



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

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

MEETING MINUTES COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2024 AT **9:00 A.M.** OZAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATON CENTER, ROOM A-200 (121 West Main Street, Port Washington, WI 53074)

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 at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Room A-200.

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	8:40 AM
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson	Present	8:55 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate	Excused	-

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director - Planning and Parks Department; Brittany Whyte, Natural Resources & GIS Technician. Katie Vogeler – Director – Land and Water Management Department.

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 9:00 AM. Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

3. Public Comments, Correspondence and Written Communications

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Struck stated there were no written communications or correspondence. There were no additional public comments at the meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes (November 20, 2024)

Motion made by Supervisor Rischel, seconded by Supervisor Maguire, that the November 20th, 2024, minutes be approved. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

5. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 (3rd Edition)

- a. Review/Discussion on Overview and Background Information for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County and Planning Process (Hardcopies of A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035 available)

Mr. Struck: Presented a summary PowerPoint presentation from the last Farmland Preservation Plan planning effort to provide background on the statute, public participation, inventory and other plan elements and set the stage for how the CPB will proceed with the update to the Farmland Preservation Plan: 2050 (FPP). *A copy of the PowerPoint presentation has been archived for review as necessary.*

Mr. Struck also handed out hard copies of the existing, adopted FPP for Ozaukee County: 2035.

Chairperson Ross: I thought it would be worthwhile for everyone to have a hard copy of the existing FPP for reference. Vice Chairperson Richart was on CPB for the last FPP. There was a lot of work done as it was the first version under the new State Statute and requirements.

Mr. Struck: In the packet, for background, I included a couple of documents from the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). The letter on page 10 of the agenda packet was letting us know that the existing FPP plan will expire in 2025 and talks about an extension request, which we have already submitted. December 31, 2025 will be the final deadline. The letter dated this December is a reminder letter. Grant funding is available, and we have already received a grant award for preparation of the update to the Farmland Preservation Plan. The official letter documenting the extension from DATCP is on page 11 of the CPB packet.

Mr. Struck: Noted that we requested an extension from DATCP to allow us to coordinate the update of the Farmland Preservation Plan with an update of the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan. One of the criteria for DATCP approving an extension is coordination of efforts with the Comprehensive Plan.

Supervisor Holyoke: No more extensions are available after next December?

Mr. Struck: Correct, only one extension is available and we received that extension. This extension also allowed us to complete the Park and Open Space Plan first as it had a more sensitive timeline for completion and we have already begun efforts on that plan update.

Chairperson Ross: Do we expect this to be a problem?

Mr. Struck: I don't expect a problem, but we will need to move quickly through the plan update and plan input. Last time the FPP was done in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan process, so it benefited from the data collection that had been done. It took 2.5 years to complete the last FPP. The previous FPP prior to that was in the 1980s, for a different version of the Farmland Preservation program and State Statute. So, the current plan was significantly updated to meet the new statutory requirements. New statute language was passed right around the time when we were working on the FPP update last time, so we were able to make it compliant. The statute is the same as when we adopted the last plan in 2013 and we have already compiled a significant amount of inventory information, data and mapping as of this last plan; therefore, we expect that an update will be less time consuming. We are updating the inventories as opposed to creating new data and mapping. We also completed the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis last time, which was a very large undertaking and we will not be updating that analysis.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: I think the biggest challenge for planners in this FPP process is the Public Participation Plan (PPP).

Mr. Struck: Yes, I have some PPP items in the agenda packet. There will be items to discuss and challenges that we face given the constrained timeline.

Mr. Struck: Another item included in the agenda packet for this section is the contract with SEWRPC on page 15. The letter is a brief overview of the scope of services and a project overview. We will get more into the overview and what SEWRPC will be doing and not doing for the FPP. The last document included in this section of the agenda packet on page 20 is an overall flow chart of various plans for how they fit into

the overall scheme. With the FPP we will adopt the plan as a separate individual plan, and also as an amendment to the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County. This is not a statutory requirement for the Park and Open Space Plan (POSP) as it is for the FPP, but we have made a Comprehensive Plan amendment for the POSP also. It is a statutory requirement for the FPP. We are delaying the POSP amendment to the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan in order to incorporate both the FPP and POSP all at once at the end of 2025.

