dispatch can notify law enforcement of more details of what is actually happening.

Consultants explained that they refer to/utilize statutes as well as security checklists provided by several Federal Agencies and groups for best practices.