



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/540/Planning-Parks

MEETING AGENDA
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 21, 2024 AT 10:30 A.M.*
COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER, ROOM A-200

*(OR 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, Supervisor, District 19	Present	11:08 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor, District 15	Absent	N/A
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	11:08 AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Excused	N/A
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson, Supervisor, District 12	Present	11:06 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate, Supervisor District 10	Present	11:06 AM

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

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior 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 11:11 AM. Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

3. Approval of Minutes (July 17, 2024)

Motion made by Supervisor Richart, seconded by Supervisor Holyoke, that the July 17, 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.

Mr. Struck stated that a comment was received from a high school student about installing public art along the Ozaukee Interurban Trail. This option will be explored.

Supervisor Jack Arnett, District 17 Supervisor, was also present at the meeting.

Chairperson Ross stated that Mr. Vogel, as an alternate, is a voting member today, and that Supervisor Maquire may still be arriving late to the meeting. Supervisor Rischel is excused today.

5. Update/Discussion/POSSIBLE ACTION – A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County (4th Edition)

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

Chairperson Ross introduced item A: Chapter III: Development of Existing Park and Open Space Sites.

Mr. Struck: The Planning and Parks Department (Department) has provided a track changes version of the Chapter showing changes since the last CPB meeting. Some highlights include: a variety of text added (including about bird conservation, invasive species, hunting, lake access sites, historic sites), another existing County Park site added (Milwaukee River Oxbow Nature Preserve – property along CTH W in the Village of Saukville), added islands in the Milwaukee River (some are identified as Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands, files were obtained from the BLM), and added text for shipwrecks (relevant to the new Wisconsin Shipwreck Coast National Marine Sanctuary).

Supervisor Holyoke mentioned an article about buoys that were deployed recently in the National Marine Sanctuary marking the locations of the known Shipwrecks.

Mr. Struck confirmed that NOAA was placing buoys all known shipwrecks in the National Marine Sanctuary. This is one of the large undertakings by NOAA as part of the designation to protect the shipwrecks.

Mr. Struck noted that the Department will be writing more narrative regarding the accomplishments and funding table and section.

Mr. Struck noted that Table 3.3 was updated. This table shows Wisconsin and Federal open space lands and has BLM lands added per the islands noted above in the Milwaukee River.

Chairperson Ross asked how far Ozaukee County extends into Lake Michigan.

Mr. Struck stated that he believes the state boundary is approximately 2 miles offshore, but that would need to be confirmed. Ozaukee County has no real jurisdiction over land or water in Lake Michigan.

Chairperson Ross noted that the title on shipwrecks map says, “in Ozaukee County.”

Mr. Struck: This map is showing the north and south boundaries of Ozaukee County extended out into lake and the National Marine Sanctuary. The map is not showing Ozaukee County’s jurisdiction over the shipwrecks.

Mr. Struck: There may still be some other changes to Chapter III with regard to existing park sites. No action is needed right now

- b. Development of Public Involvement (Chapter IV)

Chairperson Ross introduced item B, Chapter IV.

Mr. Struck introduced the SWOT document (starting on page 149 of the agenda packet).

Mr. Struck: Documents are included in the agenda packet that show where we are pulling supporting numbers from for the SWOT document.

- i. Supporting Documentation - Review / View Video – Wisconsin Public Policy Forum Report, “Open Spaces, Cultural Places” - February 2015.

Mr. Struck: Making comparisons of Ozaukee County to other counties is very challenging. In 2015, the

Wisconsin Public Policy Forum took a comprehensive look at “Open Spaces, Cultural Places: Exploring Culture & Recreation Funding in Waukesha, Ozaukee, and Washington Counties” (agenda packet, starting on page 29) and made a deep dive into the budgets and finances of these three southeastern Wisconsin counties. For more current data, the Department took a more cursory approach at comparing the counties and their budgets in regard to Parks, Recreation and Culture by looking at the Department specific budget that has oversight for these functions. Each county’s budget requires an extensive policy analysis to truly be able to compare. Each County’s budget and also the amenities they consider as part of Parks, Recreation and Culture can vary significantly as well as how the Department budgets are structured.

Mr. Struck played a ~5-minute YouTube video summarizing the 2015 Wisconsin Public Policy Forum report.