Mr. Struck: The presentation slides start on page 21. I'll go through them quickly. Any questions so far?

Supervisor Holyoke: This new FPP takes us out to 2050?

Mr. Struck: Yes, the current plan has a 2035 design year. The FPP is good for 10 years until State Statute requires an update (which can be extended once for up to 2 years). The POSP is good for 5 years until the WDNR requires an update for grant funding eligibility. So, while there are required updates either every 5 or 10 years depending upon the program or statute, we also have a design year specified. The design year often extends longer than the required updates; however, often times updates can be less significant given the extended design year.

Mr. Struck: Page 22 of the agenda packet discusses the "new" State Statute passed around the time of the last FPP update. Eligibility for farmland tax credits is provided through participation in and provision of a certified FPP. Unlike DATCP, the WDNR has gone from certifying all POSPs to self-certification. DATCP still certifies the FPP upon submittal, typically simultaneously to adoption locally.

Mr. Struck: Page 23 shows the components of the Working Lands Initiative, the statutory program. The FPP also can create eligibility for 2 other programs aside from the farmland tax credits (Agricultural Enterprise Areas and Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements). The Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements program is in the statutes; however, the State doesn't provide funding anymore for the purchase of easements. We did apply for this program for a farm in Belgium in the last round of grant funding, which was awarded, however, the funds were eliminated from the program in that last round by the legislature. Therefore, that last round, no funds were obligated and the program has remained unfunded since then. I believe there were only a couple of years of actual obligated awards.

Mr. Struck: Page 24 shows the FPP requirements. The FPP is required to designate strategies to increase housing density and must stay consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Struck: Page 26 discussed plan development and oversight. We are again coordinating with SEWPRC on plan development. We also received a planning grant (similar to last time) to assist with funding the cost of plan development. Last time we also had guidance from a citizen advisory committee.

Mr. Struck: Page 27 shows the 6-step planning process. Public participation is required. The planning steps are similar to the last FPP and POSP as far as development of inventory data, public participation, and plan element development.

Mr. Struck: Page 28 shows a diagram of what we did last time for the FPP; it was pretty involved. It happened right on the heels of the Comprehensive Planning process. A lot of this committee infrastructure was already in place. The diagram shows an iterative feedback loop. You can see the 4 committees/groups in light blue. All communities participated and were involved at different levels. We don't have an active Land Preservation Board; they were active for the last planning effort. I don't anticipate we will have this board formed for this FPP update, due to timing, staff support, and budget. We can discuss a citizen advisory or technical advisory committee further; however, even this will be a challenge with our constrained timeline.

Supervisor Rischel: Is there anything required by law?

Mr. Struck: No specifics are required, just that public participation is encouraged and provided for in a Public Participation Plan.

Chairperson Ross: Have we reached out to the various municipalities to let them know we are working on an update to the FPP, and to find out what level of involvement they may desire?

Mr. Struck: We have reached out to the municipalities for data and GIS mapping requests; however, we have not extended any formal requests to participate in a citizen advisory or technical advisory committee at this time. The planners in each of the municipalities are aware that we are undertaking an update to the FPP as has been discussed at several municipal staff meetings.

Chairperson Ross: Will we be sending a formal letter to them as well?

Mr. Struck: We could prepare a letter; however, most of the staff at the municipalities are aware. We might decide to send the letter and ask for their participation in a focus group or committee and also to share any updated inventory information, data or GIS mapping.

Chairperson Ross: Given the tight timeline, we might want to consider doing this very soon.

Mr. Struck: We have already drafted an email to go out to municipal staff contacts asking for assistance with updating the inventory data for their particular municipality. We also have a meeting planned to discuss potential citizen advisory and technical advisory committee with UWEX (Paul Roback) and the LWMD to gather more input and assistance.

