



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

[www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks](http://www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks)

**MEETING AGENDA**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 2024 AT 10:30 A.M.\***  
**COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM A-200**

**\*(10 MINUTES FOLLOWING CONCLUSION OF THE COUNTY BOARD MEETING, WHICHEVER IS LATER)**

Agenda Packet: <https://ozaukeecounty.gov/2107/Comprehensive-Plan-Board>

*Bruce Ross, Chairperson*

*Thomas Richart, Vice-Chairperson*

*Rob Holyoke, Scott Rishel, and Timothy Maguire*

*Dan Vogel (Alternate)*

**1. Call to Order**

A regular meeting of the Comprehensive Planning Board was held in room A-200 at the Ozaukee County Administration Center.

| Attendee Name | Title                   | Status  | Arrived  |
|---------------|-------------------------|---------|----------|
| B. Ross       | Chairperson             | Present | 10:00 AM |
| T. Maguire    | Supervisor              | Present | 10:13 AM |
| R. Holyoke    | Supervisor, District 22 | Present | 10:10 AM |
| S. Rishel     | Supervisor, District 14 | Present | 10:13 AM |
| T. Richart    | Vice-Chairperson        | Present | 10:09 AM |
| D. Vogel      | Alternate               | Present | 10:16 AM |

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director - Planning and Parks Department; Brittany Whyte, Natural Resources and GIS Technician; Amy Hoffman, Administrative Assistant & Natural Resources Analyst.

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC); Miranda Page, Land Use Planner - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC).

**2. Assurance that the Meeting has been Properly Noticed / Adoption of Agenda**

Chairperson Ross called the meeting to order at 10:30 AM. Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

**3. Approval of Minutes (March 20, 2024)**

Motion made by Supervisor Holyoke, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Richart, that the March 20, 2024 minutes be approved. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

**4. Public Comment and Written Communications**

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any public comments. There were no members of the public present. Mr. Struck confirmed no written communications were submitted/received.

**5. Staff Update**

Mr. Struck welcomed new members of the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB), Supervisor Vogel the Alternate Appointed, who will be active in discussion as part of the Comprehensive Planning Board, but will

only vote if one of the existing members are not able to attend the meeting. Mr. Struck noted that the CPB is working towards completion of the Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County (POSP), and anyone can reach out to Mr. Struck with questions or can review past CPB documents and minutes posted on the Department website. Staff and CPB members can help fill in new CPB members. Mr. Struck also sent an introductory email prior to the meeting, which included past action of the CPB for new members.

Mr. Struck noted that the Senior Planner position with the Planning and Parks Department is currently vacant, as Natalie Avallone is no longer working for the Department. The Department is hopeful of bringing on a new Senior Planner by the end of the year.

Mr. Struck introduced Planning and Parks Department Staff: Brittany Whyte, Natural Resources and GIS Technician, who is working on mapping and GIS work related to the Park and Open Space Plan, and Amy Hoffman, Administrative Assistant & Natural Resources Analyst, who is assisting in taking minutes at the meeting and also pulling together inventory information and data.

Mr. Struck described the Department's relationship with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) and noted that Robbie Robinson normally attends the CPB meetings. Mr. Robinson is the Department's contact at SEWRPC for the POSP. The Department has a contract with them to compile the POSP document and both organizations are working on developing the data, analysis and narrative. SEWRPC also brings the regional perspective and additional data for comparison.

Chairperson Ross introduced Tim Maguire, a new CPB member and County Board Supervisor, briefly.

Chairperson Ross thanked CPB members for their service and referred to a recent News Graphic article mentioning the importance of the Comprehensive Planning Board and the impact it has on Ozaukee County's future.

Chairperson Ross stated that there are no other updates.

## **6. Update/Discussion/POSSIBLE ACTION – Park and Open Space Plan**

Mr. Struck stated that CPB has already conditionally approved some of the POSP chapters (Chapters I-V). The CPB reviews each chapter individually; CPB then makes a direct recommendation for adoption of the entire POSP to the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors for adoption by resolution and also ordinance (per Comprehensive Plan Amendment).

