



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

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

MEETING MINUTES COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2025 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	8:58 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor	Present	8:45 AM
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	8:58 AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Excused	-
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson	Present	8:52 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate	Present	8:58 AM

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director - Planning and Parks Department; Brittany Whyte, Conservation Biologist (Planning).

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC); Miranda Page, Land Use Planner - 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 that no written communication or correspondence was received.

There were no additional public comments at the meeting.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that he had a copy of the DVD created for the last Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County, if anyone wanted to see it.

4. Approval of Minutes (December 18, 2024)

Motion made by Supervisor Maguire, seconded by Supervisor Holyoke, that the December 18, 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. Update on DATCP timeline for certification of the FPP

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5a.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) sent a letter to Ozaukee County stating that, because of their staffing situation this year, they are requiring that any Farmland Preservation Plans (FPPs) being adopted by the end of 2025 need to be submitted to them by October 1, 2025, for their review and certification. After that time, DATCP can't guarantee they will send their reviewed draft of the plan back by the end of 2025, in which case Ozaukee County wouldn't be able to adopt the plan by the end of the year, as is required.

Chairperson Ross asked if Ozaukee County needs to have the plan adopted by the County Board prior to sending it to DATCP.

Mr. Struck said no; DATCP will usually have comments and changes that will then need to be incorporated into the plan prior to County Board adoption. Any changes must be incorporated into the plan by the December 2025 County Board meeting. A public hearing will likely be held at the October 2025 Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) meeting, right after sending the final plan draft to DATCP. The Planning and Parks Department (Department), SEWRPC, and CPB will need to address those public comments at the November CPB meeting in order to get the updated plan ready for the December 2025 meeting.

Chairperson Ross asked if CPB might need to have another meeting within that timeframe.

Mr. Struck said possibly, if timing is tight two meetings may be needed in a month. The Department and SEWRPC can try to complete the draft earlier; the proposed schedule would likely be the worst-case scenario. In November 2025 CPB would discuss any public comments from the public hearing and address those as well as DATCP comments (hopefully) prior to December County Board adoption. Hopefully DATCP doesn't need three months to review the plan. In the past, everything went through their attorney, and it was a slow process, but they have changed the process since then.

Chairperson Ross asked if Mr. Robinson and SEWRPC are okay with this new FPP timeline.

Mr. Robinson said yes; he is spending lots of time on this project right now. In addition to submitting the plan to DATCP, DATCP also requires a checklist that needs to be filled out. He and Mr. Struck will complete that checklist.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the checklist will help DATCP with their review of our plan. The completed checklist will be provided with the draft that is submitted to DATCP in September 2025, or earlier (hopefully). CPB should plan on having monthly meetings from now until the FPP is completed, in order to make the timeline work.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any comments from any of the CPB members. No one had any comments at this time.

b. Review, Discussion, and POSSIBLE ACTION on A Public Participation Plan (PPP) for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5b.

Mr. Struck handed out a hardcopy of the FPP Public Participation Plan (PPP) and stated that is the old public summary version from the last FPP for Ozaukee County. The PPP that will be adopted as part of the new FPP is included in the agenda packet (on pages 13-16); it will meet the requirements for the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County and also meets PPP requirements for the FPP. Only minor edits have been made to this PPP (since adoption of the last amendment to the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan). This formal PPP is the minimum standard. The hardcopy FPP PPP – Public Summary, with updates to

this last version, will be used for distribution to the public and will also be included in the final FPP document. CPB will need to adopt the formal version that is in the agenda packet. The hardcopy public summary FPP PPP that was handed out today was also included in the December CPB agenda packet; this is verbatim how it was written in the last FPP.

Mr. Struck noted that he recently met with Katie Vogeler, Director of the Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, and Paul Roback, Ozaukee County Community Development Educator with UW Extension, regarding specifics to update the public summary FPP PPP. Mr. Struck noted that he would like CPB's input; he hopes to have a new revised version of this public summary FPP PPP at the next CPB meeting.

Chairperson Ross asked whether the CPB will be approving the hardcopy PPP at today's meeting.