Mr. Struck: Page 31 shows the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis done as part of the last plan. In the past, innate soil characteristics were used to designate classes of farmland. That was established by NRCS to classify lands largely by soil type and characteristics (ability to grow certain agricultural crops) and give them priority. The LESA was new during the last FPP (also developed initially by NRCS), to consider not only the land evaluation (soil characteristics), but also took into consideration site assessments as well. The site assessment takes into consideration other development factors such as proximity to sewer service areas, land use, contiguous agricultural lands, etc. Our LESA scored and evaluated every single eligible agricultural parcel in the County at the time. We don't have the time or resources to do this again for the FPP update; however, the existing analysis is still valid and a full report is available. One example development factor is the proximity to sewer service areas. A farmland area may have great soil characteristics, but if they are right next to a village and/or in the village planning area it may be that the land is more suited to development instead. The yellow areas on the LESA map designate farmland under the mean/median score and are less high quality for agriculture, the dark the green the higher the score for agricultural use and preservation. The various factors are based on the NRCS model. Our LESA analysis generated a mean and median score that was then used to classify higher quality above the mean and median (same actually) and lower quality below the mean and median. The LESA scoring considers approximately 14 criteria in addition to soil characteristics.

Chairperson Ross: How will this impact things moving forward, since it's not quite current?

Mr. Struck: The results of the LESA analysis are still largely valid and useful. Farmland areas that have been annexed or have permanently changed land use like development since last time are obviously no longer relevant. So, we can tweak the LESA analysis to reflect the new areas annexed or developed since the analysis was done; however, we would not be able to rerun the model with those changes (how that impacts adjacent parcels, etc.). I strongly recommend that everyone reviews the LESA analysis and study results. The LESA analysis is available on the Department and SEWRPC websites and/or we can provide a hard copy of the report.

Mr. Struck: Page 32 has a map showing adopted sanitary sewer service areas. The data has changed since the last plan and we can update the sanitary sewer service areas on the LESA mapping.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: With the additions to sewer service areas – will SEWRPC be updating the Regional Water Supply Plan?

Mr. Robinson: No, an update has been discussed but it is probably about 10 years out.

Mr. Struck: We will do everything required by statute for data and public participation. We went well above and beyond the requirements last time.

Mr. Struck: Page 34 shows a future land use map for 2035. Land uses have changed since then and do require updates. One example is the land use and associated zoning, the City of Mequon would need to make zoning changes (agricultural zoning not just agricultural overlay district) to have landowners be

eligible for FPP tax credits; currently it is suburban density land use and zoning.

Mr. Struck: Page 35 shows that Ozaukee County had 51% of land use in agriculture in 2007.

Mr. Struck: Page 36 has a pie chart with planned land uses (done as part of the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan: 2035) and it shows only 27% percent for future agricultural land use.

Supervisor Holyoke: Do some of the other sections of the pie chart also include agriculture?

Mr. Struck: Yes, however, a very small percentage is associated with small-scale farming associated with development (e.g. conservation subdivisions. Typically (in Ozaukee County), conservation subdivisions are protecting natural resources and not agricultural lands though.

Mr. Struck: Page 37 shows by land section where we were losing agricultural land. Red areas show a 50% or more decrease in those sections.

Mr. Struck: Page 38 shows aggregated urban versus agricultural land use from SEWRPC over time. This graphic is pretty dramatic; the county is urbanizing and that trend has continued.

Chairperson Ross: There are no real deviations in the line on the graph – it is very straight. This is interesting. For the POSP, we were proud of the impact we will have on the county. Will we discuss that – the impact of the new FPP (the “so what” of why we do the plan)?

Mr. Struck: Yes, we will try to address that as part of the planning process and the tools that are in place to assist with decisions; however, local land use and zoning decisions play a significant role along with the landowner’s desired future for their property. We will also incorporate data from the Land and Water Management Department (LWMD) on agricultural and conservation practices that have been implemented over time.

Mr. Struck handed out several GIS maps showing Normalized Difference Tillage Index (NDTI) for 2014, 2019, 2021, and 2022. The NDTI is a measure of the percentage of tilled land, those areas that have more tillage and lower residue to less tillage and high residue as one measure of the amount of exposed soil to erosional forces (e.g. wind, rain, snow, etc.). These maps document the change in tillage through remote sensing data. Counties also do on-the-ground surveys of tillage for validation. These maps provide a status of how farmland is being managed in the County, particularly for erosion.