Mr. Struck: Noted that this Wisconsin Public Policy Forum analysis and report was very detailed and sought to make comparisons across the counties and their budgets (including capital budgets). Trying to get make a financial comparison to other counties is extremely challenging and takes a significant amount of time and analysis, as every county functions differently. Some other counties do not have golf courses, for example.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if there is any relationship between the Wisconsin Public Policy Forum and SEWRPC.

Mr. Struck: The Wisconsin Public Policy Forum has done conducted economic and financial studies on various topics in the region from parks to transportation to sales tax, etc. and is a separate non-partisan organization. There is no direct connection to SEWRPC; however, the two organizations do work together and address similar regional analyses.

Mr. Struck introduced a short paper from Wisconsin Public Policy Forum: “Staying Engaged in Outdoor Pursuits” which is included in the agenda packet starting on page 110.

Mr. Struck: This document looks statewide at how recreation has fared through the Covid-19 pandemic. There is a strong case for lots of use of parks and outdoor recreation and a corresponding interest in purchases of hunting and fishing licenses and outdoor equipment sales.

Chairperson Ross stated that he didn’t spend the time to draw conclusions from the “Open Spaces, Cultural Places: Exploring Culture & Recreation Funding in Waukesha, Ozaukee, and Washington Counties” study prior to this meeting, but noted that he didn’t see it reflected in the SWOT document. He asked what conclusions we will draw from the study.

Mr. Struck: We wanted to offer a financial comparison between the southeastern counties with regard to how Parks, Recreation and Culture functions are funded and to what extent. With that said, the 2015 study showed levy impacts for these functions; Ozaukee County was quite a bit lower than the other 2 counties included in the study. We will go more in depth when we get to SWOT document. We did a rough look at budget and percent of levy for the Departments providing these functions in different counties and that data was reflected in the SWOT as well as reference to this 2015 Wisconsin Public Policy Forum comprehensive analysis of funding for Parks, Recreation and Culture.

Chairperson Ross noted that one of the things this made him think of is the funding model. He asked if that is something we want to weigh in on as a board.

Mr. Struck: Yes, the funding models in each of the counties had similarities, but also varied on aspects particularly as it relates to services, amenities and functions they provide (e.g. golf courses, ice centers, fairgrounds, etc.). Truly understanding the various county funding models (e.g. revenues, expenses and functions) takes a significant amount of policy analysis and understanding, but there are takeaways that can be gleaned such as the levy impact for each county to provide these Park, Recreation and Culture services, functions and amenities. The last POSP was adopted in 2011, and the 2015 Wisconsin Public Policy Forum analysis came after the plan had been in place, so it is new information since the last plan. The financial comparisons to provide these services, functions and amenities is the take away from this comprehensive study and the fact that each county addresses these to different extents and in different ways often as defined by priorities of the specific county overtime (different priorities for some items and different funding such as fairgrounds). There are many similarities in how the various county Departments function though.

Mr. Struck noted that each item on the SWOT document is a research study on its own, and the Department is

doing what they are able to provide good, detailed, quality supporting documentation.

ii. Supporting Documentation – Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department - Ozaukee Interurban Trail Promotion Project – Wisconsin Department of Tourism Joint Effort Marketing (JEM) Grant Report – March 2021

Mr. Struck introduced the JEM grant report and noted that the main takeaways from the report are the usage of the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (e.g. trail counts) and also the economic impact analysis of the Trail (e.g. spending, tourism, etc.).

Mr. Struck: This document is the Department’s best available data for an economic impact study of the Trail. The study focused on marketing the Ozaukee Interurban Trail in the shoulder-seasons (particularly fall) and documents trail usage, spending and tourism impact. The Ozaukee Interurban Trail is a significant driver of tourism for the County as well as a quality-of-life issue for relocation to the County.

iii. Supporting Documentation – Ozaukee County Park and Ozaukee Interurban Trail Visitor/User Counts (2016 – 2024)

Mr. Struck introduced the tables shown on pages 146 and 147 of the agenda packet.

Mr. Struck: These are updated trail user count and park usage numbers that we have been collecting since 2016. Two tables will be included in the appendices of the POSP. The first one is for the Ozaukee Interurban Trail; the Department has several trail counters on the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (Freistadt, CTH A, I-43 Bridge, and Pioneer Road). The bottom row shows the cumulative daily average. Lower trail counts are observed further from the population/urban centers. Over 400 daily users are logged at Freistadt Road, including late fall and winter time. Over 130 users are logged daily at the northern trail counter on CTH A.