Mr. Struck said no, the CPB will not approve the public summary FPP PPP today, as this is the last version and needs updates. The PPP in the agenda packet (pages 13-16) will be approved and afterwards will be sent to the County Board for adoption by resolution. The version in the agenda packet doesn't have as many specifics (e.g. dates) as the public summary version. The PPP that the CPB is adopting applies to the adoption of all amendments to the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan including the FPP (as an amendment); therefore, having all the dates listed on the adopted PPP (in the agenda packet) would not work. The public summary FPP PPP is a supplemental item to let the public know where and when there will be opportunities for public participation. This was the same process used for the last FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that at the recent meeting he had with Mr. Roback and Ms. Vogeler, they discussed the Public Involvement Opportunities listed on pages 2 through 3 of the hardcopy public summary FPP PPP. For the first item, "Working Lands Initiative Information Meetings," they don't anticipate that DATCP would come to present this time. The next item on the list, "Kickoff Meetings," will be held again and dates need to be established. On page 3, for "Countywide Public Information Meetings," these will be held this year as well, once the majority of the draft plan is complete. In the past, three meetings have been held: one in the southern end of the county, one in the north end, and one more central, at the Administration Building in Port Washington. Three meetings may be held again this year, but CPB should give their input on this. The southern end of the county is largely just the City of Mequon, so that meeting may or may not be critical. Between 1 to 3 kickoff meetings will be held, hopefully at least one in March 2025. Dates will be decided on soon. The new version of this public summary FPP PPP will have meeting dates shown.

Chairperson Ross asked if CPB members will be informed of the meeting details prior to the meeting dates.

Mr. Struck said yes; he will send the meeting details by email to CPB members. Meetings might need to be held in April 2025; however, later April often gets very busy for the Department.

Chairperson Ross asked if there's a usually significant crowd at these public meetings.

Mr. Struck said usually not, but it is hard to predict. Some previous public meetings have had significant attendance, however, that was a different time. There was new legislation for the last FPP, so there was a good public turnout. We're not sure what to expect this time around.

Chairperson Ross acknowledged that invites will be sent out to the public but asked whether municipalities will be invited as well.

Mr. Struck said that this will be discussed further, and municipalities can certainly be notified, but the kickoff meetings are generally geared towards the public / residents / landowners.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that he doesn't see a Mequon meeting being particularly helpful.

Chairperson Ross agreed that just two meetings may be sufficient.

There was a consensus among the rest of the CPB members to hold just two kickoff meetings for the public.

Mr. Struck stated that at the kickoff meetings, there will be a general discussion about the FPP process and timeline, and the public will be given a chance to comment. No plan recommendations will be given at this meeting, but inventory data will be available for discussion. It is really just a kickoff meeting to let the public know that Ozaukee County is working on the FPP update.

Supervisor Vogel noted that people attending the meetings will want to see the data.

Mr. Struck said that inventory data will be provided at these kickoff meetings, but the recommendations will be at the end of the process and presented at the separate countywide public informational meetings. Ms. Vogeler can send meeting invitations to the Ozaukee County Demonstration Farm Network and Ozaukee County Clean Farm Families. A press release will also be written.

Chairperson Ross asked if state legislators and senators could be added to the list as well?

Mr. Struck said yes; legislators and senators have occasionally come to meetings in the past. Two kickoff meetings will be planned, hopefully in March and April 2025.

Mr. Struck brought up the next item on the outline, "Countywide Public Opinion Survey." Most of the same FPP questions were asked in the most recent (2020 survey) Park and Open Space Plan (POSP) as were in 2010. However, in the 2020 countywide public opinion survey more questions were related to parks and open space, versus farmland. These will be teased out and used in comparison to the 2010 countywide public opinion survey. There already are statistically significant survey results with some FPP questions from 2020. It has direct comparisons to the 2010 survey, so they can be compared.

Chairperson Ross asked if there would be an opportunity to hand the public a brochure at the meetings; it is a good idea to use existing information. He also asked if there's a way to refresh that.

Mr. Struck said that this will be discussed further, but there isn't a summary flyer prepared yet. The survey reports are available on the website as part of the POSP, though. Also, the public will be provided with the public summary FPP PPP. Data from the 2020 public survey will be displayed at the kickoff meetings. There were several questions related to farmland preservation in both the 2010 and 2020 public opinion surveys. The Department is currently planning to have three target groups to survey. Mr. Roback will assist with setting up the survey online; he recently did a similar survey for the Village of Fredonia's Park and Open Space Plan (Mr. Struck handed out a hardcopy flyer from this survey). Ozaukee County will use this model; it will be a short questionnaire with approximately 10-15 questions. People will be encouraged to fill the survey out electronically; however, a paper version will be available as well. Maybe a future Department intern or Department staff can enter data from the hardcopies into the system. Questions are actively starting to be compiled for the survey. If any CPB members have ideas for the survey, they should email Mr. Struck with thoughts or questions to add. The survey needs to be coordinated quickly. The three groups that will be reached out to are the full County Board, all Ozaukee County municipalities (might spend more time on encouraging some municipalities with stronger participation role to fill it out), and a target group of agricultural operators and owners (existing FPP recipients who have claimed the tax credit, Clean Farm Families, Demo Farms, etc.). These may need to be mailed out; the Department should have addresses for each FPP recipient. Ozaukee County Demonstration Farm Network members and Ozaukee County Clean Farm Families members will also be included.