Chairperson Ross: What changes were driven from the last FPP and what did we learn from the last plan? What is the driver for our work?

Mr. Struck: That is a difficult question to answer succinctly with each of the municipalities differentially impacting the results. From the last FPP, the only municipality that was fully eligible was the Town of Belgium. At the time of the last FPP (not the case now), there was a financial penalty for rezoning land out of farmland preservation, which was seen as a disincentive for being involved in the program. What did we learn last time? The law/statute was changed to get rid of the rezoning financial penalty/fee and there is now no penalty/fee for rezoning out of farmland preservation. If we gain a township eligible for the tax credits and other programs, that would be a good goal for this plan. To reverse the trendlines, it will take conscious efforts from all parties from landowners to municipalities to the County.

Vice Chairperson Richart: Going back to the last FPP, we looked at other models of farmland preservation around the country like Lancaster County. In fact, some of the County Board Supervisors actually went on a tour to learn about how other counties took an active role in farmland preservation and how they accomplished it.

Mr. Struck: Yes, that is correct, we did look at several other examples from around the country and even in Wisconsin. We had taken a tour organized by American Farmland Trust to Dunn County in Wisconsin to learn from them and how they passed a referendum to raise taxes to protect farmland and purchased agricultural conservation easements.

Chairperson Ross: We can go through the exercise of creating the plan, but what have we learned from the

process before that will help us make a more impactful FPP update?

Supervisor Rischel: I was talking to Belgium residents. It's complicated, there are lots of pros and cons for deciding whether to participate in the program. I don't know what the right answer is. These are suburban areas; how much are you going to stop urbanization? Residents say we aren't going to stop urbanization, but we can slow it down.

Mr. Struck: The Town of Port Washington, Town of Saukville and Town of Fredonia all opted out of the plan in 2013. It generated a lot of discussions in the community about what was the desired course of action and whether participation in the FPP program would help accomplish goals. There are, of course, lots of examples around the state on the conversion of agricultural land to other uses. The Town of Belgium has used the FPP and Farmland Preservation zoning to manage and preserve farmland. It's very complicated, some communities want to see development, and some want to see greater preservation.

Chairperson Ross: It may be that we have a lot of actions that come out of the planning that describe what the County Board's role is and how it can move forward in figuring out the future land use. From one perspective, I may want to keep everything how it is, but that doesn't pay the taxes, it's complicated.

Supervisor Holyoke: Does this plan push for smaller residential lots?

Struck: Yes, there is that aspect to the plan to focus on higher density residential development and closer to existing infrastructure, rather than more scattered (residential) development. Residential land use is definitely impacting agricultural land in the County.

Supervisor Holyoke: For a while, Mequon had lots of 5 and 10 acre lots.

Mr. Struck: Actually, the suburban development of the 3-5 acre lots are more impactful overall.

Supervisor Holyoke: It seems like the use of GIS and LIDAR are getting more advanced than with the last FPP.

Mr. Struck: Of course, there are definitely technological advances and better resolution on things like orthophotos and topographic mapping; however, the LESA analysis heavily used GIS data and analysis. We, of course, take advantage of any new GIS data, but it still seems that much of the data is still not kept in a GIS database (e.g. conservation practices, etc.).

Mr. Struck: We tried to identify many different strategies for communities to use regarding farmland preservation. The county doesn't always have the jurisdiction for implementation though given local land use and zoning. One option is Agricultural Enterprise Areas; the county could have more influence in working with landowners on this designation. Also, the County has supported the actions of the Clean Farm Families. Beyond providing the tools (in many instances), we demonstrate successful implementation of practices through targeted efforts.

Supervisor Rischel: We can provide the tools to municipalities to use to preserve land; however, it's up to the landowners and municipalities if they want to use the tools.