Mr. Struck: The Department is also getting park user counts from trail counters. Some trail counters track primarily vehicles based on location, while some log pedestrians on trails (no automobile counts). Generally, the highest counts are seen at Lion’s Den Gorge Nature Preserve County Park (close to 600 daily users). Virmond County Park is a very close second place. The Department hopes to capture recent improvement (e.g. stairway to the shoreline/beach) impacts to visitor numbers at Virmond County Park. As well as other POSP improvements (e.g. pavilions, etc.) at other County Parks in the System.

iv. Supporting Documentation - Protection Status of Environmentally Significant Lands in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region

Mr. Struck introduced the next table in the agenda packet: Protection Status of Environmentally Significant Lands in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region (page 148).

Mr. Struck: This table was originally put together in 2008, but Mr. Robinson updated it recently. The table shows a definition of what environmentally significant lands are and shows the seven southeastern Wisconsin counties. The table shows the total county acreage and what portion is environmentally significant. It also shows which ones are considered protected currently. The updated data is coming largely from adopted POSP plans – so there are different years at the different counties. Kenosha and Racine have 2010 data, for example. For Ozaukee County, there has been significant progress since last the POSP: 23% protected lands in 2008 and 2024 has 33% of total environmentally sensitive lands protected. Across the southeastern Wisconsin counties, Ozaukee County is fairly comparable for percentages, except for Milwaukee County.

Vice Chairperson Richart noted that this was all background information for the SWOT and stated that he wonders if CPB is spending too much time on this.

Chairperson Ross: As CPB refines the SWOT, that will drive the executive summary, which is the communication to the board. The board can’t read and digest the entire document, but they can see this SWOT and get the main takeaways. For instance, how are the goals, objectives, programs and policies of the POSP funded? It is reflective of the CPB and County Board in implementing the plan. This is our challenge as the CPB, to make sure the County Board understands and supports the goals, objectives, programs and policies of the POSP. The SWOT will help us get there.

Mr. Struck: Noted that Chapters 1-3 explains where the county started (existing inventory and status of current goals, objectives, programs and policies). Then, Chapter 6 explains where the county is going in the future (recommended goals, objectives, programs and policies). The POSP needs to include specific recommendations tied to the goals and objectives in order for it to be used in securing grant funding for the development of programs and projects.

v. DISCUSSION and POSSIBLE ACTION - Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis, summary document and prioritization

Mr. Struck introduced the new version of the SWOT, starting on page 149 of the agenda packet. Mr. Struck noted that the document is not finalized but is getting closer to completion.

Mr. Struck: This is a refined SWOT document; the Department provided some additional supporting information and data as a basis for the items listed as requested by the CPB.

Chairperson Ross: The question we need to ask is “so what?” for each item on the SWOT. How is each item applicable and how does it drive actions. This will influence the way he thinks about how this should be structured.

Mr. Struck: The SWOT is intended to include high level guiding goals and some objectives in each category. Chapter 5 and 6 explains what and how we will address the items on the SWOT (how to capitalize on strengths, for example) through specific recommendations for objectives, policies, programs and projects.

Mr. Struck: We will not review everything on the SWOT in detail at today’s meeting (it was included in the packet); however, the Department needs to know if this document is what we want and on the right track, or if we need to start over. The SWOT has been a significant staff time investment; therefore, we want to make sure it meets the needs of the CPB. Perhaps the first review item can be if each listed item is in the correct SWOT categories.

Chairperson Ross: It would be helpful to look at the first paragraph of each item on the SWOT and see how we are articulating that item and if it fits in that category. We should be asking “Is the sentence at the top accurately reflected in the data that’s below? Can we support each item listed?”

Mr. Struck: Yes, that is how the document is generally organized. We can break it out into a wider table and put the data in another column if that is preferred.

Chairperson Ross: It needs to be clear that the first paragraph is a summary of what’s below it. It is helpful for me to know if the data supports the comment above. We need to rely on the research the Department has done.

Mr. Struck: Overall yes, we have found supporting documentation for everything listed on the SWOT whether it’s a strength or weakness, etc. The document is in a fairly good position currently. The first summary statement initially came from Chairperson Ross and Supervisor Rishel. The Department would appreciate comments on if the items need to be changed. Some items were combined for instances, one strength about the County Park System and one strength about the Department.

Chairperson Ross: When thinking about digestibility, if the data supports the top-level statement, can we move all supporting data to the appendix?