- a. Development of Inventory Findings (Chapter II)
  - i. Summary of revisions/updates

Mr. Struck gave an overview of Chapter II – the chapter covers a detailed inventory of existing natural resources in the County as well as a brief summary of demographics and farmland. The CPB previously recommended a comprehensive review of accomplishments since the last POSP including funding amounts and sources of funding for projects/accomplishments. Mr. Struck noted that staff has been working on this table of accomplishments and also the funding amounts and sources with the approximate timeline of 2010 – 2023. SEWRPC also provides some regional context for natural resources in this chapter. Mr. Struck further noted that the financial analysis (funding amounts and breakdown of funding sources for each project) aspect has been challenging since it is more than a 10 year look back. Department staff are diligently compiling all this information, particularly from the many grants and capital funded projects over 13 years for review and discussion. The Department is also preparing additional narrative around river and creek impoundments (e.g. Milwaukee River, Cedar Creek).

Chairperson Ross noted that there was discussion at the last meeting about the importance that this plan does not sit on the shelf and one way to help ensure relevance is to connect the plan with the outcomes, achievements and accomplishments as well as where plan items were not addressed or implemented. Chairperson Ross thanked Mr. Struck for the effort in compiling this information to tie the plan and its outcomes in a tangible way (e.g. outcomes, metrics, accomplishments). He also noted that he expects that this plan would be a supplement to a strong strategic plan, and this would continue with the farmland preservation plan and the multijurisdictional comprehensive plan.

Mr. Struck noted that it is always the goal to do a summary of outcomes for each version of the three plans based

on the plan's goals, objectives, programs and policies.

b. Development of Existing Park and Open Space Sites (Chapter III)

i. Summary of revisions/updates

Mr. Struck summarized the Department's ongoing work for several Chapter III (existing park and open space sites) items for inclusion in the Chapter including finalizing some inventory numbers and narrative.

Mr. Struck introduced Robbie Robinson and Miranda Page from SEWRPC.

Mr. Robinson stated that there are a few items needed for Chapters II and III. SEWRPC will need some narrative to be provided by the Department on approximately 3-4 components. For Chapter III, a narrative on tree management is needed, however, the tree inventory has been completed (provided on February 15<sup>th</sup>). A narrative is also needed for invasive species management; however, the invasive species inventory data has been provided (on February 15<sup>th</sup>). A narrative is also needed for bird nest boxes (an inventory was provided for this in December 2023). Finally, some clarification will be needed for the shipwrecks in the National Marine Sanctuary (in and outside of the County boundaries) as well as a cross reference to those in the National Register of Historic Places.

Mr. Robinson followed up on Chapter III's section about known shipwrecks and inquired whether it will be all sites or just the known shipwrecks.

Mr. Struck stated that we have inventory of known and suspected shipwrecks. We are working with NOAA to obtain all necessary data.

Chairperson Ross noted that there is a revised deadline from the WDNR for completion of the adopted update to the POSP. The POSP is used as a foundation for eligibility to apply for all WDNR (as well as federal) grants, but particularly through the WDNR Knowles Nelson Stewardship Program. The WDNR would like to have the entire final draft by the end of the fall.

Mr. Struck: Eligibility for the WDNR Stewardship grant program requires an adopted POSP. The WDNR has provided an extension of our current plan, while we are working on the update, especially given COVID-19 and that we had a signed contract with SEWRPC since before COVID. The WDNR has extended our current plan eligibility considering that we have been actively working on the POSP update. Usually, a POSP update is required every 5 years. The WDNR Stewardship grant program has an annual application period in May for local governments. Usually, applicants will hear about award status by the end of the calendar year. So, the goal is to have POSP updated completed before final grant awards (likely) in December 2024. We have two pending WDNR Stewardship grant applications this year.

Chairperson Ross expressed concern on the timeline for completing the update to the POSP.

Mr. Struck stated that we will discuss the schedule in further detail, but feels comfortable with the schedule and progress being made on the POSP chapters.

Mr. Robinson noted that as long as the WDNR knows we are making progress on the POSP, they are usually lenient.