Mr. Struck: During the last FPP process, it was difficult for some municipalities to decide if they wanted to participate or not. One other lesson learned and changed in the FPP is that the tax credit is higher now.

Ms. Vogeler: It went from \$7.50 to \$10.00 per acre.

Mr. Struck: At that time, many landowners felt that the tax credit was not enough incentive to participate, especially given the penalty if land was removed from farmland preservation zoning. It may be a little better incentive now with the new rate.

Ms. Vogeler: We receive a lot of phone calls from farmers. I also hear things on MMSD programs, and they are only for Milwaukee River watershed properties. Much of Ozaukee County is not in the Milwaukee River watershed and therefore ineligible.

Mr. Struck: Yes, about two thirds of the County is in the Milwaukee River Watershed and about one third

is not. Part of the one third is much of the Town of Belgium and Port Washington where there is strong agricultural land use. We have that problem with many programs. The Milwaukee River watershed has a lot more targeted funding availabilities than other watersheds in the County. There are new tools and funding that didn't used to be available though. As I noted, we toured the Town of Dunn; they voted to increase the tax levy specifically to purchase agricultural easements and take the high cost of land out of the equation.

Chairperson Ross: I think the discussion is useful for why we are sitting around the table. What do we want to focus on? It's helping define the county's role. Maybe we could focus on farmland preservation grants. I don't know if that's the right thing, but I'm thinking about what we are trying to accomplish. What does the county look like in 20 years? I don't know; the committee can help solve this through the planning process.

Mr. Struck: One of our roles will be public involvement (see page 39 of the agenda packet). We will also do another Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) analysis, so members can gain insight and input from constituents and residents.

Mr. Struck: Page 40 discusses the public opinion survey that was conducted during the last FPP. In the 2025 Department budget, we won't have funds to contract for a statistically significant public opinion survey; however, we will still try to do some kind of survey.

Supervisor Richel: Would it make sense to survey municipal officials about their opinions on farmland preservation?

Mr. Struck: Yes, that would be a possibility and might provide an interesting perspective.

Supervisor Rischel: This would be good data. They could rate how important farmland preservation is to them, for example: How important is this to you? Do you care about farmland?

Chairperson Ross: I was going to ask the question to the board – how do we feel about creating the FPP without a statistically significant survey? What does the board think?

Supervisor Rischel: My opinion does not matter – it should be the opinion of the community. I don't have that authority on this board; our purpose is to represent the community.

Mr. Struck: I am going to talk with UW Extension about other survey tools we can use as well. We probably won't be able to do the same level of the comparisons we have made in the past with the statistically significant surveys.

Chairperson Ross: If we had the money, could we do the survey in the time that we have?

Mr. Struck: Potentially, however, I haven't reached out to UW River Falls survey center (who conducted our last survey) about the effort, cost, availability; knowing we didn't have the available funding.

Supervisor Holyoke: In looking at the study details, we only received 420 responses last time?

Mr. Struck: Yes, but that number is considered statistically significant for the county. The results were also representative geographically in the County and from a random selection.

Supervisor Holyoke: If we can't do a survey, how do we know what people think?

Mr. Struck: We can still do a survey, but it probably won't be non-biased, statistically significant and thorough processes like the last two times we contracted for survey work.

Chairperson Ross: Let's go through the public input plan and come back to this issue.

Mr. Struck: Pages 41 and 42 show the outcomes from the last survey.

Mr. Struck: Page 43 shows the Citizen Advisory Committee membership from the last FPP. We can try to do some form of this Citizen Advisory Committee or Technical Advisory Committee, but we would not be able to support monthly meetings of a committee; it might be semi-annual or potentially quarterly. Last

time we did a whole application and screening process for the citizen advisory committee. We would not have time to follow this same selection process this time.

Mr. Struck: Page 41 shows the Farmland Preservation Areas. Many citizens/landowners wanted to participate, and some didn't. The Town of Fredonia had qualifying areas; however, the Town decided against participating.

Mr. Struck: The only formally approved farmland preservation area was in the Town of Belgium. A significant portion of Town of Belgium is in farmland preservation, shown on page 45.

