

From: Jim J. Graf  
Sent: Wednesday, February 22, 2006 2:57 PM  
To: (Marilyn M. Vicky M.)  
Cc: Renee Suscha  
Subject: New Police Facility

Just got off the phone with DC Wojis. He reported to me that John Sabinash said the cost estimate for construction was based on about a 35,000 sq. ft station. The D.C. said they would need a minimum of 64,000 sq. ft. he estimated the cost to be an additional \$1.5 million of construction cost. According to Rich G. an additional \$120,000 would be needed to cover the additional debt service for the Police Facility. I asked him to put something on our finance agenda to discuss this situation.

I believe that if we are going to share any services with the County, as far as law enforcement, now is the time to look at these, including: joint dispatch, turning over detective division to the sheriff, and moving the maintenance division to the municipal service building. If you have the opportunity since you are both on PP&S maybe you could discuss some of the above suggestions at you committee.

Thanks for you help. Jim G.

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2006 10:50 PM  
**To:** Jim J. Graf  
**Subject:** Re: New Police Facility

I believe that if we are going to share any services with the County, as far as law enforcement, now is the time to look at these, including: joint dispatch, turning over detective division to the sheriff, and moving the maintenance division to the municipal service building. If you have the opportunity since you are both on PP&S maybe you could discuss some of the above suggestions at you committee.

Thanks for you help. Jim G.

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Relax. Yahoo! Mail [virus scanning](#) helps detect nasty viruses!

From: Richard Suscha [REDACTED]

Posted At: Sunday, February 26, 2006 12:22 AM  
Conversation: New Police Facility  
Posted To: CS-Archive  
Subject: RE: New Police Facility

Jim,

I got this message sent back to me without any comments from you. Did you say anything?

Vicky and I met with Helmke unexpectedly on Friday. He's willing to cooperate and do anything that the County Board tells him to do.

I was thinking about meeting with the Chairman of their Law Committee, Michael Ogea. Do you know him? Do you think he might be open to the concept of Metropolice? I thought I might start with him and see if he would like to intorduce this concept to the County Board, OR if maybe a joint meeting between their Law Committee & our PP & S committee might be in order.

Let me know what you

think. Renee

**"Jim J. Graf** <[REDACTED]>

wrote: Jim,

Vicky and I will be meeting with Sheriff Helmke next week. I'd like to put this on the PP & S agenda for our first meeting in March, once we have some more information. Would that screw up the time line?

I hope you put it on the finance agenda next week. That way you can be the bad guy and I can coast for two weeks! If there is a rush, I can add it to the PP & S agenda on Friday or Monday, just let me know.

Renee

**"Jim J. Graf** <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Just got off the phone with DC Wojis. He reported to me that John Sabinash said the cost estimate for construction was based on about a 35,000 sq. ft station. The D.C. said they would need a minimum of 64,000 sq. ft. he estimated the cost to be an additional \$1.5 million of construction cost. According to Rich G. an additional \$120,000 would be needed to cover the additional debt service for the Police Facility. I asked him to put something on our finance agenda to discuss this situation. Sounds good to me. Discussion of the additional cost for the police station should be on the Finance Agenda for Monday. See you on Monday. Have a great weekend. Jim G

From: Richard Suscha [REDACTED]  
Posted At: Thursday, May 11, 2006 10:09 AM  
Conversation: Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution  
Posted To: CS-Archive  
Subject: Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution

Hello,

Attached is the resolution that will be on the agenda Monday night.

Thanks for your support.

Renee

How low will we go? Check out Yahoo! Messenger's low PC-to-Phone call rates.

From: Richard Suscha [REDACTED]  
**Posted At:** Thursday, May 11, 2006 9:33 PM  
**Conversation:** Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution  
**Posted To:** CS-Archive  
**Subject:** RE: Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution

PRIVATE COMMENTS. NOT FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION. Jim,

I spent hours with Jim Bohrn, Eldon, and Jean Kliejunas incorporating their suggestions and addressing their concerns. After jumping through hoops for Eldon, he decided this morning that this issue should go to the Committee of the Whole instead of a special study group.