Mr. Struck noted that this is different from the Farmland Preservation Plan, where the State Statute specifies the timeline for completion of each county plan. Rather, this is a WDNR policy for grant eligibility.

Mr. Robinson stated that that is all we need to complete Chapters II and III.

Mr. Struck asked if anyone had any questions and stated that progress is being made on all fronts.

Chairperson Ross: Will the County be providing all this information and data? CPB won't need to review until after it is added to the Chapters?

Mr. Struck: Yes, the Department is compiling this data and drafting narrative for incorporation into the conditionally approved Chapters of the POSP.

Supervisor Rischel mentioned that he was contacted by DNR regarding 100-year floodplain.

Mr. Struck responded that the FEMA floodplain review process is outside the CPB responsibilities (lies with the Natural Resources Committee), but floodplain descriptions and inventory of floodplain locations are included in the POSP. One of the challenges of the POSP update and why we do the conditional approval of Chapters is because we are always getting new and updated data and need to draw a line at some point for the Plan. Often times there is a lag on data and map adoption, so we would recognize new floodplains in the Plan once they are adopted.

c. Development of Public Involvement (Chapter IV)

i. Summary of revisions/updates

Mr. Struck mentioned that some items relating to the ongoing SWOT analysis would be discussed and he would continue to provide and include any public comment relevant to the plan.

ii. Public Open Houses – comments

Mr. Struck: When a public comment is received in the form of a formal letter or email, we usually include it as attachment to the POSP. In the current POSP appendices, you can see some examples of these formal comment letters/emails. If public comment is provided in another form (e.g. handwritten comments, photos, etc.) or verbally, it would be provided in the summary of public comments. These comments are compiled throughout the plan development. All comments provided at the open houses will be provided in the appendix. We are continuing to amend the summary of public comments. All public comments have been forwarded to SEWRPC to add to the summary or attach to the plan.

iii. POSSIBLE ACTION - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis and prioritization

Mr. Struck expressed thanks to Supervisor Ross and Supervisor Rischel for revising the SWOT analysis to be more descriptive and a better reflection of the CPB thoughts and goals.

Mr. Struck: This is a high-level exercise identifying those four categories of the SWOT - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats. There was a lot of discussion on the SWOT at the last CPB meeting. CPB members wanted to see more background about each statement on the SWOT, and felt they had to decipher what each item on the list meant when taken out of context. The original comments were recorded “as is” from the SWOT exercise and then summarized in the graphic form.

Supervisor Ross: Approximately nine months ago, at CPB, we had an abbreviated opportunity to address items on Post-it notes into SWOT categories and then discussed grouping the various items. There was not much time to discuss after that exercise. Mr. Struck and Department Staff turned those notes into a draft and graphic for the POSP. Looking back at the draft the next time CPB met, it was difficult to review and was clear that we didn’t have consensus on what each item on the draft meant. There is a desire, as a committee, to show what we mean when we put this out to the County Board. Rather than try to edit the SWOT draft at a CPB meeting with 6-7 people, Supervisor Rischel and Supervisor Ross worked together to try to address some issues and clarify. He noted that as a CPB, we should try to explain how to leverage opportunities, mitigate threats, etc., for each item on the SWOT list. It is important to have an iterative process. We don’t want this to be something that just sits on the shelf, but we would like it to drive what we do and drive the POSP. He noted that what is represented in the POSP should be a good understanding and reflection of the CPB’s consensus. All agreed with that process.

Supervisor Ross introduced the document in the meeting packet entitled, “Park and Open Space Plan: SWOT, Reconsidered.” Supervisor Ross noted that this document is not intended to be the final SWOT document, but was created just to inform our thinking.

Supervisor Ross asked if everyone agreed to open up the SWOT for discussion.

There was a consensus to start discussing the SWOT.

Supervisor Rischel: The public should have input, but ultimately the CPB, representatives and experts should condense and digest and decide what goes in the SWOT.

