MEETING AGENDA
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2024 AT 9:00 A.M.*
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM A-200

***(10 MINUTES FOLLOWING CONCLUSION OF THE NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE 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	8:55 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor	Present	8:55 AM
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	8:55 AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Present	8:55 AM
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson	Present	8:55 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate	Present	8:55 AM

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director - Planning and Parks Department; 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 9:00 AM. Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

3. Approval of Minutes (June 19, 2024)

Motion made by Supervisor Holyoke, seconded by Supervisor Maguire, that the June 19, 2024 minutes be approved. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Comment and Written Communications

Chairperson Ross made a favorable mention of the level of detail in the meeting minutes such that others could understand the significant discussion taking place.

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 for the Park and Open Space

Plan or Comprehensive Planning Board.

5. Update/Discussion/POSSIBLE ACTION – A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County

Chairperson Ross introduced the discussion and possible action items including Chapters II, III, and IV.

Mr. Struck ran down the three chapters describing the items added into the current CPB packet which were verbally discussed in the past

Mr. Struck made mention that some items, which were previously discussed verbally, are now in the packet and not finalized, but will still be incorporated into the chapter regarding these three chapters.

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

Mr. Struck noted that Chapter II adds a discussion about impoundments on the rivers. There was a single page narrative and a table of large known damns both on Milwaukee River and Cedar Creek supplied and that addition will go in Chapter II.

Mr. Struck reminded the CPB that Chapter II was conditionally approved, however the single page narrative and table were an additional recommendation. These additions will be included as track changes for the final approval.

b. Development of Existing Park and Open Space Sites (Chapter III)
    i. Summary of revisions/updates

Mr. Struck explained that within Chapter III there are a number of items that were completed and those were also included in the packet. There was a narrative on forest and woodland management, invasive species, and bird conservation and management that supports the inventory data that has already been captured as a table. The table will be further refined. The unformatted tables will be updated, referenced and included in the chapter. These tables include specific species (both trees and invasives), number of trees planted, acres of invasives managed, etc. that the Department has been implementing since the last Park and Open Space Plan.

Next item in the packet is a handout about the Wisconsin Shipwreck Coast National Marine Sanctuary. In Chapter III there was an inventory of those shipwrecks that were on the National Register of Historic Structures. All those within the National Marine Sanctuary will be included, both those known and those suspected. Included in the packet was the map and there will be a table that references those shipwrecks and specifically those within the Ozaukee County area. Those within the dark blue box on the map are formally within the National Marine Sanctuary per the boundary designation.

Chairperson Holyoke asked how the boundary was picked.

Mr. Struck noted that there was a lengthy nomination process, which started with an inventory of the Wisconsin Historical Society. The larger boundary (Boundary B) was originally submitted to NOAA for the designation and then through an approximately 5-year process of public input, the boundary was subsequently amended to Boundary A based on public and municipality comments.

Mr. Robinson asked if only the shipwrecks in Ozaukee County would be included.

Mr. Struck confirmed that the known and potential shipwrecks within Ozaukee County would be included in the table and the rest would be referenced in the map.

Supervisor Ross noted that the map looked to be a proposed version and asked if it was an older map.

Mr. Struck confirmed it is an older map, however it was intentionally included as the older map shows some shipwreck sites that are within Ozaukee County but not within Boundary A (the currently approved Wisconsin Shipwreck Coast National Marine Sanctuary designation).

Mr. Struck noted that the boundary was originally at the southern portion of the county; however, the City of Mequon approved a resolution to be removed from the sanctuary boundary. This area covers the shoreline of Virmond County Park, for instance.

Mr. Struck drew attention to the last piece, an accomplishments table that has been referenced and worked on for quite some time. An updated version was circulated which showed a greater refined list of what was originally supplied in the packet. The version is still marked as a draft as it is still a work in progress and will be finalized for the final draft.

Mr. Struck quickly outlined the structure of the table and encouraged a closer review afterward of each line item. The table included each accomplishment, funding, and a further breakdown of non-county tax dollars and tax levy for each project.

Mr. Struck noted that further review is needed to confirm the first few columns showing which element of the Park and Open Space Plan (POSP) that the item resides. He also noted that there is a page reference where each item relates to the current POSP from 2011. Some of the goals are broad, so further detail is provided in the table. Then the listing is organized by park or other project areas that are not formally parks, for example, those related to the Fish Passage Program and Ecological Division (e.g. tree planting).

Mr. Struck mentioned that it was a considerable effort to get exact project costs and split up between funding sources. Non-county funding is comprised of local, state and federal grants, private donations and private foundation grants, user fees and other.