I think it's imperative that we have input from County Supervisors right from the start. I think some of the walls that were built between the City and County are from unilateral decisions or from decisions made by department heads without the input from Council. This study group incorporates all the stakeholders, something I think is essential to get buy-in from everyone involved.

Another problem with going with the COW right from the start is the way Silas runs meetings. He loves to let the public speak for as long as they want. I think the police union (and potentially all unions) would fill the Council Chambers with complainers. This would slow down the entire process.

So, a long answer to your short question is that Steve McLean advised me not to have more than 8 authors on this document, but this was before

Baumann resigned. At the last minute, I decided it would look better if I left my name off of this resolution. The people who agreed to author it are Bohren, Manny, Montemeyer, Meyer, Kleijunas, and you.

I would guess, and this is only a guess, that after a full discussion on the floor maybe Eldon, Radtke and I might vote in favor of this.

We'll have to wait until Monday to see

how it goes. Renee

**"Jim J. Graf <GRAFJJG@co.sheboygan.wi.us>** wrote: The Resolution looks good to me, were other council members contacted or only the ones listed? Jim  
G

-- Original Message-----

**From:** Richard Suscha [REDACTED]

**Posted At:** Thursday, May 11, 2006 10:09 AM

**Posted To:** CS-Archive

**Conversation:** Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution

**Subject:** Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution

Hello,

Attached is the resolution that will be on the agenda Monday night. Thanks for your support.

Renee

How low will we go? Check out Yahoo! Messenger's low PC-to-Phone call rates.

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.--'

Resolution No. \_ By Alderpersons Bohren, Graf, Meyer, Montemeyer, Manny & Kliejunas

**A RESOLUTION** authorizing the formation of a Metropolitan Law Enforcement Services Study Committee to review the opportunities and challenges of the possibility of contracting with the Sheboygan County Sheriff for law enforcement services.

**WHEREAS**, Wisconsin Act 40 provides for the County Sheriff Department to provide law enforcement services to municipalities, and

**WHEREAS**, 80% of the Sheboygan Citizens who participated in the Citizen Budget process agree the City should share services and costs by merging the police and sheriff departments, and

**WHEREAS**, Future revenues the City of Sheboygan receives may not be able to keep pace with the continued cost increases of the City of Sheboygan police department, and there may be substantial savings to the taxpayers by contracting with the Sheriff's Department for law enforcement services, and

**WHEREAS**, a study of the opportunities and challenges of the possibility of joining forces with the County Sheriff will give the Common Council and the city taxpayers a basis to make an informed decision,

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:** That the Common Council hereby establishes a Metropolitan Law Enforcement Services Study Committee for the purpose of reviewing the opportunities and challenges of the possibility of contracting with the Sheboygan County Sheriff's Office for law enforcement services pursuant to Wisconsin Act 40, and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the committee will have public input scheduled at the beginning and end of each meeting, and the committee will reach a recommendation within four months. The committee will research the issue, meet with consultants if deemed necessary, develop an action plan including the advantages and disadvantages of combined law enforcement services, and make a recommendation. A recommendation to move ahead will result in their action plan being presented to the full Common Council and Sheboygan County Board of Supervisors at a joint meeting for further consideration, discussion and possible implementation.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the composition of the voting members of the committee shall consist of 8 people who are residents of the City of Sheboygan, one County Board Supervisor from outside the city, and shall be appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by the Common Council. The specific composition of the committee shall consist of:

Voting Members

- \*Two Alderpersons
- \*One Accountant (CPA)
- \*One Business Leader
- \*One Labor Leader
- \*One School District Representative
- \*One Citizen at Large
- \*One County Board Supervisor who represents the City of Sheboygan
- \*One County Board Supervisor who represents Sheboygan County

Non-Voting Members

- \*One Sheboygan Police Department Representative
- \*One Sheboygan County Sheriff Department Representative
- \*Sheboygan City Attorney
- \*Sheboygan County Corporate Counsel

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:** That the committee shall be temporary and shall automatically dissolve when it presents its final recommendation to the Common Council.