Mr. Struck noted that a lot of this data is already a summary of the full reports in the appendix or online. Mr. Struck thinks it should be kept in the SWOT but could be put it in a separate column.

All CPB members, and Mr. Robinson, agreed with Mr. Struck.

Mr. Robinson: The document will likely need to be landscape formatted.

Mr. Struck requested that all CPB members look at the SWOT; Mr. Struck is interested in everyone’s thoughts on where each item has been listed.

Mr. Struck introduced item #2: Park Amenities

Mr. Struck: The Department tried to update economic data and provided percentages. The cross-county comparison was difficult, but some aggregate numbers are provided. This includes updated 2023 data.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if it was taken into consideration that some counties charge park admission fees.

Mr. Struck: Yes, the analysis takes that into account and generally lists the source of revenue whether from fees, grants, or levy (similar to how the accomplishments and funding table was developed). The numbers reflect the average tax levy percent (non-fee revenue). Ozaukee County is comparable to some of the southeastern counties, but definitely less than several others.

Mr. Struck introduced item #3: Availability and Support of Open Space. Mr. Struck noted that not much was changed for this item; there is good information here already.

Mr. Struck introduced item #4: Lake Michigan and noted that a brief summary is provided that references survey data.

Mr. Struck introduced item #5: Bike Trails and Regional Connectivity and noted that CPB may want to revisit the summary statement.

Mr. Struck introduced item #6: Golf Courses and noted that the statement is a good summary. The Department provided data for this item.

Mr. Struck noted that item #7: No Park/Trail Admission Fees is listed in the Strengths category.

Supervisor Vogel noted that having no admission fees generates more park/trail use.

Mr. Struck: Some other nearby counties do have entrance admission fees and Ozaukee County does have some use fees for things like camping, pavilion rentals, disc golf, etc.

Supervisor Vogel asked if other counties provide admission stickers annually.

Mr. Struck: Yes, and some counties enforce using cameras are at every park. The Department then sends out fines for non-compliance. This requires a significant amount of additional administrative work for fines, collections, disputes, etc.

Chairperson Ross noted that later we will discuss the SWOT item in the threats category – Expanded Use of Park Facilities by Non-Ozaukeeans.

Chairperson Ross mentioned the funding model.

Chairperson Ross: How do we sustain our parks system? Is our funding model appropriate? This is not something that we find in Chapter 6. Perhaps this shows up in the executive summary.

Mr. Struck noted that he believes this is taken up in the annual County budget for the Department that gets voted on by the County Board each year. Some items are multiple year commitments such as grants.

Supervisor Vogel noted that in the future Ozaukee County have more expensive park items.

Mr. Struck stated that these funding models have been looked at; it is part of what provoked the “Open Spaces, Cultural Places: Exploring Culture & Recreation Funding in Waukesha, Ozaukee, and Washington Counties” study.

Supervisor Vogel mentioned that Ozaukee County has recently added indoor, flush bathrooms to some county parks, and he expects that will become a standard for all county parks.

Mr. Struck agreed, and those recommendations are in Chapter 6 of the POSP.

Supervisor Holyoke also noted that Ozaukee County uses sales tax to offset property tax.

Chairperson Ross: There are a range of different models that are possible to use, Ozaukee County has devolved to the one it is using. Is it a function of the CPB to say we should look at this again? Not sure. The Department is very dependent on grant funding – we should also consider Mr. Struck's potential future successor.

Mr. Struck: This funding model was looked at in 2008-09 and then again in 2015 (Wisconsin Public Policy Forum), and to a lesser degree more recently. The funding model also comes up as a function of the annual County budget. There are also regular discussions with adjacent counties on their funding models.

Mr. Struck: noted that some counties use sales tax for capital park projects or certain park, recreation and culture projects. He further noted that counties used to be able to collect environmental impact fees like municipalities, but this was eliminated several years ago by the Wisconsin State legislature. Also, Ozaukee County gets a payment (environmental impact) annually from We Energies for having a Powerplant located in the County. When this payment was established/revisited (around the time the powerplant went from coal to natural gas), it was discussed that as an environmental impact fee those dollars should go to offset natural infrastructure projects and parks. Ultimately, the County has used those funds annually to offset the County levy each year (reduce taxes). The Planning and Parks Department (parks, recreation and culture) is a very small percentage of the overall County budget each year.

Chairperson Ross: What we are presented at budget time is a list line item by line-item budget. This is not the large-scale perspective for a funding model.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that neither the Comprehensive Plan nor the Park and Open Space Plan is a budgeting document.