Supervisor Rischel: Is it true that the FPP is basically just for northern Ozaukee County?

Struck: The plan is for the entire County; however, there are requirements for minimal farmland acreage and contiguousness. The Town of Saukville would probably have an eligible area, and potentially the City of Mequon, but there would need to be changes, especially in Mequon with regard to zoning. The Town of Grafton and Cedarburg probably do not have enough eligible acreage.

Mr. Struck: Page 50 talks about the tax credit mechanism. We also had a lot of good examples of intergovernmental cooperation last time we went through comprehensive planning.

Mr. Struck: Rick Kania at SEWRPC worked on the last FPP with the County and provided some of these examples of conservation subdivisions.

Chairperson Ross: Are there any other questions for agenda item 5a?

b. Review/Discussion on Outline and List of Maps and Figures for the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 Update

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5b.

Mr. Struck: In your agenda packet is the tentative draft outline on page 56. We will do chapter-by-chapter review again, with conditional approval. Chapter 4 is the public participation chapter and the outline provides the details in each Chapter. The next item in the packet starts on page 58 and is a list of potential maps/figures. There are a number of highlighted areas we will be discussing as staff for updates. After each one of these, it references an existing data source. It should be the most recent data we have for that particular item. A couple of important ones are on page 3 under Existing Plans and Existing Regulations – we will update the planning areas and the extraterritorial plat review areas. Chapter 5 has the farmland preservation areas designated.

Mr. Robinson: The Town of Cedarburg Comprehensive Plan has just updated and approved. The Town administrator reached out to landowners to see if they wanted to be in a farmland preservation area with farmland preservation zoning.

Mr. Struck: Noted that the Town of Cedarburg probably does not have the contiguous acreage to participate in the farmland preservation program for the tax credits based on our submittal to DATCP with the last FPP.

c. Review, Discussion, and POSSIBLE ACTION on A Public Participation Plan (PPP) for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County – Review of Existing PPP

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5c.

Mr. Struck: A Public Participation Plan is required by State Statutes for the Farmland Preservation Plan and also the Comprehensive Plan. The document on page 63 of the agenda packet is a public participation plan that was developed for the Comprehensive Plan but meets requirements for FPP. We will use this as a basis for the update to the PPP. The document on page 67 of the packet is in addition to the first document. This document has more specifics, particularly with regard to timing and specific events or presentations. At the time, the Working Lands Initiative was brand new, and we took advantage of presentations and discussions. Ms. Vogeler may have more ideas too. We are still planning to do (a) kickoff meeting(s) and send formal communications to the communities. We might have an alternative to the countywide public opinion survey,

or we would need to find more funding. We might also consider a meeting or two for focus groups or as a forum for local municipalities as well.

Chairperson Ross: Who would run that committee?

Mr. Struck: Last time the committee elected their own chair. I suspect it will be a streamlined version of that committee this time. Let me know if you have thoughts about membership or meetings. We plan to do a SWOT analysis with this board and potentially with a Focus Group or Citizen Advisory Committee.

Chairperson Ross: What is the role of LWMD; will they be supporting this planning effort?

Mr. Struck: Yes, we hope the LWMD will be active and also assist with public participation, outreach to members, communication with landowners/farmers and providing updated inventory data. We will discuss this further with Ms. Vogeler.

Mr. Struck: A tour with the Town of Dunn could be possible (like last time); we would need to discuss this further. We will have at least one public informational meeting. We are required to have a public hearing. The overview of our timeline is on page 68 of the agenda packet.

Mr. Robinson: Before we move to chapter one of the FPP, I thought I would emphasize that we have a hard deadline of December 2025 to get the FPP adopted. Realistically, we have less than 10 months to get the consolidated plan done. We have to send the plan to DATCP for their review and approval of the consolidated plan. Then, we have to complete some revisions as noted by DATCP. Realistically, we need to get the FPP to DATCP by October 2025.

Chairperson Ross: Can we buy a few months by completing revisions later? Do we have to have DATCP amendments in it by the time that the County Board adopts it in December 2025?

Mr. Struck and Mr. Robinson stated that we probably need those amendments in the FPP in December 2025.

