



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

<https://ozaukeecounty.gov/540/Planning-Parks>

MEETING MINUTES
COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 2025 AT 10:45 A.M.
OZAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION 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 (CPB) was held at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Room A-200. Chairperson Ross called the meeting to order at 10:45 AM.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
B. Ross	Chairperson, Supervisor, District 19	Present	10:22 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor, District 15	Present	10:20 AM
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	10:26 AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Excused	-
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson, Supervisor, District 12	Present	10:32 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate – Supervisor, District 10	Present	10:22 AM

Staff present: Andrew Struck, Director – Planning and Parks Department; Brittany Whyte, Conservation Biologist (Planning); Paul Roback, University of Wisconsin Extension; Katie Vogeler, Director – Land and Water Management Department

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

Supervisor Kurt Schoessow, District 23, was also present.

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

Mr. Struck provided assurance the meeting was properly noticed.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that he invited Supervisor Schoessow to attend today's meeting, due to his background in agriculture.

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.

4. Approval of Minutes (February 19, 2025)

Motion made by Supervisor Vogel, seconded by Supervisor Richart, that the February 19th, 2025, 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 and POSSIBLE ACTION – Development of the Public Involvement Chapter (Chapter 4)

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5a.

i. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threat Analysis and Prioritization – Facilitation by UWEX – Paul Roback

Chairperson Ross welcomed Mr. Roback to today's meeting. Mr. Struck stated that Mr. Roback is the Community Development Educator with the University of Wisconsin Extension (UW Extension) and noted that having Mr. Roback join as a third-party facilitator for the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) SWOT will be helpful.

Mr. Roback passed out a "Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats" (SWOT) worksheet for CPB members to fill out about farmland preservation in Ozaukee County. CPB members filled out this worksheet individually to think through ideas.

Mr. Roback stated that it is good to get ideas written down in brainstorming and thanked the group for filling out the SWOT worksheets.

Mr. Struck noted that the SWOT question is related to farmland preservation and/or agriculture in Ozaukee County. So, what are the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of farmland preservation and/or agriculture in Ozaukee County.

Mr. Roback stated that each CPB member or Supervisor can provide one idea at a time from their written list and the group will go around the table until all ideas are stated.

Supervisor Vogel stated that he thinks there are lot of people who move to Ozaukee County because of farming or nature – rural character and open space, as Ozaukee County is in its current state, and that the county should try to hold onto that. (Strength: Farmland is attractive in its current state)

Supervisor Schoessow stated that farming is a way to maintain open space without weeds overtaking the area. (Strength: Way to maintain open space without weeds overtaking)

Supervisor Maguire stated that as land values increase, he would think more farmers would want to sell their land and retire. This is an opportunity for farmers to make more profit. (Strength: As land values increase, farmers retire and make money)

Chairperson Ross stated that we have existing farmland now and will never have more in the future. The County is at the pinnacle of where it can be at this moment. (Strength: We have existing farmland, and we will probably never have more)

Supervisor Holyoke stated that Ozaukee County farmers are a Strength. (Strength: Our farmers – we also have multiple farmers on the Ozaukee County Board)

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that diversity of agriculture is a Strength. There are over 100 different kinds of agriculture in Ozaukee County. (Strength: Diversity of Agriculture – from beekeepers, to just about everything)

Supervisor Vogel stated that he also likes the Strength that Supervisor Holyoke mentioned – the farmers themselves. The farmers maintain a culture.

Supervisor Schoessow stated that farming is a lifestyle that is the best for families, even though it's a lot of work. (Strength: Farm lifestyle is best for families, but a lot of work)

Chairperson Ross mentioned the 4-H program in Ozaukee County. (Strength: Connection to 4-H and learning about agriculture)

Supervisor Schoessow added that there are many 4H members that aren't family farmers who get involved in family farms and learn about agriculture; other communities don't have that.