Chairperson Ross agreed there is a connection to the annual budget process and noted that the POSP should be reflective of the strategic plan or inform it. We have the opportunity to recommend to the board.

Chairperson Ross: I keep looking for what the policy issues are, not what we need to do in each park. It would be okay if the CPB wanted to keep the funding model, but CPB should consider the alternative models.

Mr. Struck noted that a recommendation could be to review the funding model and set aside funding (as this would not be something eligible for grants) in the annual County budget to conduct an analysis of various models. So, this could be a recommendation in the POSP. Mr. Struck agreed that there are ways to connect the County Strategic Plan, the Park and Open Space Plan and the annual County (Department budget) and that effort has been ongoing for the last several years (since the first version of the Strategic Plan). Mr. Struck noted that all the CPB members were provided a flowchart of how the various plans inter-related at the first meeting of the re-engaged CPB. In general, he noted that the POSP is a more detailed plan that provides details and refines the broader Comprehensive Plan. The Strategic Plan has guided the annual budget process. The POSP refines the Comprehensive Plan in the park and open space and natural resources sections. The POSP is more of an implementation plan, how we implement one aspect of the Comprehensive Plan.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the meeting has diverged from the SWOT agenda item.

Mr. Struck introduced item #8: Beauty and Mix of Suburban and Rural Settings and stated that he thinks this item may be more of a Comprehensive Plan issue.

Mr. Struck introduced item #11: Median household income and mentioned that he thinks this item may be more of a Comprehensive Plan issue.

Mr. Struck introduced item #12: Strong Non-profit Partnerships and mentioned that the Department added to this description.

Mr. Struck introduced the next SWOT category: Weaknesses

Mr. Struck: Not too much has changed in the Weaknesses category, other than additional support data.

Mr. Struck introduced item #4: Lack of Camping and mentioned that the Department added a table showing less availability of camping spaces in Ozaukee County compared to other nearby counties.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if items #2 and #3 are the same.

Mr. Struck: Possibly; they definitely are related.

Supervisor Vogel asked what the three campsites are in Ozaukee County.

Mr. Struck: Waubedonia County Park, Harrington Beach State Park, and one private campground in the northern part of the county.

Supervisor Vogel: Could a new campground be constructed at Clay Bluffs Cedar Gorge Nature Preserve County Park?

Mr. Struck: No, there are grant and easement restrictions on that property.

Mr. Robinson asked how Harrington Beach State Park has campsites if it is on the Lake Michigan.

Mr. Struck explained that the restrictions at Clay Bluffs Cedar Gorge Nature Preserve are due to federal deed restrictions, grant funding restrictions and a conservation easement held by the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust. It does not have to do with its location on Lake Michigan.

Chairperson Ross: Weakness items #1-3, and several other items really go beyond the direct scope of the POSP. These items are not captured within the POSP recommendations. So, if the items are not addressed, then maybe CPB should remove them from the SWOT? Why talk about the items in the SWOT if they are not part of the plan and what we present to the county board?

Mr. Struck noted that at the beginning of the SWOT exercise he provided the bounds/parameters and referred back to the directions given when doing the SWOT (...that relate to Park and Open Space items). However, having said that they are high level goal statements and probably OK to leave in the SWOT, but yes, there are several items that are specifically beyond the scope of the POSP in directly addressing such as the high cost of housing (median household income). However, these are factors that do influence the POSP and recommendations in the plan indirectly.

Chairperson Ross stated that the CPB needs to do a better job on conveying the accomplishments and funding noted in item #1 to the County Board.

Mr. Struck noted that implementation priorities are noted in the POSP chapter 6.

Mr. Struck asked the CPB if they had any additional input on item #2: County Board Differing Opinions / Visions?

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that item #1: Accomplishments from 2011 POSP Not Broadly Appreciated is the most important item to him, since so much work has been done to address that item in this updated plan. It's for the CPB to convince the county board that we need a new POSP that they need to approve/adopt. The first step is that we want the County Board to approve/adopt the POSP. Vice-Chairperson Richart thinks that in the executive summary we need to mention the #1 weakness and the results of the analysis that was completed by the Department.

Chairperson Ross: The CPB goal is to develop the POSP and get the county board to approve it. I think there are other purposes as well. We need to get the POSP in front of the WDNR to satisfy requirements. I view this as the opportunity to look at the big picture.

Mr. Vogel: It feels threatening if we don't do it right now.