Chairperson Ross asked if the surveys will be tailored for each audience.

Mr. Struck said that a few questions might be tailored to the specific audience, but the core questions will all be the same for all audiences. Likely there will be around 10 core questions. Tailoring questions will take more effort if there are three surveys.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that on this paper flyer for the Village of Fredonia survey, it has the option to scan the QR code, but it lists the website URL as well, which is helpful. He asked if Ozaukee County could also show the website URL on our flyer.

Mr. Struck said yes. Many agricultural landowners likely won't use a computer or phone to complete the survey electronically though, so there will need to be a hardcopy version. Mr. Roback won't be working on the compilation of the hardcopy data; our department staff (possibly an intern) will do that.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the Fredonia survey event on the flyer has already been completed.

Mr. Struck said yes, this was just an example.

Supervisor Vogel asked what kind of response they received from the paper notification flyers; he wondered how effective they were in recruiting responses.

Mr. Struck said that he thinks in total they received around 75 survey responses, but that is not just from the paper flyer. There were probably some other communications about the survey aside from this sample flyer.

Mr. Struck said that the Department is currently doing some research on survey questions. There are a few recent surveys from nearby counties to compare questions. The Department will look primarily statewide for comparisons as the FPP and Working Lands legislation is Wisconsin specific. Mr. Struck wasn't sure if Washington County has done a recent FPP update. The Department plans to compile the survey questions by March. The survey results will be tied into the focus groups with a meeting; that will be the best way to do the survey follow-up. Sometimes a question doesn't provide a full answer, so focus groups would be beneficial. Ms. Vogeler is already having a large meeting with Ozaukee County Demonstration Farm Network members and Ozaukee County Clean Farm Families members on March 18th or 20th, so the FPP items will be on the agenda for that meeting. There will be a focus group follow-up to the public survey. It would be ideal to have the survey results back by March 18th. That will give the public around two weeks to fill out the survey. It is a great opportunity to use these meetings for focus groups. The survey from the Village of Fredonia example gave the public only 2 weeks to fill out the survey as well. County staff will try to meet with the municipalities after the survey is completed as another focus group to talk about the FPP and see if they have any comments. Ms. Vogeler and Mr. Struck will try to split those meetings up and will try to meet with key stakeholders at least once. They will meet with the Town of Fredonia, Town of Saukville, Town of Belgium, Town of Port Washington, and maybe the City of Mequon for the key municipalities, knowing that some municipalities won't have big stake in the FPP.

Mr. Struck noted that the Village of Grafton and City of Cedarburg are two incorporated municipalities that may have an interest in farmland preservation. Both these municipalities are paying for agricultural conservation practices outside of their jurisdiction to meet Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) and stormwater requirements, particularly for the wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) (as an alternative to more costly expansions of the WWTPs). They are actively paying to support conservation practices on agricultural lands in the town (in the drainage watershed) to meet TMDL and phosphorus (P) reduction requirements. This pilot is to see if TMDL and P requirements for the WDNR permit for the WWTP can be met without significantly more expensive additions and treatments at WWTP. They have a working group that meets once per year. County staff will try to get an audience with them to do some outreach. It will be a small and targeted group; there are only four or five people in the group.

Chairperson Ross asked if their incentive is if farmland decreases in the upper watershed, then they aren't able to meet their requirements.

Mr. Struck said yes; this is an inexpensive way for them to meet the TMDL and P requirements of their WDNR permits. They haven't bought any easements; they have invested in conservation practices. If they had some assurance of permanency in their watershed, it would be beneficial to them. There is already a partnership between municipality and landowner. That will fall under the "Agricultural Stakeholder Focus Group" Public Involvement Opportunity on page 3 of the public summary FPP PPP. There is the Ozaukee County Clean Farm Families focus group and this focus group at least, not including County Board (policy focus group).

Mr. Struck stated that the group has now talked about all of the audiences. Coming back to the public summary FPP PPP, on page 2, there is the "Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee." Staff will not have the capacity this year to create a citizen advisory committee. The committee process was extensive for the last FPP. There is the intent to do a "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats" (SWOT) analysis, mentioned on page 2 of the public summary FPP PPP, with CPB next month on March 19th. Mr. Roback will help facilitate the SWOT analysis.