Supervisor Rishel stated that he was hoping to discuss and add more context to each item on the SWOT. For example: why is the golf course a strength? It is ranked highly, and it is profitable. We could include the percentage of residents who use them. Supervisor Rischel would like to provide reasoning for why each item is in each category. Supervisor Rishel acknowledged that CPB likely won't figure that out today, but that is very important to him to drive strategic planning.

Mr. Struck responded that he understands that it should be one driver for goals in the POSP. Mr. Struck would like to run down the list and comment on each item on the SWOT as a group, so that that staff has some clear direction and is able to follow up with any research or background. He noted that staff has provided some data for some items on the list already. For example, Chapter V talks about standards for county parks (e.g. how many picnic sites should be provided per capita). Mr. Struck thought the group could go through each item on the list to get further clarification. Mr. Struck noted that this is currently a working draft and an iterative process as Supervisor Ross noted.

Supervisor Rischel then discussed the first item on the document: "Ozaukee County Parks System".

Supervisor Rischel: This item seems to be very subjective without much background information provided. Do we have enough definition?

Mr. Struck: One example, he noted that there is a table of the Southeastern Wisconsin counties (SEWRPC counties), showing acreage and number of parks per capita, and percent of overall land use. This table didn't get added into the last POSP, but it could be added or used here for a comparison. Ozaukee County was near the bottom in all categories in 2011. He noted we can work with SEWRPC to update this table, if desired.

Supervisor Holyoke: What did Supervisor Rischel mean with his comment: "Existing Park System; how does this compare"?

Supervisor Rischel believed we have a strength in our park system, but we need to explain why.

Supervisor Rischel: Let's go through each item on the SWOT tables and see if everyone agrees with what is stated.

"Park Amenities" was introduced.

Supervisor Rischel agreed that should be a strength, but perhaps could be supported by background on the County Park amenities (as a footnote).

Chairperson Ross: We may find that we are going to move items around as we go through the list (e.g. move from the various SWOT categories as currently listed).

Chairperson Ross introduced "Regional connectivity" and stated that he is not certain what the intent behind that comment.

Mr. Struck asked if this may have been referring to regional connectivity in the trail system (e.g. Route of the Badger Initiative).

Supervisor Rischel: Let's remove this item or put a question mark on it.

"Availability and Support of Open Space" was introduced.

Mr. Struck: We can provide survey data on this item from the statistically significant survey conducted in 2020. The Department will summarize or refer to that data in the survey (see also Chapter IV and appendix).

Chairperson Ross introduced "Lake Michigan." Chairperson Ross thinks this is a strength, but asked whether it is an opportunity as well.

Supervisor Rischel replied that it might be both a strength and an opportunity.

Chairperson Ross agreed.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department can provide information like the length of the lakeshore, etc., but ultimately Lake Michigan is unique to the county, most counties in Wisconsin don't have Lake Michigan shoreline.

"Bike Trails" was introduced.

The group noted that we will need context, but agreed that the Ozaukee Interurban Trail is a strength.

Mr. Struck noted the Route of Badger and that a summary of this initiative can be referenced in the plan.

"Golf courses" was introduced.

The group agreed that additional context was needed, but agreed that it is a strength.

"Parks Department" was introduced.

Mr. Struck: This item will be challenging to provide objective quantification. We can potentially measure this by noting that the Department has received national awards. This year there were over 125 applicants, and the Department was 1 of 25 awarded for a national award for its conservation work.

Chairperson Ross introduced "No Park/Trail Admission Fees" and noted that "Park Entry Fees is also listed in the opportunities section.

Mr. Robinson stated that he thinks "No Park/Trail Admission Fees" should be kept in the strengths section. Mr. Robinson noted that Ozaukee County Parks get people visiting from out of the county.

Chairperson Ross introduced "Beauty" and stated that this is in the eye of the beholder.

Supervisor Rischel recommended removing this from the list.

Chairperson Ross proposed the option of using the text from the right-hand side of the table and making that the bullet point instead of "Beauty".

Chairperson Ross introduced "Recently Acquired County Parks" and stated that these are partially a blank slate and are good opportunities. Chairperson Ross asked whether this is this strength or opportunity.