From: Richard Suscha [REDACTED]  
Posted At: Thursday, May 11, 2006 9:33 PM  
Conversation: Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution  
Posted To: CS-Archive  
Subject: RE: Law Enforcement Study Committee Resolution

PRIVATE COMMENTS. NOT FOR PUBLIC CONSUMPTION. Jim,

I spent hours with Jim Bohrn, Eldon, and Jean Kliejunas incorporating their suggestions and addressing their concerns. After jumping through hoops for Eldon, he decided this morning that this issue should go to the Committee of the Whole instead of a special study group.

I think it's imperative that we have input from County Supervisors right from the start. I think some of the walls that were built between the City and County are from unilateral decisions or from decisions made by department heads without the input from Council. This study group incorporates all the stakeholders, something I think is essential to get buy-in from everyone involved.

Another problem with going with the COW right from the start is the way Silas runs meetings. He loves to let the public speak for as long as they want. I think the police union (and potentially all unions) would fill the Council Chambers with complainers. This would slow down the entire process.

So, a long answer to your short question is that Steve McLean advised me not to have more than 8 authors on this document, but this was before Baumann resigned. At the last minute, I decided it would look better if I left my name off of this resolution. The people who agreed to author it are Bohren, Manny, Montemeyer, Meyer, Kleijunas, and you.

I would guess, and this is only a guess, that after a full discussion on the floor maybe Eldon, Radtke and I might vote in favor of this.

We'll have to wait until Monday to see how it goes.

Renee

"Jim J. Graf <[REDACTED]> wrote:

The Resolution looks good to me, were other council members contacted or only the ones listed? Jim G

**From:** Perez, Mayor

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 21, 2006 8:47

**To:** 'Jim J.Graf

**Subject-** RE: Bldg Use committee meeting

Good Morning Alderman Graf: I will have Susan fax you two documents. It is time to make some tough decisions and move on. Thank you.

*"Let our thoughts and actions reflect our true commitment to public service."* Mayor Juan Perez, city of sheboygan.

—Original Message—

**From:** Jim J. Graf [mailto: ]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 21, 2006 7:38 AM

**To:** Perez, Mayor

**Subject:** Bldg Use committee meeting

Mayor, I will call a meeting on either June 22, @ 4, or June 23 @ 4, or June 26 @ 4. All of these choices would require

that the meeting would be over within an hour. We would discuss the spending limit on the new PDS and make a recommendation as to what the \$ amount should be for the project. I would hope that the price tag could be at the

\$8,000,000 range.

Would you please fax me a copy of the resolution we looked at last night. My fax number is 459-0399. I will be checking to

see what other meetings are on the dates listed above. I will also be contacting the council members of the BU Committee

to make sure they can be there. My directions to the committee will include a review of all the plans and project specs to

bring the square footage down to about 40,000 square feet.

I would also like to suggest that we eliminate the garage, sally port, detective department, keep the dispatch area where it

is, until a decision is made about joint dispatch. With those adjustments, I believe that we will meet the above goal. Your

thoughts would be appreciated.

Notice must go out before 4 p.m. today.

Jim Graf

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**From:** Jim J. Graf

**Posted At:** Wednesday, June 21, 2006 7:59 AM

**Conversation:** Building Used Committee Meeting

**Posted To:** CS-Archive

**Subject:** Building Used Committee Meeting

I would like to have a Building Use Committee on one of the following dates: June 22, 23, or 26. the meeting will start at either 3:30 or 4 p.m. and last no longer than 1 hour to 1 and 1/2 hour. The purpose of the meeting would be to determine the \$ amount of the new PDS, and make that a recommendation to the Common Council.

I believe that if we look at sharing some things either internally or externally we could trim the size of the PDS to about 40,000 sq. ft. and a cost not to exceed \$8,000,000. Some things that need to be look at (my idea) include: garage to public works, sally port and detective division to sheriff dept., all interview rooms and detention cells to the County Detention Center, and keeping the dispatch center where it is now in the City Hall. I believe that we could add about 5 patrol officers to the streets if we do the above and increase the safety concerns of our constituents.