Mr. Struck then directed attention to the last page as one of the intents of the table was not only what was accomplished from the 2011 POSP, but also to get an objective read on how the accomplishments were financed. Totals were provided on the last page of the table – total project costs (primarily capital costs) of $30 M and the non-county tax dollars made up $26 M, County tax dollars was about $4 M. The core message is an approximately 1 to 6 leveraging of County tax dollars for the goals, objectives and projects accomplished since 2011. Lastly the smaller table below it related to the implementation and ongoing maintenance effort as it does come up in the POSP to maintain a standard. From 2009-2023 the average of that time period was about $40 K a park annually averaged based on the number of parks, but it has fluctuated over the years.

Chairperson Ross noted that a 6:1 leverage is impressive and speaks to the value of the efforts that Mr. Struck and his staff put into finding outside sources of funding. With regard to the ongoing maintenance that $40 K hasn't been down below $40 K for seven years and maybe a trend diagram may be more appropriate.

Mr. Struck noted that the maintenance costs include all the staff time, which is imbedded, not just purchasing supplies, services, contractual and other items.

Chairperson Ross noted that the number is pretty low.

Mr. Struck replied that a significant number of the Department staff are not levy funded (e.g. grants and golf course enterprise fund).

Chairperson Ross noted that going back to the SWOT, it may be useful to support some of the SWOT comments regarding funding levels for parks within the county and comparing that number to surrounding counties.

Mr. Struck replied that it would be very difficult to get that level of data from surrounding counties; however, maybe the percentage of the budget other counties have devoted to their "Parks Departments" would be possible. We would not be able to break down to the level that is provided on the included table though. He also noted that there is a trend of increasing maintenance cost per park, but suspects that this is largely a function of increasing staffing expense.

Supervisor Rishel asked if the $40 K is tax levied.

Mr. Struck replied that this is the maintenance expense levied annually including staff expenses to the levy.

Supervisor Rishel asked if the other funding is coming from offsets of the golf courses, etc.

Mr. Struck noted that golf course staff funded by the golf course enterprise fund (non-tax levy) do work on parks projects. In addition, a good portion of the department staff (~$300-500 K annually since 2009) has been funded by outside grants and not county tax dollars. This portion is comprised of federal or state grants or private funding.

Chairperson Ross noted another basis for comparison is how much is spent on ongoing maintenance versus the overall levy in an attempt to get additional context.

Mr. Struck noted that this $40 K average annual per park is operational (ongoing maintenance) and does not reflect the capital expenses (including those noted above funded without County levy on a proportion of 6:1).

Supervisor Rishel also noted that we are looking at Operating Expenses versus Capital Expenses with this number.

Mr. Struck confirmed.

Chairperson Ross recalled putting outside sources of funding as a threat in the SWOT analysis.

Mr. Struck noted that a lot of parks projects that we undertake – both capital projects and some operational, particularly as the staff expense, could be jeopardized or a potential threat if not available.

Supervisor Rishel noted that golf course employees might be working on both parks and golf; thereby, maximizing the benefit to the Department.

Mr. Struck noted that the Department mechanics work on park equipment and golf course equipment, but are funded by the golf course enterprise fund (non-levy). He did note that the majority of their time was dedicated to the golf courses though. He also stated that there are a number of Department staff who work on park capital projects, but are grant funded.

Supervisor Rishel brought up cleaning bathrooms as an operational county funded item.

Mr. Struck noted that a significant amount of tree (ash) removal expenses including staff time and also trail maintenance expenses are offset with grant funding.

Supervisor Rishel said it would be interesting to see as a thought experiment if there were no grants available what would the Department metrics look like. He also noted that it is highly unlikely that all the grant funding would dry up at once, although it is a risk area.

Supervisor Maguire noted that if money dries up for grant funding there will be concerns for other things too.

Mr. Struck noted a public policy forum report from about 8-10 years ago. They did a study of the "WOW" southeastern counties looking at the financial structure. Each of the counties have a unique structure such as Ozaukee County's ecological division and fish passage program; however, there are similarities and with a significant amount of analysis they were able to compare operational and capital expenses amongst the counties. He also noted that many of our projects are done completely in house by either our Planning and Parks Department staff or Highway Department staff. The Planning and Parks Department uses the Highway Department contractually, often funding them with grants and thereby retaining a lot of the revenue back to the County. Mr. Struck noted that he would try to locate the Public Policy Forum report.

Supervisor Rishel noted that a common argument could be that even if a park was provided to us for free, it would still cost a lot to maintain it. However, the maintenance figure would support securing the park.