Mr. Struck: The advantage is that we have a very good draft from the last FPP. We have updated a good amount of data as part of other plans, namely the Park and Open Space Plan.

Chairperson Ross: I want to get a sense from the board – do we need more public input?

Mr. Robinson: That's why I mentioned the timeline; we only have limited time.

Supervisor Richel: Can we do the bare minimum for the public participation requirement?

Mr. Struck: That's why I included both PPP documents. The text document is the only requirement. The colored version can be amended and is supplemental.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: The County has money that we don't know how to spend. Sales taxes are way up; we should have a good end-of-the-year report. I think if we need \$15-25K, we should make it known we need it for the survey or other desires.

Chairperson Ross: Yes, so I wanted to get input on whether we should do another statistically significant survey. Is there sufficient time?

Mr. Struck: I haven't talked to UW River Falls, but it might be possible. We could try to submit this project as part of the application for the capital program that is due in January 2025. I think it falls under the purview of the County's Capital Fund program.

Supervisor Rischel: I don't think we should recreate the survey. I think because of time and money we should just do a general check of what the municipalities are thinking. I'm looking for a check of the general direction of the communities, assuming they are in touch with their constituents. We don't need a statistically significant survey.

Supervisor Holyoke: I agree with getting a general idea of what the municipalities want.

Chairperson Ross: I don't know if that adds more work for staff, compared to just contracting the survey out?

Mr. Struck: I don't know. I could see the time being equal either way.

Chairperson Ross: I don't think we need to decide today, but I think we need to do some sort of feedback at a minimum.

Mr. Struck: I agree. I will talk in more detail with Ms. Vogler and Mr. Roback and see what might be possible. Proposals for the Capital Fund Program would be due January 11th, should we apply? That's the one tangible funding source I can think of right now.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: I am good either way.

Supervisor Rischel: I'm envisioning a 10-question survey maximum. I don't see it as a very expensive project, but I could be wrong.

Chairperson Ross: Don't do the paperwork for the capital fund requests. If we need the money, I'll talk to Chairman Schlenvogt to find the money to do that. It sounds like we have the intent of doing something simpler.

Mr. Struck: As you look through the colored paper version of the PPP, any input on these categories or other items would be helpful. I would like to start filling out dates, events and other items as soon as possible.

d. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 1, Introduction and Background for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5d.

Mr. Struck: Chapter 1 has a few highlighted areas that still require data or dates. We have updated sales and revenues generated in Ozaukee County from agriculture. The plan review and adoption processes are mentioned but need additional refinement. On page 13 we mention bylaws for the Citizen Advisory Committee, which may or may not be applicable.

Supervisor Rischel made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 1 of the FPP. Seconded by Vice-Chairperson Richart. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Discussion on the adopted A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050

a. Executive Summary – Development of a public, graphical executive summary

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 6a.

Mr. Struck: We are working with SEWRPC currently on a graphic version of the executive summary for the POSP. This is largely the existing executive summary text with graphics, highlights, and photos added.

Mr. Robinson: We will likely have a draft completed early next year. Our graphics department has been downsized recently, so there is a little backlog of items.

Chairperson Ross: The executive summary is part of the plan?

Mr. Struck: It is intended to be a more graphical summary of the full POSP. I also hope to compile some of the information from my presentation to the County Board into the graphic summary also.

Chairperson Ross: Mentioned that he provided his version of the previously discussed cover letter for the POSP to the NRC to stimulate discussion and use as a guide for projects coming before that committee.

Vice-Chairperson Richart: I recently saw an article in the Milwaukee Journal discussing how Portage County is converting some number of acres from agriculture to prairie grass, due to a huge solar farm. How do we feel about that as a board working on the FPP? I personally don't feel good about it.

7. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

8. Next Meeting Date(s) – TBD, February or March 2025

The next meeting will be February 19, 2025 or mid-March 2025 depending upon progress with the FPP Chapters.

Mr. Robinson: We will likely have Chapter 2 of the FPP ready for review by the CPB at the February meeting.

9. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 11:04 AM.

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