Your thoughts would be appreciated.

Please let me know asap as I need to get the agenda out by 2 p.m. today, if the meeting is June 22, 2006.

Jim Graf

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

**From:** Jim J.Graf  
**Posted At:** Friday, June 23, 2006 7:44 AM  
**Conversation:** Bldg Use committee meeting  
**Posted To:** CS-Archive  
**Subject:** RE: Bldg Use committee meeting

Mayor, I trust that Susan will share my reductions suggestions with you. I thought the meeting went fairly well. It certainly stirred up the PD. I faxed a copy of my suggestions to John Sabinash asking him to call me, as DC Wojs said he would take care of contacting John to answer some of these questions and concerns. I believe the line in the sand has been drawn. We also asked what size PD could be build for \$8.8m or \$10m.

Your opinion is always appreciated. I will be leaving town for the weekend, returning late Sunday. We should be out of here by 4p.m. today. I will be in my office until then.

Have a great weekend Jim Graf

-- Original Message ----

**From:** Perez, Mayor [mailto:Mayor@ci.sheboygan.wi.us] **Posted At:**  
Wednesday, June 21, 2006 8:47 AM  
**Posted To:** CS-Archive **Conversation:** Bldg Use committee meeting  
**Subject:** RE: Bldg Use committee meeting

Good Morning Alderman Graf: I will have Susan fax you two documents. It is time to make some tough decisions and move on. Thank you.

***"Let our thoughts and actions reflect our true commitment to public service."*** Mayor Juan

Pore/., City of Sheboygan.

-- Original Message-----

**From:** Jim J. Graf [mailto: [REDACTED]]

**Sent:** Wednesday, June 21, 2006 7:38 AM

**To:** Perez, Mayor

**Subject:** Bldg Use committee meeting

Mayor, I will call a meeting on either June 22, @ 4, or June 23 @ 4, or June 26 @ 4. All of these choices would require that the meeting would be over within an hour. We would discuss the spending limit on the new PDS and make a recommendation as to what the \$ amount should be for the project. I would hope that the price tag could be at the \$8,000,000 range. Would you please fax me a copy of the resolution we looked at last night. My fax number is 459-0399. I will be checking to see what other meetings are on the dates listed above. I will also be contacting the council members of the BU Committee to make sure they can be there. My directions to the committee will include a review of all the plans and project specs to bring the square footage down to about 40,000 square feet.

I would also like to suggest that we eliminate the garage, sally port, detective department, keep the dispatch area where it is, until a decision is made about joint dispatch. With those adjustments, I believe that we will meet the above goal. Your thoughts would be appreciated. Notice must go out before 4 p.m. today. Jim Graf

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 27, 2006 11:37 PM

**To:** Jim J. Graf

**Subject:** Re: PD Facility

Jim,

It was interesting to see that this week \$8.8 million will only get you about 32,000 sq. feet.

I didn't realize the salt shed was on the 23rd street site. Do you think that could be used as a temporary garage for a few years? How many cars would fit in there? Could we do the maintenance on the squad cars in the garage at City Hall or down at the municipal service bldg?

I think Sabinash was expecting his \$8.8 million police station to be ripped apart. In reality, he produced what I was looking for. I think his \$180 per square foot is too high, but I'm satisfied with what he presented.

Renee

**"Jim J. Graf** < [REDACTED] > wrote:

Renee,

Got a chance to speak to John S. today. He will put something together regarding what he could build for what dollars. During our discussion he did state that as an example for a total project cost of \$8.8m, he could construct about a 37,500 - 40,000 sq. ft. building. Hopefully, he will remember that next week at the C.O.W. meeting that he will be attending.

I will be leaving town for the weekend and just wanted to tell someone that the \$8.8 is still in the ball game as far as I am concerned.

Have a great weekend, Jim G

NOTICE: This e-mail may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited. If you are

not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and delete all copies.

Sneak preview the all-new Yahoo.com. It's not radically different. Just radically better.