Chairperson Ross: There will probably be a gap between what the WDNR wants, and the POSP plan for the next 10 years. There is an additional layer of how the county board will get involved in actively planning for the future.

Chairperson Ross: There is a tension between the course of the POSP document and what we are trying to do in CPB.

Mr. Robinson noted that budget is likely listed as a weakness for all other southeastern Wisconsin counties.

Mr. Struck: The Department had to tease out other county Department budgets because some are partially fee-based, and some are not. All have different models and often times budgeting history has generated the funding model for each county.

Chairperson Ross asked whether the county is “driving by looking in the rearview mirror or by looking out the windshield”

Mr. Struck mentioned that for item #5 Park Management, he thinks that this should instead be more about implementation capacity.

Chairperson Ross agreed.

Mr. Struck introduced item #8 Additional Hunting Lands.

Mr. Struck: The Department made a table only comparing federal and state-owned lands in each county, but there are assumptions here (not all federal and state-owned land is open for hunting). The data in the table demonstrates that Ozaukee, Racine, and Milwaukee counties have low availability of hunting lands. The Department is trying to dig into all other hunting lands (e.g. received WDNR Stewardship funding), but it’s a difficult and time-consuming task. He also thought that we may want to show percentages per county as land area of the county definitely influences the acres available.

Supervisor Holyoke: Yes, add a fourth column in the table for percentages.

Mr. Struck introduced the next SWOT category: Opportunities

Mr. Struck introduced item #2: Farmland Preservation and noted that there was not much changed for this item.

Mr. Struck introduced item #3: New Parks and Activities to Remain Relevant to Resident Interests.

Supervisor Vogel mentioned the idea of a dog park, or multiple, and noted that the county could charge entry fees at these areas.

Mr. Struck: Will confirm but believe this is a recommendation in the POSP already.

Mr. Struck introduced item #5: Bike Trail Expansion.

Chairperson Ross and Supervisor Holyoke: Should we mention rebooting the Ozaukee Interurban Trail Advisory Council? We could list this as an opportunity. Not just expansion of the council, but improved coordination as well.

Mr. Struck: Yes, Mr. Struck believes this is mentioned in Chapter 6 recommendations of the POSP, but we can list it in the SWOT also.

Mr. Struck introduced item #7: Private/Public Partnerships and noted that there is an opportunity there, especially funding opportunities

Mr. Struck introduced item #10: Rural Undeveloped Land.

Mr. Struck: This item description was edited slightly. Discussion was added to note that some rural land is important to be undeveloped for farmland. Some land may be more suitable for development.

Mr. Struck introduced item #11: Proximity to Milwaukee and noted the tourism aspect.

Mr. Struck introduced item #16: Fish Passage and noted that the Department expanded the description.

Mr. Struck introduced the final category of the SWOT: Threats.

Mr. Struck introduced item #5: Bluff Erosion and noted that this item will be broadened to include coastal hazards (hazard mitigation plan will be referenced).

Mr. Struck introduced item #6: Expanded Use of Park Facilities by Non-Ozaukeeans.

Supervisor Vogel: Is there is no supporting data to show how many Milwaukee County residents come to Ozaukee County?

Mr. Struck: The Department did the best we could with available data – park user surveys data included, as we don't track entrance to parks via passes or collect addresses.

Supervisor Vogel: Based on the data provided it appears that most people visiting the county parks are from Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross: How many Ozaukee County citizens use the county parks?

Mr. Struck: Overall user counts for specific parks can be referenced for this question; however, the only percentage of resident vs non-resident is the park user survey percentage noted earlier.

Mr. Vogel asked if reservation data could be used.

Mr. Struck: The Department does have reservation data for pavilions and camping. The Department will look at securing the data and consider adding to the SWOT.

Chairperson Ross introduced item #7: Percent of County Residents Who Use County Park Facilities.

Chairperson Ross: Coming back to the “so-what?” question, considering the percent of Ozaukee County residents that use County Park facilities – if the county doesn't have support from the community, then the community won't want to fund it.

Supervisor Vogel: Marketing was mentioned earlier. Why isn't there a sign saying “this is what your tax dollars are doing” at each park?

Mr. Struck: That method could be used at the parks similar to how it is required for some federal funding programs. We have not had the funds budgeted to make those signs in the past.

Chairperson Ross: How do we adapt and modify to keep the County Park System reflecting the interests of the park users? It would be good to know the percent of Ozaukee County residents that use County Park facilities.