Supervisor Rischel stated that "Recently Acquired County Parks" probably can go in both categories. Because the county owns them, it may be considered a strength.

Chairperson Ross stated that he agreed with the last five items on the strengths list that Supervisor Rischel added.

Supervisor Rischel noted that we don't have to keep all these on the list.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that he also agreed with all five items.

Mr. Struck noted the maintenance cost of \$49 per acre, that is listed in the table. We may not be able to give comparisons to other counties as this data might not be readily available.

Chairperson Ross introduced the "Weaknesses" section and brought up how those items could be leveraged.

Chairperson Ross introduced "County Board differing opinions/visions" and stated that he is not sure about this one fitting into the section.

Supervisor Maguire noted that this is somewhat inherent with 26 different supervisors.

Supervisor Rischel stated that he would remove it from the list.

Chairperson Ross: If we do keep it on the list, we will need to explain how it's hurting the POSP.

Mr. Struck: For "County Budget," we could talk about percentage of the budget for the Planning and Parks Department and do a cross-county comparison.

Mr. Struck: Some counties charge park entrance fees, while others have an established park fund or acquisition fund. He could give some examples and we could make a determination.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that there used to be a set amount proposed in the budget each year for acquisition and restoration, but that proposal was never adopted as part of the budget. He noted that instead each project is brought independently to the County Board and there are some challenges on timing.

Chairperson Ross introduced the 4<sup>th</sup> item, "Community Support / Lack of Input."

Mr. Struck: We can reference the park user survey and the countywide public opinion survey results to provide some background.

Supervisor Rischel expressed that he doesn't think this is a weakness.

Chairperson Ross: Maybe it is an opportunity or strength?

Mr. Struck noted that he thinks "Community Support" is probably an opportunity.

Supervisor Maguire: There was public support for the new Clay Bluffs Cedar Gorge Nature Preserve (CBCGNP) acquisition, correct?

Chairperson Ross introduced "Accelerating Development." Maybe this could be considered a threat?

Supervisor Rischel agreed to move it to the threat category.

Mr. Struck: If it is outside of your agency, it is usually considered a threat (or an opportunity). He noted that members could reference some of the supporting SWOT materials from the exercise.

Chairperson Ross introduced "Engagement / Coordination with Municipalities and Other County Departments" and expressed that he thought we could do a better job at this.

Mr. Struck said that he doesn't think it is a weakness. For example, Ozaukee County has a cross-county public health department with Washington County and the Department frequently works closely with the Ozaukee County Highway Department (e.g. CTH W / Milwaukee River Oxbow Restoration – also cooperative with the Village of Saukville) as well as other Departments. Mr. Struck sees this as more of an opportunity; we can always do better.

"Lack of Camping" was introduced.

Mr. Struck: The Department is currently pursuing additional campsites/campground and can provide some data on the lack of camping opportunities in and around the County and possibly also provide some comparison data.

Mr. Robinson noted that additional camping was a public comment.

Chairperson Ross introduced "Park Management (e.g. dead trees, seasonal closings)."

Mr. Struck: Maybe there is an opportunity for us in this category. We can give some budget context. The budget is always a limiting factor, but we have accomplished a lot of dead tree removal with

grant funding (those inventory items are being compiled as noted above). Also, for context, we limit motor vehicles at Waubedonia park in winter, to allow snowmobilers to use the park as a connecting route.

Chairperson Ross: We can leave this item to Mr. Struck

Mr. Struck: We could provide some context to the Department budget.

Supervisor Vogel: How does this topic tie into the maintenance budget?

Mr. Struck: Yes, that is definitely a factor, funding for maintenance of the parks. Of course, we may not be able to provide data from other nearby counties as a comparison.

Mr. Robinson noted that lack of maintenance funding was included in the previous POSP SWOT as a weakness.

Mr. Struck: We might be able to get a percentage of the entire County budget spent on parks from other counties.

Chairperson Ross introduced "Boat Access to Lake."

Supervisor Rischel stated that there are not many boat access options in Ozaukee County and questioned whether this would be considered a threat or weakness.