Chairperson Ross noted that CPB members might not have as many opinions for the SWOT for the FPP as they did for the POSP SWOT.

Mr. Struck said he understands that; that is okay. It may turn out that Mr. Roback will also use a SWOT at the Ozaukee County Clean Farm Families meeting. There will be about an hour to talk about FPP items at the meeting. Mr. Roback will figure out how to organize this focus group meeting.

Mr. Struck moved on to the "Town of Dunn Tour" on page 3 of the public summary FPP PPP. Mr. Struck

hasn't reached out to the Town of Dunn yet about the possibility of touring with them again this year. The Town of Dunn passed an additional tax (levy) to purchase agricultural easements to protect the land as farmland permanently. Ozaukee County wanted to get this perspective from them for the last FPP. The Department can reach out to them if CPB members like to hear from them again. They had several easements back in 2011. The Town of Dunn thought it would be most beneficial to have the Town purchase easements to protect farmland in order to provide affordable farmland. The price of land in the Town of Dunn is similar to that in Ozaukee County. They did have some pressure from the City of Madison. The easements were just one of the tools in their toolbox; they passed a referendum to levy funds to buy the easements. At the time, this was a useful perspective to help consider if Ozaukee County would also benefit from using this tool. Agricultural easements are not the only tool available to Ozaukee County. Of course, Ozaukee County has pressure with proximity to Milwaukee also, as they did with proximity to Madison.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if they were trying to keep a buffer in the Town of Dunn.

Mr. Struck said essentially, yes, to protect their town from encroaching development. Mr. Struck doesn't know the town's current status.

Chairperson Ross asked what the result was from the visit in May 2011.

Mr. Struck stated that Ozaukee County created the Land Preservation Board and a conservation easement program. So, Ozaukee County is able to purchase conservation easements, but there is no funding for the purchases currently. The Land Preservation Board and CPB were one oversight created for potential conservation easements. Those programs are on the books and passed. The other result of this tour was that the County set up a fund for the potential purchase of easements, but there was little money donated or raised and there are no funds in the account now. The fund to accept donations and grants still exists though. Going back to 2011, the county applied for the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) grant funding from DATCP, the Land Preservation Board approved it for a farm in Belgium, and the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection approved/awarded the grant. Then, shortly afterwards the State legislature pulled all the funding out of the State PACE program, and they canceled all the grants that were not obligated yet (even though they were awarded). So, Ozaukee County did not receive this grant. The State PACE program has not been funded since the first round. Ozaukee County set up a lot of infrastructure as a result of the Town of Dunn tour. At the time, the Town of Belgium was an interested participant; if you purchase agricultural easements, it is possible lower the land cost for potential agricultural landowners/renters.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that Ozaukee County has a \$500,000 budget surplus right now and asked if that should be refunded to the taxpayers or used for agricultural easements.

Mr. Struck stated that there was a survey question related to this in the 2010 public opinion survey. The question asked if the public would like the County to purchase agricultural easements and also a preference on the funding source including a tax levy. There was a pretty positive survey response back in 2010. This specific question was not asked in the 2020 survey, however.

Chairperson Ross asked, since there is no State grant money for this fund currently, if Ozaukee County could levy money, and if any other options have been pursued.

Mr. Struck said yes, it would be possible to levy funds (provide in the County budget), and Ozaukee County has tried other funding sources. There was a local foundation that had a lot of interest in this topic, but some of the national grant programs (like the State program) have gone away since the 2010 era.

Chairperson Ross said that for the Town of Dunn tour, it seems like this tour has been done already and the most benefit may just come from a phone call with them to see how they have progressed since then. Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks Ozaukee County probably does not need to visit for another tour.

Mr. Struck said yes, the Department can reach out to them.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that he thinks one of the specific outreaches needs to be to the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT) (now known as Restoring Lands: A Wisconsin Land Trust) and the County should consider including them in the survey effort. He thought they had a program where they allow farmers to use land and thinks there are some synergies.

Mr. Struck said yes, the Department can reach out and potentially survey the OWLT. Ozaukee County also has the North Branch Milwaukee River Farming and Heritage Area, which is described in the POSP, a designated area where the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) has the authority to purchase agricultural conservation easements. It is unique that they are protecting both farmland and natural resources. This area takes up around 1/3 of the Town of Fredonia. The WDNR was extremely active in the early years, but little has been done in the last decade in this area. There's the potential to go back and re-engage the project area. Lastly, the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) recently received some large federal grant funding to pursue agricultural easements; however, it remains to see if those federal funds will be available now.

