

**MINUTES OF THE ONEIDA COUNTY
PUBLIC SAFETY COMMITTEE MEETING
JANUARY 16, 2020**

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Russ Fisher, Billy Fried, Mitch Ives, Chairman Mike Timmons

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Joan Meyer (Branch I), Anna Gauthier (DA Office), Jennifer Allen (Branch II), Brian Desmond (Corporation Counsel), Crystal Schaub (ME Office), Sheriff Grady Hartman, County Board Member Steve Schreier, Tom Jerow

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Timmons called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. at the Oneida County Courthouse, Committee Room #2, stated the meeting notice had been posted and mailed in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law and noted accommodations would be made for handicap accessibility.

APPROVE AGENDA

MOTION: To approve the amended agenda (Fisher/Ives, PASSED).

APPROVE PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

MOTION: To approve the December 12, 2019, Public Safety Committee Meeting Minutes (Fried/Ives, PASSED).

SCHEDULE COMMITTEE MEETING DATE(S)

The next meeting was scheduled for February 20, 2020.

BILLS, VOUCHERS AND LINE ITEM TRANSFERS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENTS

MOTION: To approve bills, vouchers, and line item transfers for Public Safety Departments (Fried/Fisher, PASSED).

ONEIDA COUNTY A SECOND AMENDMENT SANCTUARY

Chairman Timmons handed out copies of the Florence County Resolution regarding Second Amendment Sanctuary (Exhibit #1). There was discussion on other counties/townships, etc. passed/not passed resolutions regarding sanctuary. Timmons asked if this was something the committee would like to go forward with creating their own resolution with input from Sheriff Hartman and Corp Counsel Desmond.

Fried asked what this was all about. Timmons stated it was to guarantee second amendment rights, if something were to change in the constitution, it would guarantee what you own legally today, you legally own and could not be taken away.

Sheriff Hartman reported that he supported the concept of it, but this was likely merely symbolic and a statement. Hartman stated that if you live in the Northwoods, there was a high probability that you own guns or have guns in your house. Hartman reported that

Madison forgets about anything north of Highway 29/10. Hartman stated that possessing a gun in an urban area might be odd, but in rural areas it is not, and Madison forgets that. Harman stated Madison passes laws that affect everyone, but they need to take into account the rural areas of the state. Hartman stated he supports the concept, but the resolutions are not really very binding.

Ives asked if this was tied to the red flag gun law proposal. Hartman stated yes, and he was concerned when the Governor talked about mandatory buy backs and how someone could buy my property when it was not for sale. Hartman stated it was very concerning when the government takes people's property. Hartman stated he had many people in the community contact him regarding this topic and he is following what is happening in Virginia, where there is talk about enforcing gun control and people are pushing back in the more rural areas with large scale protests.

Desmond stated it was not the Sheriff's prerogative to determine what was constitutional and that needed to go through the courts to determine if it was valid. The constitutionality of law is not determined at the local level.

Timmons reiterated that this resolution was just an example that brought to his attention and was not what this committee would suggest.

Fried asked if the committee was looking for wording to go forward and present a resolution to the county board. Timmons stated yes, that had been discussed. Ives asked if anyone had put this forward to the board and Timmons reported no one had yet. Desmond stated this type of resolution would need to come from a committee to the board. Fisher stated he would like to see this at the county board floor and discussed there, and opened for public comment or a public hearing. Ives agreed that it should go forward, even if only symbolic. There was further discussion on if this was the path to go, the process to get things done, and pending legislation.

County Board Rep for District 4 Steven Schreier was in the audience and spoke. Schreier stated he was concerned that this was thinly veiled politics. Schreier stated they all recognize that this is a hot button. Schreier asked if this issue were to go to full county board, then what would the next issue be, abortion? Schreier was concerned about the process for the public to chime in, and did not want this just sent to the floor for the county board to decide and speak for the public. Schreier asked where in the Second Amendment it listed body armor as it does in this resolution. Schreier asked how much time they wanted to spend tweaking this resolution and if this needed to take place in their arena or if it should take place in Madison. Schreier stated he thought people were putting the cart before the horse on this subject, and it shouldn't be debated on the county board floor.

Timmons noted to Schreier that he wanted to stand corrected, that this was the first introduction of a resolution, he was just bringing this information forward, and numerous political resolutions had been brought forward in this manner. This was not a first time precedent-setting item.

Schreier apologized and stated that it sounded like some of the members were ready to send to the county board floor. Ives stated that the committee wanted to be proactive instead of reactive. Fisher stated this was something to look into and work on a resolution. Fried stated he did not like the wording in the presented resolution. Sheriff Hartman stated he had two strong opinions on this. One, this was up to the County Board to decide. Sheriff Hartman stated it was important that the County Board have this debate, as the community wants to know where their elected officials stand on this matter related to the Northwoods. Two, it is likely this is symbolic and Sheriff Hartman doesn't believe it will change the way the Sheriff's Office operates on a day-to-day basis. Sheriff Hartman and committee members noted that they have had many contacts from the community related to this subject.