Mr. Struck: Agreed that data could be provided and perhaps comparisons with other counties. Ozaukee County doesn't have many large inland lakes, but has several small inland lakes and there is a standard (WDNR) for providing access to inland lakes. He noted that he believes that there are only a couple of public access points on inland lakes in Ozaukee County (e.g. Watts Lake at the Cedarburg Bog Natural Area, Hurias Lake (semi-public as OWLT property), Hawthorne Hills Lake (Hawthorne Hills County Park)), which is extremely low. We could also look at Lake Michigan public access points, which would include the Harbor in Port Washington for boat access. He noted that there is potential for more inland lake access and one of the recommendations in Chapter VI specifically addresses inland lake public access.

Mr. Robinson noted that he believed Ozaukee County has three "major" inland lakes over 50 acres: Lac Du Cours, Mud, and one other (maybe Hurias or Long Lake).

Chairperson Ross introduced "Milwaukee River Dams."

Mr. Struck noted that only two large dams currently remain on the Milwaukee River in Ozaukee County. The Planning and Parks Department has an inventory of large and small dams in Ozaukee County from its Fish Passage Program and the WDNR has a partial inventory of dams, mostly of large dams.

Supervisor Rischel expressed that fish passage is an issue.

Mr. Struck agreed and stated that a lot of work has been done in the last 15 years (and still ongoing) for fish passage in Ozaukee County, largely through the Department's Fish Passage Program.

Supervisor Rischel suggested changing the category to Fish Passage instead of Milwaukee River Dams.

Chairperson Ross introduced "Percent of County Residents that Leverage the System."

Mr. Struck: The best way we can currently demonstrate this metric is to look at the Park onsite user surveys and whether they had an Ozaukee County zip code or not (resident or not). In the latest on-site park survey, 65% were residents. Mr. Struck believes this is pretty accurate. We should also have the percentage of resident and non-resident users at the Golf Courses.

Supervisor Rischel: If the percentage is small, then this is a threat. If it's a threat, then we need to do



more marketing.

Mr. Robinson: How many city residents are content with just going to their city/local parks, and not going to larger regional county parks?

Chairperson Ross introduced the “Opportunities” category and the first item on the list: “County Open Spaces and Associated Value.”

Mr. Struck can provide some additional information and context.

“Farmland Preservation” was introduced.

Mr. Struck can provide some additional information and context from the current Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) (also the next plan update the CPB will be reviewing).

Chairperson Ross asked how success was attributed to farmers and farmland preservation. Was it through zoning, incentives or buying land. He also noted that there must be a balance with landowner’s rights. Do we want to retain the farms we already have? Or a percentage? How do we encourage farming? Incentives? Buying land?

Supervisor Maguire: This must be balanced with landowner rights to decide whether they sell their land.

Mr. Struck can provide some additional information and context from the current Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis the Department did for the last FPP.

“New Parks and Things to Offer” was introduced.

Mr. Struck noted that Chapter VI and the recommendations should address this issue.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Future Park Amenities.”

Mr. Struck noted that Chapter VI and the recommendations should address this issue.

“Lake Michigan and the Milwaukee River”

Supervisor Rischel considers this an opportunity and noted that when opportunities like the CBCGNP property come up, we should pursue it. We should be pursuing Lake Michigan access when it’s available.

Mr. Struck: We also have the weakness of access to (inland) lakes.

“Park Access Fees” was introduced.

It was noted that perhaps this was an opportunity.

“Private / Public Partnerships” was introduced.

Chairperson Ross: Are partnerships expanding or continuing?

Mr. Struck: There is a list of all non-profit and volunteer partners to be included in the POSP; we can reference this list. Our partnerships have been growing over the years and many more organizations have been added to this list (active partnerships) since the last POSP.

Supervisor Rischel stated that he thinks this is a strength for Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross introduced “State, Federal, and Non-Profit Grant Awards and Partnerships,” and agreed that this was an opportunity and also a strength.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Coordination with Municipalities.”

Mr. Struck noted that there was good and ongoing coordination with municipalities, but that it is an opportunity to do more as well.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Additional Boat Access to Lake Michigan, saying this could be tied into its previous mention in Weaknesses category.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Additional Hunting Lands.”