Chairperson Ross asked if the Milwaukee Riverkeeper is involved.

Mr. Struck said that they would have an interest, from a water quality perspective, but don't purchase easements as an organization.

Supervisor Vogel mentioned a discussion he had with Lester Bartel Jr., Chairman of the Town of Grafton. He said that MMSD has purchased easements in the Town of Grafton, which is at the expense of local preservation. MMSD got the benefit, but Ozaukee County and the Town are not getting the benefit of it up here.

Mr. Struck noted that MMSD has been active in their Greenseams program and purchasing conservation easements for natural areas and have very few agricultural easements, particularly in the Ulao Watershed. They have been investing less in agricultural land though. He thought Mr. Bartel may have been saying that if the Town of Grafton and Village of Grafton were to have implemented something they could have gotten credit for water quality purposes.

Mr. Struck said the Department will follow up with the Town of Dunn to see what has progressed there since the last tour. The county has been working on this for a long time, and it has been really difficult. There aren't the same funding sources available and land prices keep increasing, but that doesn't mean it's not worth revisiting.

Mr. Struck brought up "Countywide Public Information Meetings" on page 3 of the public summary FPP PPP and said he expects the County will probably have two meetings, one in August and one in September 2025. By that time, some of the recommendations and the FPAs will be available to discuss and present, as much of the final draft plan will be ready.

Mr. Struck brought up the next item on page 3, "First Friday Forum," saying that was an opportunity used at the time, but this forum hasn't existed since then.

Mr. Struck brought up the next item on page 3, "County Plan Public Hearing" saying that it is required again. It will probably be held at the September meeting of CPB. Online public comments can also be received at any time. This public summary FPP PPP flyer will be recreated with updated dates and topics discussed for the update and recertification of the FPP. The calendar on the last page will be updated. Once ready, this public summary FPP PPP document will be distributed to the targeted groups; however, this version doesn't get formally adopted.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if CPB had 3 years to complete everything for the last FPP.

Mr. Struck said yes; this year there is a shorter required timeline. The last FPP is a very good template, and the County will take advantage of the existing plan. CPB was at capacity last year with the POSP and other items, so CPB was not able to get started any earlier on the FPP. Once this public summary FPP PPP document is revised, it will be provided at the March CPB meeting.

Supervisor Vogel noted that there are some farmers on the County Board.

Mr. Struck said yes, and they know other farmers as well. The County is planning to survey the County Board. Mr. Struck was pleased to be able to meet with Mr. Roback and Ms. Vogeler's to get their assistance and to get some tangible outreach ideas figured out. CPB does need to take action on the resolution on page 17 of the agenda packet to adopt the formal PPP (for Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan amendments including the FPP).

Motion made by Vice-Chairperson Richart, seconded by Supervisor Vogel, that the resolution and the “Public Participation Plan for Amending A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County inclusive of the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County” be approved and recommended to the Ozaukee County Board for adoption. A voice note was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

c. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 2, Inventory and Analysis for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.

Chairman Ross introduced agenda item 5c.

Mr. Struck introduced Chapter 2 of the new FPP, included in the agenda packet, starting on page 19. There are several areas that have yellow highlighting; those are areas where data is still actively being collected to complete. The yellow highlights are just a placeholder. The Department has emailed every municipality to request updated data since the last CPB meeting in December 2024. Even the incorporated municipalities have some items that will be incorporated in the updated FPP. Some of the data will fill in the yellow highlighted areas. The Department has also been working on getting data from the Ozaukee County Land & Water Management Department (LWMD). One of the sources is a list of all of the participants currently enrolled in the state tax credit program for the FPP in 2023 and 2024.

Supervisor Vogel asked what the percentage of farmers who have taken up the program is, versus those who haven't.

Mr. Struck said he didn't know the exact percentage but thinks there were around 70 total landowners enrolled; this would only include the Town of Belgium as that is the only town that was eligible in the last FPP.

Supervisor Vogel asked what the total number of farms in the County is.

Mr. Robinson stated that there are 292 farms in the whole county; that is included in the FPP.

Supervisor Vogel noted that comes out to less than a quarter of the total farms.