Supervisor Vogl asked when the County does work for the Town of Grafton, is the County making a profit on that?

County Administrator Dzwinel noted that the Town has a guaranteed work partnership with the County where the summer work is discounted. This is done so plowing can occur in the winter. It is an incentive for the Town to use the County to do their plowing specifically.

Mr. Struck noted that the Planning and Parks Department does provide revenue for the Highway Department to offset slower time that may occur during the summer months whereby the Highway staffing is predominately based on winter use (e.g. plowing).

County Administrator Dzwinel summarized that the Highway Department work in the summer assists in funding the winter staffing levels. There is always work to be done, state, county, and local municipalities.

Supervisor Rishel clarified that the average maintenance/operational figures were per park. It was agreed that "per park" should be added in the description to add clarity.

Supervisor Holyoke noted that this is about $8 per person in the County for operational expenses annually.

Chairperson Ross summarized that 6:1 funding is an impressive leverage, which will tie into the SWOT analysis. He then asked if there were any other thoughts on the table. He noted that it was a lot of work, but is a shining light of good work and justification for what is being done and the success that has occurred.

Supervisor Rishel agreed that the dataset is great and very valuable.

Mr. Struck noted that the department is hoping to track in real time going forward now that the table and structure has been created.

Chairperson Ross noted that to that point, the County Board has not been alerted to what is being done by the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB), and that some may be unaware of the CPB existence. In terms of giving the County Board something that makes sense or is digestible, how would this table be put in front of the County Board?

Mr. Struck replied that an option used previously was to have a mid-month County Board informational presentation with a summary PowerPoint to capture the plan and table in summary form and also provide the full plan for anyone that wants to review it.

Chairperson Ross asked when it has to be completed.

Mr. Struck noted that there is not a hard and fast date since we are making significant progress; however, it is the intention to adopt in fall to know that the current pending grants are contained within the new POSP before the grant award dates. Mr. Struck would like to come back with the full draft at the next meeting including what was added. The goal would be to have a draft plan and resolution before CPB in September (or October), perhaps a to mid-month County Board meeting presentation and then the County Board adopts the resolution in October or November.

Chairperson Ross asked if it made sense to put something like the outcomes table and the SWOT in front of County Board in August, so that they do not have to take all the information in all at once.

Mr. Struck noted that the summary chapter will hopefully be done in August, but he would really like the CPB to review that summary chapter before advancing to the County Board.

Chairperson Ross would like to give County Board the ability to weigh in on the POSP before being given the final version to approve.

Mr. Struck noted that there is still not a final approved SWOT document including prioritization.

County Administrator Dzwinel noted that we will work on scheduling a mid-month County Board presentation.

Supervisor Rishel suggested an update provided in the County Administrator's report giving a high-level summary to County Board.

Supervisor Vogl noted that a large document like the accomplishments table would be difficult to digest.

Mr. Struck noted that the table would be summarized, and the full intent is to summarize the plan for County Board; however, the detail needs to be included for the CPB in order to have an understanding of the full plan.

Vice Chairperson Richart brought up the summary chapter and how an executive summary may be beneficial outlining what should be included.

Mr. Robinson agreed and noted that the current summary is about 3 pages and there would be about 1 and a half more pages when everything is included, in line with Vice Chairperson Richart's expectations of seven pages or less.

Chairperson Ross asked if Vice Chairperson Richart was requesting the Executive Summary be provided to the County Board.

Vice Chairperson Richard responded yes.

Mr. Struck noted that the executive summary is under development and hopefully will be ready for the August or September CPB meeting for approval depending upon CPB discussion on it.

Chairperson Ross asked if the plan would be presented with the executive summary in September to the CPB.

Mr. Robinson responded tentatively yes.

Supervisor Rishel then asked if approval would occur in October or November.

Mr. Struck responded either October or November for County Board, but at the latest December. He reiterated that the end of the year deadline is related to the pending WDNR grants. He also noted that there may be additional time needed based on what happens with Chapter VI.

Mr. Robinson noted that there are additional appendices and may take time to consolidate all the chapters into one draft document.

Chairperson Ross asked if SWOT would be available in September.

Mr. Struck agreed and confirmed that it is the goal.

Mr. Robinson confirmed Executive Summary and SWOT for CPB in September.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any other thoughts about engaging the board.

There were no further comments from the CPB members.

c. Development of Public Involvement (Chapter IV)
    i. Summary of revisions/updates
    ii. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis and prioritization

Chairperson Ross directed CPB members to page 53 and began the discussion on the SWOT analysis. He asked how the CPB members should be thinking about this specific task in order to be able to deliver the draft.