Mr. Struck: We do survey residents as was mentioned in the POSP Chapter IV (countywide public opinion survey, park user survey, JEM grant, etc.). It is very difficult to gather this data except by survey (which requires significant budget) unless we have paid park admission and collect addresses.

Chairperson Ross: This is an encouragement to keep doing the park user surveys. For example, pickleball wasn't as much of an interest by park users 10 years ago.

Mr. Struck: The surveying that we have been able to do in the past has been supported by grants. In addition, it is very time consuming, so also required additional staffing in the form of interns. We have not had Department budget to conduct user surveys.

Chairperson Ross: Does Ozaukee County have a strong system of metrics and key performance indicators (KPIs) that are routinely visited at policy level? Are there metrics that reflect what we want to accomplish out of the POSP at a high level?

Mr. Struck: Yes, the Department tracks many KPIs and metrics and reports out to the County Board as part of the Strategic Plan and these indicators measure progress towards some of the goals and objectives recommended in the POSP.

Chairperson Ross: I could see in a recommendation that we try to figure out what the roll-up metrics are that say we are hitting the mark on our goals and objectives. This could be for the POSP in 5 years. This could become a management tool.

Mr. Struck: noted the KPIs that are tracked and reported on for the Strategic Plan and noted that they are reviewed annually and as part of the County budget process. If desired, those could be prioritized. These KPIs were generated as a result of the strategic plan; however, we have many other metrics that the Department reports on for the various funding sources and grants. Of course, some KPIs are operational. I believe we have good KPIs that match up with our goals and objectives for the POSP, Farmland Preservation Plan and ultimately the Comprehensive Plan. These are reviewed annually by the County Board as part of the Strategic Plan and County budget. We are also trying to have one set of metrics to make the best use of staff time as we already have many other metrics we track for the various grant funding sources.

Mr. Struck asked that all CPB members take a look at the SWOT further.

Mr. Struck: The Department will do some more formatting adjustments and add some additional supporting data (including reservation visitor data). Of course, we don't have much time between now and the September CPB meeting.

Supervisor Vogel: If we had to submit this SWOT today, would it be good enough?

The overall consensus of the group was "yes."

Mr. Struck: The goal is to complete the SWOT in September

Chairperson Ross: The general consensus from the CPB today is that we don't need much more data. The work that the Department has done so far is great.

Supervisor Holyoke: I thought we wanted the POSP completed by the end of the year?

Mr. Struck: Yes, I want to get the final POSP plan to CPB by the September CPB meeting, and to the County Board by October or November 2024 meeting.

Mr. Robinson: Will the next CPB meeting be mid-September?

Mr. Struck: Yes, the 18th of September. The Department plans to include the SWOT in POSP Chapter 4 at next CPB meeting.

Supervisor Vogel thanked the Department for all their hard work.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked what the "possible action" is for the SWOT - to conditionally approve it?

Mr. Struck: If the CPB thinks the SWOT is close enough, then we could conditionally approve it. It will probably be added to Chapter 4 by the next time we meet. I will leave the decision up to the CPB.

Chairperson Ross: We are close to where we need to be. The next challenge is what do we do with it? I have thoughts about how to use the SWOT, but not on any changes to the SWOT.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: Should we conditionally approve the SWOT?

Supervisor Vogel made a motion to conditionally approve the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis as presented.

Vice-Chairperson Richart seconded the motion.

All were in favor. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Robinson noted that the last SWOT in the current plan was prioritized. Is the SWOT going to be prioritized?

Mr. Struck: We could possibly choose the top three items in each SWOT category at the next CPB meeting. This would be a way to prioritize the SWOT if desired.

Mr. Robinson noted that the existing Ozaukee County POSP is online, including the existing SWOT.

Chairperson Ross: We won't be able to prioritize the SWOT today.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: We still need to show all the items, so it may not be worth highlighting or prioritizing.

Mr. Struck: We will discuss this at the next CPB meeting after the SWOT document is cleaned up and in a more final form.

- c. Development of Recommended Park and Open Space Plan (Chapter VI)
 - i. Summary of revisions/updates

Chairperson Ross introduced item C and asked what needs to be discussed with Chapter 6.

Mr. Struck: There will be a few additions to Chapter 6 yet and also as a function of today's discussions. We talked about a lot of the updates already. This is the recommendation chapter of the POSP; if you see something you want added, let me know ASAP. This chapter is already conditionally approved. Plan implementation starts on page 29 of the chapter.