Mr. Struck noted that, per the last FPP, only farms in the Town of Belgium were eligible to claim the credit, so the number is only of those farms in the Town of Belgium not the entire County. This is because the other Towns did not have eligible Farmland Preservation Areas (or an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) in the FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that, as was with the POSP, the Department will move forward to get CPB input on FPP chapters as they are completed with some of the pending updated data. In Chapter 2, the Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Analysis starts on page 22 of the agenda packet and is shown on map 2.6 LESA Scores for Agricultural Parcels in Ozaukee County, on page 150; this is supported by a very in-depth separate analysis and report. This same LESA will be used again for this FPP update with minor adjustments due to the extent of time it took to prepare this analysis (GIS) and separate report. The farm drainage districts, noted on page 24, largely have not changed; there are only two active ones, both in the Town of Belgium. An inventory of existing farmland starts on page 26. Prior to the last FPP, Ozaukee County only had one Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO). Ms. Vogeler noted that there are five CAFOs now. Ozaukee County is moving towards having less farms, but larger ones. Working dairy is still a part of the agricultural community. There aren't a lot of medium-sized farms. Page 31, in the “Number, Size, and Value of Farms,” shows what Ozaukee County had and lost. The next section discusses the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), and Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), which are federal programs to conserve natural resources on farmland. Usually there is a long-term easement. The Department will be updating that data; it is highlighted. For the next section, “Agricultural Infrastructure and Support Services,” it is noted that Ozaukee County farmers are dependent on Washington County and Sheboygan County for agricultural implements; there isn't a lot of that within Ozaukee County.

Mr. Struck stated the next part of the FPP, section 2.3 on page 32, goes into natural and cultural resources.

Most of the information in this section is from the updated POSP. One piece the Department is still working on updating is the Wetland Restorations data on pages 37-38. The agencies were very active in completing wetland restorations in the early years. There are over 330 wetland restorations in Ozaukee County. In addition, an item that people often don't relate to agriculture is forestry. There is some small-scale forestry in Ozaukee County per the Managed Forest Law (MFL) program. The Managed Forest Law program is discussed on pages 40-41; this program is geared towards lumber harvests and provides a tax credit. There are some MFL participants in Ozaukee County.

Mr. Robinson noted that there are around 30 MFL participants in Ozaukee County.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department is working on updating the Local Landmarks section on page 51 of the agenda packet. This data will also update the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan. Page 52 discusses Archaeological Resources, which are an important part of some farmlands. Section 2.4, starting on page 54, discusses population, household, and employment characteristics for Ozaukee County. Some of this information was updated as part of the POSP. In section 2.5, starting on page 57, this text highlights the Urban Service Areas. These areas are planned to be served by sewer and usually municipal water.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that page 62 states "local transit includes low-speed local bus routes," though Ozaukee County currently doesn't have any, and asked if that should be kept in the text.

Mr. Struck stated that it is a list of types of potential local transit possibilities, not necessarily what currently exists in Ozaukee County.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that page 70 states that there are 11 emergency medical service zones, but there was recently some consolidation, and believes there are only 9 now.

Mr. Struck said yes, the Land Information Office recently presented this data, and the County will give this new data to SEWRPC to update in the FPP text.

Mr. Struck brought up one of the next yellow highlighted sections, on page 72, about soil and water conservation plans and practices. The LWMD hasn't been tracking this data as it had been in the past for various reasons. There is some additional data, and staff are trying to merge it.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the next section, 2.7 Existing Regulations on page 82, is a good section to review. There are limitations per existing regulations – zoning. Staff will be updating local zoning data and are actively working on getting GIS data from all municipalities; the Department hopes to have at least some of the current municipal zoning data included in the FPP. The municipal zoning data will be added to the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan also. Mr. Struck recommended reviewing the "Land Division Regulations" section starting on page 84 and all the tables and maps after that in the packet. On the map on page 150, Map 2.6 LESA Scores for Agricultural Parcels in Ozaukee County, there are a few parcels with red hatching; these parcels were incorporated into a planned sewer service area. Page 159, Map 2.18 Existing County, State, and Federal and Open Space Sites in Ozaukee County: 2024, shows the North Branch Milwaukee River Farming and Heritage Area project area, a WDNR project area with some lands under a conservation easement or acquired in fee simple. On page 170, Map 2.31 Extraterritorial Plat Review Jurisdiction for Cities and Villages in Ozaukee County, the extraterritorial plat review jurisdictions are shown, which is also important to review. Each of the incorporated municipalities can review and require approval of land divisions within their area. The southern part of the county has a lot of overlapping jurisdictions.

Supervisor Holyoke asked to clarify if there can't be extraterritorial plat review by more than one municipality where they overlap.

Mr. Struck said that is correct; the area gets split equally between the two municipalities where they overlap. This keeps evolving as areas get annexed into cities and villages. The jurisdiction areas even cross county boundaries where the municipality straddles the county line, like the Village of Newburg.

Chairperson Ross noted that this affects municipalities' input but asked if it is zoning.