Mr. Struck noted that due to limited staff time there was not as much time spent re-doing the SWOT analysis, however all the comments from last time were captured and data was included where more easily accessible. Those adjustments were included in blue on the current draft. He noted that what would be helpful would be to call out what is on the right track and what would need possible clarification and supporting data.

Mr. Struck noted that it is very difficult to generate new data and analyses at this point rather than utilize what currently exists in the plan through reference, reformatting and summary; however, if there is any information that should be added or removed or existing data added from the outcomes table to support a specific point that would be most helpful. He also noted that if there are any general formatting suggestions they would be welcomed.

Chairperson Ross gave his initial reaction that the second column may not be needed as it was from the original version.

Mr. Struck understood that the bullet points were the summary that was then formally clarified with narrative and data.

Chairperson Ross noted that the original bullet was left and then he and Supervisor Rishel added comments and tried to make sense of each point in order to clarify the SWOT analysis. He expressed concern that the columns may not have matched up after clarification as the summarized original point needed to be adjusted.

Mr. Struck expressed concerns that if there was not summary title or general bullet point then the main take away or point may be harder to digest.

Supervisor Rishel noted that if there is a bullet pointed item than the other column describes what that bullet item was and provides further context. He then said that if each point has enough information that can be followed by someone reading it for the first time than we would be done.

Mr. Struck asked if the current draft was close to that end goal.

Vice-Chairperson Richart expressed concerns that too much time has been spent on the SWOT analysis. He asked if we showed legislative intent and posed the question if we have bullet points, do we have enough information to share what our intent was?

Mr. Struck noted that he often added a reference back to an earlier chapter to support the point because a lot of the supporting information and data was within the previous plan chapters and inventory.

Supervisor Rishel agreed and noted that nothing needs to be overengineered. He noted that the plan should be generated from the SWOT. Supervisor Rishel said that it was great to reference the pages of the plan.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any other thoughts.

There were no further comments from the CPB members.

Chairperson Ross suggested that part of the issue is editing the document so that what was said is what was heard. He noted that he would work directly with Mr. Struck to make that happen. Chairperson Ross agreed with Supervisor Rishel that the SWOT is important, but only if it is seen as reflected in the rest of the POSP. He posed the question, asking if each item is connected to POSP recommendations and priorities. He then noted that the SWOT does not need to be gone through line by line.

Mr. Struck agreed and said that he is looking forward to assistance in making sure the SWOT reflects the intent. He also would appreciate any comments on formatting and where supporting data is needed.

Supervisor Rishel noted that he was comfortable with Mr. Struck's opinion if he is comfortable putting himself in the place of a citizen or another board member.

Chairperson Ross noted that the SWOT may inform what the County Board does regarding planning and budget. He was hoping to elevate the entire plan, so that it is as much the County Board's plan as it is the CPB's plan and includes all the public input.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were specific items from the SWOT that Mr. Struck would like to highlight, otherwise he suggested the members email Mr. Struck within a week or so with any input.

Mr. Struck provided an example of changing OWLT to all partner nongovernmental agencies instead. Mr. Struck noted that the Department works with many wonderful partner organizations and nonprofits.

Chairperson Ross noted that input on which SWOT category each item belongs in will also be important. He then asked if there were any other SWOT thoughts.

Mr. Robinson brought up that in the existing plan all the items were listed in the SWOT, but then prioritized with 3-4 top items. He noted that the current SWOT is very detailed with 15 or so per category. He asked if there were 3-4 top-level priorities for each category.

Chairperson Ross noted that it could potentially be prioritized in August or September.

6. **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 <u>POSSIBLE ACTION</u> to Conditionally Approve Chapter VI including the Open Space Preservation Element and Outdoor Recreation Element of the Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County (4^{th} Edition)

Chapter VI was introduced by Chairperson Ross and noted that members would be discussing and potentially conditionally approving Chapter VI.

Mr. Struck noted that the first half of the chapter was included at the last meeting. He also stated that what was added for this meeting was the second half of the chapter. Mr. Struck noted that there still may be some items to add to the chapter, which would show up as an edit to the conditionally approved Chapter VI if it is conditionally approved.

Mr. Struck discussed implementation prioritization for both restoration and preservation using the Department's award-winning decision support GIS tools and partnerships. He also noted that there is a brief discussion on maintenance. Mr. Struck highlighted key partnerships, prioritizing work within the plan using project areas, GIS technical tools, and other acquisition considerations. Mr. Struck also noted that there is a master plan map for each existing park detailing outdoor recreation considerations, which is a new addition from the last POSP.