**From:** Jim J. Graf  
**Posted At:** Wednesday, June 28, 2006 7:18 AM  
**Conversation:** PD Facility  
**Posted To:** CS-Archive  
**Subject:** RE: PD Facility

I agree that it was interesting, now it is up to the Council to decide what the needs are and what are the wants.

I believe that the salt shed is on part of the 23<sup>rd</sup> street site and that is why at one point we would share a new one if it were built. I don't believe that we could store any cars in their, but I do know that we could do the maintenance on the squad cars at the municipal service bldg.

We need to be able to negotiate with the County as well as with VDV. The proposal that Building Use came up with was what the County was willing to accept and nothing less. I want to call Jack Van Dixhorn and propose to him to send in an offer to the city on the land. At one point he had said, that we (the City) should just offer what was approved by the County Board 2 years ago.

If the county really wants to get rid of that property, they may go for

it! Jim Graf

**From:** Richard Suscha [mailto: ] Sent:  
**Tuesday, June 27, 2006 11:37 PM**  
**To:** Jim J. Graf **Subject:** Re: PD Facility

Jim,

It was interesting to see that this week \$8.8 million will only get you about 32,000 sq. feet.

I didn't realize the salt shed was on the 23rd street site. Do you think that could be used as a temporary garage for a few years? How many cars would fit in there? Could we do the maintenance on the squad cars in the garage at City Hall or down at the municipal service bldg?

I think Sabinash was expecting his \$8.8 million police station to be ripped apart. In reality, he produced what I was looking for. I think his \$ 180 per square foot is too high, but I'm satisfied with what he presented.

Renee

"Jim J. Graf < >

Renee ,

Got a chance to speak to John S. today. He will put something together regarding what he could build for what dollars. During our discussion he did state that as an example for a total project cost of \$8.8m, he could construct about a 37,500 - 40,000 sq. ft. building. Hopefully, he will remember that next week at the C.O.W. meeting that he will be attending.

I will be leaving town for the weekend and just wanted to tell someone that the \$8.8 is still in the ball game as far as I am concerned.

Have a great weekend, Jim

From: Jim J. Graf  
Posted At: Thursday, June 29, 2006 7:25 AM  
Conversation: PD Facility  
Posted To: CS-Archive  
Subject: RE: PD Facility

I believe that the following will support it for sure: Bonnie, Bob, Jean Kittelson, Mark, Silas, Jean Klijeanus, and maybe Gene Davis. I don't know what Richard and Eldon are going to do. It could be close and may end in a tie.

Just my opinion at this time.

Jim G.

**From:** Richard Suscha [mailto: ] Sent:  
Wednesday, June 28, 2006 10:23 PM  
**To:** Jim J. Graf  
**Subject:** RE: PD Facility

Jim,

Jack VanDixhom told me the same thing, just offer the same amount that was discussed last time. If we could get the 23rd Street site for \$200,000, that would be great! If not, we could just build at City Hall.

As for the VDV site, I don't see the need to negotiate any more. I was not impressed with the presentation last night. I believe the reason this site is being presented is to prevent shared services with the County. The police know that if we chose that site, this would push the wedge between the City and County in a little deeper. I would like to remove the wedge between these two entities, not make it worse. I will vote against the resolution to enter into negotiations with VDV.

Do you really think the majority of the Council wants to continue to look at VDV? Renee

*"Jim J. Graf* <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I agree that it was interesting, now it is up to the Council to decide what the needs are and what are the wants.

I believe that the salt shed is on part of the 23<sup>rd</sup> street site and that is why at one point we would share a new one if it were built. I don't believe that we could store any cars in their, but I do know that we could do the maintenance on the squad cars at the municipal service bldg.

We need to be able to negotiate with the County as well as with VDV. The proposal that Building Use came up with was what the County was willing to accept and nothing less. I want to call Jack Van Dixhorn and propose to him to send in an offer to the city on the land. At one point he had said, that we (the City) should just offer what was approved by the County Board 2 years ago.

If the county really wants to get rid of that property, they may go for it! Jim Graf