Mr. Struck stated it is not zoning but allows for reviewing and objecting to land divisions. Municipalities will often review some land divisions that are near a corporate boundary. Other far-reaching land divisions they sometimes won't comment on often. All municipalities can implement extraterritorial land division review in

their extraterritorial area. On Map 2.31, the area in black hatching is showing an extraterritorial zoning area (ETZ). In that zone, they can review and approve all land divisions, and they also have to approve all zoning changes.

Supervisor Vogel noted that he can't remember any land division ever being stopped in the Town of Grafton.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the County has a separate land division review approval authority for much of the unincorporated land in the county and advisory review in the incorporated areas.

Mr. Robinson noted that the City of Cedarburg is the only municipality that has a 3-mile land division review radius; it is considered a first-class city. The rest of the municipalities have a 1.5-mile radius.

Supervisor Holyoke asked what the difference is between the classes of municipalities.

Mr. Robinson said he believes it is due to some economic factor, as well as other factors.

Mr. Struck mentioned that he thinks, for instance, the City of Mequon could re-class themselves if they wanted to go to a first-class city and the City of Port Washington could as well. Staff can review this further.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that all villages have a 1.5-mile land division review radius.

Mr. Struck brought up Map 2.23 Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas and Existing Areas Served by Sewer in Ozaukee County, on page 164, saying that these areas come into play in the LESA as well as the overall FPP.

Mr. Robinson noted that the existing area served by sewer is shown on the map, but only as of 2010. That data will be updated.

Supervisor Holyoke noticed a needed correction on the map, where it shows an existing sewerage treatment plant in the Village of Thiensville. He noted that this has not been online for many years and that MMSD treats the Village of Thiensville.

Mr. Robinson said that he will correct that item on Map 2.23 Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas and Existing Areas Served by Sewer in Ozaukee County, on page 164.

Chairperson Ross noted that he keeps coming back to the "So What?" question that CPB have an opportunity to answer during this FPP update. He asked: What do we want to see come out of this plan? How does this plan get implemented?

Mr. Struck stated that the Department and SEWRPC's goal is to give CPB background information and inventory data, so the members know what currently exists in the county regarding available programs, regulations, restrictions, tools and inventory. CPB will discuss how all of this information is relevant to what CPB may want to pursue moving forward and what requirements exist through the State Working Lands Initiative and Farmland Preservation Program.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that Vice-Chairperson Richart may have some guidance, as he has worked on the last FPP.

Vice-Chairperson Richart said that this is a challenge; the POSP is an optimistic view of what Ozaukee County can expand on. The FPP is focused on how to prevent development and loss of farmland.

Chairperson Ross asked what are the tools that are available to us, noting that CPB needs to think about these tools.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that Ozaukee County has a fund set up, but it is without funds. Vice-Chairperson Richart asked what the County should do with the surplus from last year's budget, noting that the County could put money into the fund. It's up to CPB members to bring up this information.

Chairperson Ross stated that he hopes, as supervisors, they can all come back to the County Board with ideas on how to execute this FPP. The FPP is not just an encyclopedia of information, although there is a lot of data.

The POSP has been implemented with approval at the Committee level. Chairperson Ross noted that he doesn't have all of the solutions but just wanted to share how he is thinking about this.

Mr. Struck stated that for the last FPP, some programmatic aspects were implemented to achieve goals and objectives and some weren't successful, but the County wanted to have a goal.

Mr. Struck mentioned that Map 2.26 Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan: 2035, on page 167 of the agenda packet, has the Farmland Preservation Plan map from the previous FPP. This is the land use (both existing and planned) for the Farmland Preservation Plan at the time. He noted that all the yellow parcels have future planned urban land use. The light tan parcels are the only land dedicated/planned for agriculture. In the City of Mequon, there are many white parcels, which have rural land use. On page 168 is Map 2.28 Planned Land Uses in the Ozaukee County Planning Area: 2035, which is the planned land use map in the Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan: 2035. The tan areas are planned agricultural land use. The Town of Saukville has a lot of yellow areas showing planned rural development (residential). The Town of Port Washington has more mixed land use. In Cedarburg there is residential suburban and urban density. So, given this planned land use (as of the last Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan) there is an uphill challenge to preserving farmland. The only towns that have an agricultural planned land use are the Town of Belgium and the Town of Fredonia.

Mr. Struck mentioned that though the inventory data isn't the most exciting, it is very important to understand what exists currently, the history, what has been tried already, and what is regulated or available for implementation, but not being implemented.

Supervisor Holyoke mentioned that he thinks this chapter is very interesting.