Mr. Robinson noted that in the past the WDNR would review and certify the plan before a county would be eligible to apply for grants. He noted that this policy has changed to the requirement of a recently adopted plan prior to the submittal of a grant application. Mr. Struck noted that now the WDNR requires submittal of plan references with the grant application, so WDNR certifies grant eligibility as grant applications are made instead of certifying the entire plan. It does however require adoption of the full plan by the governing body.

Mr. Struck reiterated that the WDNR would ask where a specific grant item is within a plan recommendation chapter. This process is done now as a self-certification instead of the DNR completing the certification.

Supervisor Vogl asked how the WDNR defined a recently adopted plan.

Mr. Robinson said that the plan should be updated and adopted every 5 years.

Mr. Struck noted that COVID had a large impact on the timeline for this plan update.

Chairperson Ross noted that the plan can be revised at any time.

Mr. Struck agreed, but noted that it is a significant effort to revise the plan, so the 5-year timeframe is ambitious when plan updates can take 2 years or more allowing for public input in a variety of ways. He also noted that the Park and Open Space Plan is used for many grant applications including federal, other state, local and private foundation grants and not just WDNR Knowles Nelson Stewardship grants.

Mr. Robinson noted that revisions made over the months would be provided with track changes so any changes are easy to be seen within the consolidated draft.

Mr. Struck noted that if the CPB was comfortable the chapter could be conditionally approved.

Mr. Robinson called out table 6.5 and cost estimates. He noted that it includes rough estimates of total costs over the next 5 years.

Mr. Struck noted that 2050 is the planning horizon and items that are prioritized according to the implementation portion of the recommended plan chapter and that not all recommendations will be implemented in the next 5 years. He reiterated that while priorities change year to year it is necessary to have reference to the goals, objectives, programs and projects that will be submitted as part of grant applications for eligibility.

Vice Chairperson Richart noted that the County cost would include all the grants that were awarded. If reviewing the number of approximately $30 M dollars, with the history of a 6:1 ratio, then you have an idea.

Chairperson Ross agreed and said if $10 M is set aside over the next 25 years than it is more than enough.

Supervisor Vogl asked if the plan keeps going out every 5 years.

Mr. Struck responded that the intent is to match up with the regional plan design year. So, this design year is 2050, but the plan is updated and revised every 5 years until a new design year is needed. The last design year was 2035.

Supervisor Vogl noted that 2050 seems very far away.

Chairperson Ross asked what conditionally approving the chapter would do.

Mr. Struck noted that it indicates that the chapter is on the right track and require significant changes or additions. It doesn't mean that something can't be added, but there is significant formatting required with all the tables, figures and appendices. Conditionally approving indicates that there will be significant changes requiring new data (tables, maps, narrative, appendices, etc.).

Vice Chairperson Richart made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter VI (Recommended Park and Open Space Plan) of *A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County* (4th Edition) as presented.

Supervisor Maguire seconded the motion.

Chairperson Ross asked if there was any further discussion.

Supervisor Vogl asked why there weren't any dog parks at the county level.

Mr. Struck noted that there is a recommendation in this plan and was a recommendation in the last plan for a dog park and that efforts were made to implement the recommendation in the past; however, the proposal did not advance as a result of local input.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were other thoughts or comments. He then asked if there was a checklist of the recommendations to review when conducting normal business.

Mr. Struck noted that the recommended goals, objectives, programs and projects as identified in the plan chapter and prioritized according to the implementation priorities. Additionally, these priorities can also be driven by available outside funding.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any other questions.

There were no other comments from the members.

Chairperson Ross called for the vote. All members in favor and the motion carried unanimously to conditionally approve Chapter VI (Recommended Park and Open Space Plan) of *A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County* (4th Edition) as presented.

Vice Chairperson Richart asked if the appendices would be included in the final plan.

Mr. Struck confirmed that yes, the referenced appendices would be included in full in the final plan.

7. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

8. Next Meeting Date(s) – Wednesday, August 21, 2024

Mr. Struck noted that there is a scheduled County Board meeting for strategic planning.

Vice Chairperson Richart noted that it may be at the Ozaukee County Fair Grounds.

Mr. Struck noted that the CPB meeting would be at the same location as the County Board meeting.

The next meeting will be August 21, 2024 at 10:30 AM or following County Board.

Chairperson Ross reminded to provide any SWOT comments to Mr. Struck by next Tuesday.

9. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 10:23 AM.