There was further discussion on statutory timeframes, referendum vs. resolution, action to be taken. Ives stated the committee needed to be proactive, not just sit back and wait and see. Fisher stated the media is looking at what townships, counties, etc. were doing. There was discussion on how the committee wanted Corporation Counsel to proceed. Desmond stated he could put the Florence County Resolution into Oneida County Resolution format (with numbering system) for easy reference when the committee reviews, and emailed to committee members.

MOTION: To have Corporation Counsel put the Florence County resolution into Oneida County resolution format (with numbering system for easy reference) to be brought back to this committee next month for review (Ives/Fisher, PASSED).

Fried asked Desmond to request information from other counties/cities that have passed a resolution related to Second Amendment Sanctuary. Schreier suggested that the committee look at those that passed and failed, for the simple fact that it will make the language better for their resolution. Desmond stated he had contacts that he could ask for language of their resolution, whether passed or failed. Timmons stated the committee does not have much to go on at this time, and in November when he received this (Florence County resolution), it was the only one he had heard about. Ives noted this definitely is in the media radar at this time.

MOTION: To direct Corporation Counsel to collect as many similar resolutions as possible regarding the Second Amendment Sanctuary, both those that passed and failed (Timmons/Fried, PASSED).

Schreier asked if this was purely resolution right now and not referendum related. Timmons stated this would include any information that Desmond could locate, to include referendum information.

CIRCUIT COURT BRANCH II

Branch II and Corporation Counsel to attend Courthouse Security Conference in Appleton in March

Desmond reported that he and Jen Allen from Circuit Court Branch II are requesting to attend the Courthouse Security Conference in Appleton on March 3, 4, 5, 2020, which is put on by the US Marshall Service, along with Courthouse Security Sergeant Dave

Seefeldt. Desmond reported the entire Courthouse Security Team (which meets quarterly) was invited to attend. The cost of the conference is \$239, but they have applied for scholarships, which cover the cost. The understanding is that in the past, people who have not previously attended have received scholarships to pay for the conference. Timmons stated it was a great idea for them to attend and monies could be found from budgetary places if the scholarships did not come through. Allen stated she spoke with her contact in Forest County, who relayed that Forest County has always received a scholarship.

MOTION: To approve Branch II and Corporation Counsel to attend the Courthouse Security Conference in Appleton on March 3, 4,5, 2020 to be paid by scholarships, and if those scholarships fall through, to find pay monies within the budget to pay for attendance (Timmons/Ives, PASSED).

Fried stated he was interested in attending this conference and would speak with Luann in Building and Grounds. Allen will email Fried information regarding the topics at this conference.

CORPORATION COUNSEL

It is anticipated that a motion will be made, seconded, and approved by roll call vote to enter into closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(c) considering employment, promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation date of any public employee over which this body has jurisdiction or responsibility. Topic: Corporation Counsel's Performance Evaluation goals for 2020.

MOTION: It is anticipated that a motion will be made, seconded, and approved by roll call vote to enter into closed session pursuant to Section 19.85(1)(c) considering employment, promotion, compensation, or performance evaluation date of any public employee over which this body has jurisdiction or responsibility. Topic: Corporation Counsel's Performance Evaluation goals for 2020. (Fried/Fisher, On a Roll Call Vote: IVES: Aye, FRIED: Aye, FISHER: Aye, TIMMONS: Aye,).

The Committee entered into closed session at 10:35 a.m.

It is anticipated that the Committee will return to open session by roll call vote to consider the remainder of the meeting agenda.

MOTION: To return to open session (Fisher/Ives, On a Roll Call Vote: IVES: Aye, FRIED: Aye, FISHER: Aye, TIMMONS: Aye,).

The Committee returned to open session at 10:47 a.m.

Announcement of action taken in closed session, if such announcement will not undermine the need for the closed session.

MOTION: To accept Corporation Counsel's Performance Evaluation goals for 2020 as presented (Fried/Ives, PASSED).

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Tom Jerow spoke (prior to closed session) and stated this was a deeply partisan issue. Jerow agreed that it was not the Sheriff's duty to deem what was constitutional and non-constitutional, that was up for another body to determine. Jerow stated his co-worker was shot down in their front yard and wondered if a red flag law would have helped in that moment. Jerow stated he knows how this will go because of the way the county board votes. Jerow thought it was important to have an open session that Corporation Counsel spoke about. Jerow stated he did not believe it was likely we would see gun laws the way our government is run at this time. Jerow thanked the committee for their time and allowing him to speak.

ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDA(S)

Corporation Counsel to bring Florence County Second Amendment Sanctuary Resolution in Oneida County resolution format (for easy reference) and various other agency resolutions (passed or failed) for committee review.

ADJOURN

10:49 a.m.

Mike Timmons, Chairman

Andi Seidel, Committee Secretary

Russ Fisher, Vice-Chairman