



PORTAGE COUNTY

AMENDED MEETING MINUTES

EXECUTIVE/OPERATIONS COMMITTEE

PORTAGE COUNTY ANNEX
CONFERENCE ROOM 5
1462 STRONGS AVENUE
STEVENS POINT, WI 54481

Tuesday, December 12, 2023

1:00 PM

REMOTE ATTENDANCE & COMMENT

To attend this meeting by telephone : dial 1-872-242-7813, after dialing the number you will then be asked to enter in a meeting number. Use the following meeting number: 544 309 703, then press #

To attend this meeting by video: [Click here to join the meeting](#)

CALL TO ORDER Executive/Operations Committee with two additional citizen members under Portage County Code of Ordinances Section 3.1.9(2) and (12).

The Executive/Operations Committee meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM by Chair Al Haga.

Members Present: Supervisors Al Haga, Larry Raikowski, Stan Potocki, Don Jankowski, and Dave Ladick. Citizen Members Gary Curless and Perry Pazdernik. Corporation Counsel Hickethier as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Staff Attending: County Clerk Davis, County Executive Pavelski, Register of Deeds Wisinski, Finance Director Jossie, Procurement Director Schultz, and Human Resources Director Belanger-Tess

Others Attending: Supervisors Mike Splinter, Scott Soik, Dave Peterson, Shaun Przybylski, Pat Keller, Vinnie Miresse, Suzanne Oehlke, Barry Jacowski, Mark Hemmrich, Bob Gifford, Julie Morrow, Jeanne Dodge, Attorney Dawn Klockow, and members of the public

Public Comment: George Kraft, Ray Reser, Mildred Neville, and Supervisor B. Jacowski

PUBLIC NOTICE

Members of the public who wish to address the Committee on specific agenda items must register their request at this time, with such comments subject to the reasonable control of the Committee Chair as set forth in Robert's Rules of Order.

CLOSED SESSION

1. Enter into Closed Session Pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 19.85(1)(g) conferring with legal counsel for the governmental body who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted by the body with respect to litigation in which it is or is likely to become involved pertaining to code of conduct complaints and process.

No motion was made to enter into Closed Session.

OPEN SESSION

2. Reconvene to Open Session for Possible Action on Items Discussed in Closed Session.

None.

DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION

3. Discussion/Possible Action Re: Review the verified complaints filed by citizens Ray Reser, Tor Anderson, Lisa Anderson, George Kraft, and James Walker against Supervisor David Peterson to determine if it is more likely than not that Supervisor Peterson violated the Code of Conduct in Portage County Code of Ordinances Section 3.1.51.

Verified Complaint by Ray Reser

- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged in Paragraph 6 on Page 1 and Paragraph 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate

Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 2-3 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

- A motion was made by Citizen Member Curless, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Paragraphs 4-5 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Paragraphs 4-5 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 4-5 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged in Paragraph 6 on Page 2 and Paragraph 1 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Paragraph 6 on Page 2 and Paragraph 1 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Curless, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Wis. Stat. § 59.15 as alleged in Paragraph 2 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

Verified Complaint by Tor Anderson

- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Paragraphs 2-5 on Page 1. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Paragraphs 2-5 on Page 1. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 2-5 on Page 1. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 2-5 on Page 1. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Paragraphs 6-7 on Page 1 and Paragraph 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 6-7 on Page 1 and Paragraph 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(b) as alleged in Paragraphs 6-7 on Page 1 and Paragraph 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Paragraphs 6-7 on Page 1 and Paragraph 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Paragraphs 1-3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Paragraphs 1-3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Paragraphs 1-3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

Verified Complaint by Lisa Anderson

- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Complaint 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 1 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Complaint 2 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Citizen Member Curless, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 2 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged in Complaint 2 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Complaint 2 on Page 2. Voice vote revealed (6) aye, Supervisors Haga, Raikowski,

Potocki, Jankowski, Ladick and Citizen Member Pazdernik, and (1) nay, Citizen Member Curlless. Motion carried.

- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 2 on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Jankowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Complaint 3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 3 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 4 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 4 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 4 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged in Complaint 4 on Page 3. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Complaint 5 on Page 4. Voice vote revealed (1) aye, Supervisor Potocki, and (6) nay, Supervisors Haga, Raikowski, Jankowski, Ladick, and Citizen Members Pazdernik and Curlless. Motion failed.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 5 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 5 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 5 on Page 4. Voice vote revealed (6) aye, Supervisors Haga, Raikowski, Jankowski, Ladick, and Citizen Members Pazdernik and Curlless, and (1) nay, Supervisor Potocki. Motion carried.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Jankowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Complaint 6 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Curlless, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 6 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged in Complaint 6 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 6 on Page 4. Roll Call Vote revealed (4) aye, Supervisors Raikowski, Ladick, Jankowski and Citizen Member Curlless, and (3) nay, Supervisors Potocki, Haga, and Citizen Member Pazdernik. Motion carried.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 6 on Page 4. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Complaint 7 on Page 5. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 7 on Page 5. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Jankowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Complaint 7 on Page 5. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 7 on Page 5. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Complaint 8 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged in Complaint 8 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Citizen Member Curlless, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Complaint 8 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 8 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Complaint 9 on Pages 6-7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Complaint 9 on Pages 6-7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate

Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Complaint 9 on Pages 6-7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 9 on Pages 6-7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Complaint 10 on Page 7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 10 on Page 7. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(c) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Complaint 11 on Pages 7-8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

Verified Complaint by George Kraft

- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged in Paragraph 5 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged in Paragraph 5 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged in Paragraph 5 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged in Paragraph 5 on Page 6. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Citizen Member Curless, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged on Page 8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(b) as alleged on Page 8. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(c) as alleged on Page 9. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Haga, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged on Page 9. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Raikowski, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4)(a) as alleged on Page 9. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged on Page 12. Motion failed due to the lack of a second.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Curless, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1)(a) as alleged on Page 12. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Haga, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2)(a) as alleged on Page 12. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(a) as alleged on Page 12. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3)(b) as alleged on Page 12. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

Verified Complaint by James Walker

- A motion was made by Supervisor Potocki, seconded by Citizen Member Pazdernik, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(1) as alleged on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Citizen Member Pazdernik, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(2) as alleged on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.
- A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did violate Ordinance 3.1.51(3) as alleged on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

- A motion was made by Supervisor Ladick, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, that Supervisor Peterson did not violate Ordinance 3.1.51(4) as alleged on Page 2. Motion carried by voice vote, with no negative votes.

A motion was made by Supervisor Jankowski, seconded by Supervisor Potocki, to postpone until January 9, 2024 @ 4:00 PM. Motion to postpone carried by voice vote, with no negatives.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Supervisor Raikowski, seconded by Supervisor Ladick, to adjourn. Motion to adjourn carried by voice vote, with no negative votes. The meeting adjourned at 6:13 PM.