Mr. Struck mentioned that the Department has received some public comments saying that we need more hunting opportunities in Ozaukee County. The Department has also received comments that expressed gratitude for the current existing hunting opportunities.

Chairperson Ross: Maybe this falls into the weaknesses category?

“Wisconsin Shipwreck Coast National Marine Sanctuary” was introduced.

Several CPB members mentioned that this is a huge opportunity for Ozaukee County, especially the tourism aspect.

“Abundance of Rural Undeveloped Land” was introduced.

Mr. Struck stated that some land is best used as farmland (developed for farming). Mr. Struck introduced the Department’s LESA study (as part of the last FPP) and noted that the County has about 16,000 acres of marginal farmland that could be used for other uses (e.g. development) that is not considered high quality farmland. Mr. Struck noted that it is important to also consider individual property rights.

“Proximity to Milwaukee” was introduced.

Supervisor Rischel noted that he thinks this could be both a strength and a threat.

Supervisor Vogel noted that lots of people from outside of Ozaukee County know of Lion’s Den Gorge Nature Preserve (LDGNP).

Mr. Struck noted that Ozaukee County brings in lots of tourism dollars from sales tax from out-of-county visitors.

“Clay Bluffs Cedar Gorge and Lion’s Den Gorge Nature Preserves” was introduced.

Supervisor Rischel stated that these are gems of Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross: Is this revenue from tourism?

Supervisor Rischel: Yes, that’s what I was thinking tourism revenue.

Mr. Struck: The newly designated Wisconsin Shipwreck Coast National Marine Sanctuary will provide opportunities for partnership and tourism as well.

Chairperson Ross introduced the “Threats” category and the first item on the list: “Funding / Budget.” Chairperson Ross noted that there is no steady stream of money, and many activities are dependent on outside funding.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Development,” noting that this is a threat since we don’t control it.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Water Quality,” “Invasive Species,” and “Bluff Erosion.”

Mr. Struck agreed that these three items should be in the threats category based on work the Department has been doing over the last several years (see also inventory and narrative information in Chapter III).

Chairperson Ross introduced “Political vision of county” and noted that he has a problem with this one being on the list.

Multiple CPB members stated that they don’t consider it to be a threat.

Chairperson Ross noted that it could be considered a weakness and/or an opportunity.

Mr. Struck noted that it could be an opportunity for more education, but probably is not a threat.

Chairperson Ross introduced “Proximity to Milwaukee” and noted that it could be considered an opportunity.

Supervisor Rischel noted that proximity to Milwaukee could lead to damage of amenities from visitors outside of Ozaukee County (e.g. OIT use). Supervisor Rischel noted that we could take this off the list.

Chairperson Ross: It is good to get on the same page about what all bullets mean on the SWOT and thanked the CPB members for the good discussion.

It was agreed that staff would further develop the SWOT document with the provided CPB input and also add background information wherever possible. Mr. Struck noted that staff would work on this, but gathering some of the supporting data may take some additional time. He noted that this final draft might not be ready for the next meeting given the other work staff needs to complete for Chapter VI as well as some previous chapters.

## **7. Update/Discussion/POSSIBLE ACTION on Chapters VI (Recommended Park and Open Space Plan) of A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County (4th Edition)**

- a. Update, discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION to Conditionally Approve Chapter VI (Sections 6.1 – 6.4 Only) including the Open Space Preservation Element and Outdoor Recreation Element of the Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County (4<sup>th</sup> Edition)

Mr. Struck recommends postponing action at this time, but stated that he wanted to get the draft for this Chapter and these sections in front of the CPB for additional time to review and consider. Mr. Struck encouraged everyone to review. The second half of Chapter VI and Chapters II-IV will be discussed during the July CPB meeting; the SWOT may not be fully complete at that time. Mr. Struck would like to have the full draft POSP in front of the CPB by the August meeting depending upon comments on Chapter VI.

Supervisor Holyoke noted that there is no mid-July meeting for County Board.

Mr. Struck noted that a special NRC meeting would be needed that day (July 17<sup>th</sup>) though.