Chairperson Ross mentioned some of the priorities from the SWOT, lake access, boating access, or hunting, and asked how those get reflected in this chapter.

Mr. Struck: Page 26 shows lake and river access.

Chairperson Ross: On page 35, do we have a Land Preservation Fund?

Mr. Struck: Yes, there is a Land Preservation Fund set-up, but there is no money in the fund right now. The fund was established to accept private donations and does not receive any County levy or capital funding. The fund was used in the past (maybe for an appraisal). There is a resolution defining the fund and it was approved by the County Board.

Supervisor Vogel: We should revisit this fund.

Supervisor Holyoke: What happens once the money is in the fund?

Mr. Struck: It is a non-lapsing fund for the purposes specified (e.g. Land Preservation). There is currently no active Land Preservation Board also approved by resolution by the County Board. The Land Preservation Board does take a significant amount of staff time to support it.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if the text in red shows the changes that were made to the Chapter.

Mr. Struck: Yes, red and blue text are track changes.

Chairperson Ross: What is the difference between sections 6.3 and 6.4 in Chapter 6?

Mr. Struck: There are two major elements to the POSP: 1. parks and outdoor recreation element and 2. open space preservation element. These sections are the recommendations in each major element of the plan.

Chairperson Ross: On page 32 of the POSP (page 199 of agenda packet), in the last paragraph, recommended trails are mentioned?

Mr. Struck: There is a prioritization process, since not all the recommendations will be accomplished in 5 years.

Mr. Robinson: Section 6.5 of the POSP is just a summarization for federal, state, and county level implementation.

Mr. Struck: noted that the plan recommends park and outdoor recreation items (such as pavilions, trails, etc.) whereas the open space preservation element recommendations talk about new county parks and preservation, or restoration of lands and the remaining sections discuss implementation, prioritization, funding and maintenance items.

Mr. Struck: The County project areas are based on the priority of protecting environmentally sensitive lands in the county, particularly those that are a priority for County preservation/restoration (e.g. adjacent to existing County Park lands). Secondly, can we also meet a parks and recreation need and priority at the same time with those lands.

Chairperson Ross: I'm not sure we can give you what we need in this meeting.

Mr. Struck: The executive summary should summarize what is in the plan, it will not introduce new items.

Mr. Struck: We still need to complete implementation and cost sections as well as the Executive Summary. It is probably not realistic to finalize the plan (POSP) by the next CPB meeting.

Chairperson Ross: Should we discuss further in this meeting?

Mr. Struck: I think CPB members can provide me comments by email, and I will incorporate for the next draft that all CPB members can review.

d. Development of the Park and Open Space Plan Executive Summary (Preliminary Draft)

Mr. Struck: In the Executive Summary, the Department has identified several places where further text is needed. For the SWOT analysis section, please provide any of your thoughts and ideas via email.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: For the Executive Summary, should we just use what is written in the bullet points (first column) from the SWOT to make a list and add to the Executive Summary? I think so.

No other CPB members had current thoughts on that.

Chairperson Ross: We will need to revisit the Executive Summary. Share your comments with Mr. Struck by email.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that he thinks the project areas should be referenced, and map included in the Executive Summary.

Mr. Robinson stated that the project areas are mentioned in the Executive Summary.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: A reference should be added for that narrative to Map 6.1 and Table 6.5 of the POSP.

Chairperson Ross thanked the group for sitting through the long meeting and asked the group to provide information and comments to Mr. Struck for Chapter 6 and/or the Executive Summary via email.

6. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

7. Next Meeting Date(s) – Wednesday, September 18, 2024

The next meeting will be September 18th, 2024 following the County Board meeting. Exact time to be determined.

Chairperson Ross: We probably have a couple of weeks to get comments to Mr. Struck. Is there a deadline?

Mr. Struck: The next agenda packet should be posted by September 13th, at the latest. The Department will need all information by the first week in September in order to ensure it gets added into the packet. Please provide information to the Department as soon as you can. The Department would like to have final chapters of the POSP ready for the October 2024 CPB meeting.

8. Adjournment

Supervisor Vogel made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Holyoke. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 1:49 PM.

121 W. Main Street, P.O. Box 994, Port Washington, WI 53074

Phone: (262) 284-8257 Phone Metro: (262) 238-8257 Fax: (262) 284-8269 Fax Metro: (262) 238-8269