Mr. Struck noted that there are other things that the county could try to implement; for example, the County could implement countywide zoning in the unincorporated areas with approval of the individual towns, but that is a very unlikely and controversial topic. The towns would all have to agree for their township. Most of the towns have well developed zoning implemented over many years, so this is probably not likely or effective. The county could have more input on land divisions; currently the county does not review every land division. That authority could theoretically be used to prevent the division of the best agricultural lands.

Chairperson Ross asked how CPB members anticipate, throughout the course of time together, that these levers will be introduced and discussed and decided upon.

Mr. Struck stated that the first step is to have ideas recognized in the FPP that are desired to pursue. Then, individual objectives or programs would be reviewed by the County Board. The purpose of this plan is to set up those objectives, programs and strategies. In the last FPP, the purchase of agricultural easements program was set up, but it had limited funding. All ideas first need to be included in the recommendations of the FPP.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if other counties in Wisconsin have countywide zoning.

Mr. Struck said yes, more than half of Wisconsin counties have countywide zoning; however, nearly all the counties in the State have separate land division ordinances unlike Ozaukee County.

Supervisor Vogel asked if all of towns would need to agree to this.

Mr. Struck said yes, the specific towns where county zoning is implemented would need to agree. Countywide zoning probably wouldn't make sense for most of the towns. The smaller the parcel, the more difficult it is to make agriculture possible. You can have a lot of impact by having a say on land divisions. The county has the singular authority to pass a land division ordinance.

Mr. Struck asked CPB members to go back and take a look at the POSP to see the agricultural results of the public opinion survey in the appendices; there are some farmland-related questions.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that when putting together data, SEWRPC noticed that lots of land that was once farmland is now just being used for open space or is fallow; no one is actively farming the land.

Mr. Struck stated that a motion on Chapter 2 of the FPP would be appreciated, knowing the highlighted parts still need to be updated and will be presented and reviewed when complete.

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 2, Inventory and Analysis, of the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050. Seconded by Supervisor Maquire. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

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

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 6.

Mr. Struck noted that the Department and SEWRPC are still working on the summary document of the POSP; the Department has been collecting photographs and graphics for use in this shorter, more graphical summary of the POSP. Once completed, this document will be used to promote the adopted POSP and will be used with the public for implementation goals.

7. Other Business

Chairperson Ross asked if there is any other business to discuss today.

Mr. Struck asked CPB members to note that at the end of the agenda packet, a few other relevant items are included. On page 171 an ArcGIS map for the Lake Michigan basin regarding land use and water quality is included. On the next page, 172, note the sesquicentennial farm (this is in the Town of Grafton). On pages 173 through 177 an article about the proposed data center is included; compare the lands to the LESA map on page 150 and see that there is high-quality farmland where the data center will be located. On pages 178 through 180 a DATCP email newsletter that was sent out is included; it shows the tax credits and agricultural enterprise areas. CPB will discuss those agricultural enterprise areas more in the future.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted the grey striped area on Map 2.28 Planned Land Uses in the Ozaukee County Planning Area: 2035 on page 168 and asked how much of the data center would be within different land use areas.

Mr. Struck: Maybe a third to half of the data center land would be located in a Business/Industrial Park land use according to the future land use map when the Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan was adopted. The Town of Port Washington did envision this area as industrial/commercial, but on the LESA map, there are quality farmland properties in that area.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked what, if any, input the county can have with this data center development. They are probably going to build the center. He asked if there will be any agriculture built in within the data center property, possibly between buildings.

Supervisor Vogel said that he doesn't think they have any agriculture in their plans.

Chairperson Ross asked if the county has any role or authority.

Mr. Struck stated that the county may have a role in education and data information, but not much authority to require items.

Supervisor Vogel noted that the decision ultimately comes down to the Town and City of Port Washington, mainly the City of Port Washington as part of annexing the lands.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the Department has been contacted by the WDNR regarding data for this area, particularly for natural resources, water quality, fisheries and other items where data has been collected over the many previous years.

Supervisor Holyoke: If the City of Port Washington annexes the land for the data center, their extraterritorial plat review area will also expand.

Supervisor Vogel mentioned that he talked with a constituent who is upset that the county doesn't have a role here.

Chairperson Ross noted that this is a concrete example of what the County can or can't do and asked what everyone wants the county to look like in 15-20 years. There are some weaknesses for the SWOT that can be discussed more.

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

8. Next Meeting Date(s) – March 19, 2025

The next meeting will be March 19, 2025, after the County Board meeting. It is Youth Government Day.

9. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Vogel. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 11:13 AM.