Chairperson Ross suggested meeting at 9:00 AM on July 17<sup>th</sup>.

The group agreed.

Mr. Struck introduced POSP Chapter VI, Park and Open Space Plan Recommendations.

Mr. Struck noted that any written comments have all been forwarded to SEWRPC. Section 6.3, the recommended open space element, categorizes items and puts them in context of our inventory. Mr. Struck noted that several of the recommendations have remained unchanged since the last POSP.

Mr. Struck introduced POSP Chapter 6: Primary Environmental Corridors (PECs) on page 4 and stated that this section defines PEC and includes major recommendations. The chapter also includes notes on zoning, both local and county level, on the top of Page 5. The bulleted points on page 5 have largely not changed since the last POSP. Secondary Environmental Corridor is discussed next in this chapter, using the same methodologies as PEC. A large part of proposed county project areas focus on natural areas and critical species habitat; there are 87 of these natural areas. Protection of geologic areas is discussed on page 8; there are a few of these areas within the County. Some of the same recommendations are included in

this section.

Chairperson Ross: In interest of time, are there particular questions people have about Chapter VI? We can continue with Mr. Struck's outline and context, but it does take a lot of time.

Mr. Struck stated that he is happy to take any questions about Chapter VI.

Chairperson Ross stated that this is very important information that sets the stage for making the final POSP recommendation to the County Board.

Chairperson Ross: Any feedback from CPB members? What do we want to do with this chapter? At most we could conditionally approve the chapter, though it's not complete.

Supervisor Maguire expressed concern that there is a lot of information in the document.

Mr. Struck explained that there will be an executive summary for the full POSP. He noted that largely, the goals have not changed from the previous POSP, although there have been some additions.

Chairperson Ross: If the recommendations have not changed, then have we not accomplished anything since the last POSP?

Mr. Struck: No, but the overall goals have not changed significantly, for example, we still have a goal of protecting natural areas and critical species habitat sites as identified in the POSP and also environmental corridors.

Chairperson Ross noted that the POSP was critical for making the County eligible for grants to pursue specific goals and recommendations and we want to continue applying for the grants.

Mr. Struck explained that the new POSP will have a specific park master plan map for each park, including a listing of recommendations. He noted that this was far more detailed than the previous POSP and Department staff have been working on developing these for each existing property over the last several years.

Chairperson Ross: This tells us the "what." I want to be sure we tell the "how" to the County Board.

Mr. Struck noted that there is a prioritization and funding section under the Plan Implementation in Chapter VI in the existing POSP that would be good to review. This Plan Implementation section is also in the process of being updated with specific details that Department has developed and worked on over the last several years including both of its national award-winning GIS decision support tools (Ecological Prioritization GIS Tool and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Decision Support Tool) and grant funding awards.

Chairperson Ross: We need to provide guidance to the NRC and/or the finance committee.

Supervisor Richart referenced the County Strategic Plan - how do we get it from this POSP to an action item in the County Strategic Plan.

Mr. Struck explained that the second half of Chapter VI, Implementation, is not yet completed, but will be presented at the meeting in July.

Mr. Robinson introduced the tables in the agenda packet to see data pulled together for sections 6.1 – 6.4.

Mr. Struck: Pages 12-24 in the current draft talk about the recommendations for each existing park and where additional parks may be developed. Starting on page 24, the draft talks about trail recommendations and lake and river access. The second half of Chapter VI will discuss implementation. Map 6.1 shows where state, federal, and county project areas are located. CBCGNP was in an existing project area.

Supervisor Richart: Brought up Spring Lake – does Ozaukee County need an access point if Sheboygan County has access already nearby?

Mr. Struck: We might not need access to Spring Lake, if Sheboygan County has public access; however,

this has not been completed yet.

We will bring the rest of Chapter VI for discussion at the next CPB meeting.

#### **8. Other Business**

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

#### **9. Next Meeting Date(s)**

The next meeting will be July 17<sup>th</sup>, 2024, at 9:00 AM.

#### **10. Adjournment**

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Richart. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 12:20 PM.