Chairperson Ross stated that Ozaukee County's financial resources are a Strength. Not just the County Board, but the nature of the county demographics. There are resources available to live in this area and help sustain this farmland somehow. (Strength: Ozaukee County financial resources)

Supervisor Holyoke stated that a Strength is farmer groups, like Clean Farm Families. (Strength: Farm Groups (e.g. Clean Farm Families))

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that the planning process is a Strength. Through the plans, Ozaukee County can highlight the importance of agriculture through education (Strength: Planning process)

Chairperson Ross introduced the idea of Comprehensive Planning and the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department's (Department) success with obtaining grant funding as Strengths.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that the farms themselves are an asset. (Strength: Farms are an asset – contribute to rural character)

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that Ozaukee County has soil types that are conducive for farming. (Strength: Soils are conducive for farming)

Chairperson Ross mentioned that when CPB went through this exercise for the Park and Open Space Plan update last year, he made sure to highlight that this isn't just an exercise. There should be threads that go through the FPP that exploit opportunities or mitigate threats. The SWOT should preview things that should be in FPP.

Mr. Roback introduced the Weaknesses section of the SWOT.

Mr. Struck noted that the Strengths and Weaknesses are interpreted to be internal to Ozaukee County's operations and internal policies and programs; whereas, opportunities and threats are influenced by external forces outside of Ozaukee County. For example, a threat might be something external that affects the viability of farming. Sometimes there is some overlap in the categories when the issue is tied to more than one factor or influence.

Supervisor Vogel stated that a Weakness could be the culture of small family farms converting to large operations/businesses/CAFOS. (Weakness: Small family farms being sold to larger operations)

Supervisor Schoessow stated that if you have large farms, there will be lots of manure and a need to spread over more land. It will increase land rents within a circle around the large farm. Lots of pressure is being put on small farms to be able to maintain them. Increasing land rents is a Threat. (Threat: Increasing land rents)

Chairperson Ross mentioned that he thinks that would be external, not exclusive to Ozaukee County.

Supervisor Schoessow stated a Weakness could be the differing definitions and perspectives of farmland in Ozaukee County. (Weakness: Differing definitions and perspectives on farmland)

Chairperson Ross stated that a Weakness could be the patchwork zoning that we have in Ozaukee County, between the municipalities and the county. Ozaukee County has a Comprehensive Plan, but it doesn't provide all the necessary tools for farmland preservation such as zoning. (Weakness: Patchwork zoning between municipalities and county)

Mr. Struck noted that is not exclusive to Ozaukee County as it exists in other counties in the state, but it is important.

Supervisor Vogel stated that if farms are getting larger, small-town characteristics are lost. One farmer could now be controlling land that nine used to. There could be fewer farming families to support the small community. (Weakness: With less family farms, there are less families to support the community)

Chairperson Ross stated that a Weakness could be that legal authorities are limited for countywide zoning. (Weakness: Limited County legal authorities for zoning)

Supervisor Maguire asked how much power the county has in this area. To him, he doesn't see a clear difference between who is running the show and who isn't. He asked if the municipalities or Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources are principal decision makers.

Mr. Struck noted that several entities and agencies have a part in planning and land use, but largely the zoning in Ozaukee County is at the local municipal level; however, there are exceptions like the County has authorities under shoreland protection zoning or floodplain zoning or county-owned lands zoning and also land division authority. It is not always clear cut and depends on multiple agencies and government entities.

Supervisor Vogel stated that a larger external effect that covers everything is the value of land.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that a Weakness could be the leadership commitment of the county and the lack of long-term vision. (Weakness: Leadership commitment by the county) (Weakness: Lack of long-term vision for the county)

Chairperson Ross stated that a Weakness could be the uncertain board commitment to long term strategies. (Weakness: Uncertain of county board commitment for long-term strategies)

Supervisor Holyoke asked if a Weakness could be soil erosion. (Weakness: Soil erosion)

Supervisor Schoessow stated that soil erosion is happening more and more due to urban development. Streams/rivers and soils are not the same as they used to be and more susceptible to erosion.

Chairperson Ross stated he would put that in the Opportunities section also. This issue can be stilled down to what is the impact on waters. (Opportunity: Improving water quality by improving erosion control practices)

Given the last comment, Mr. Roback introduced the Opportunities section of the SWOT.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that an Opportunity could be new sales markets for farm related products. (Opportunity: New sales markets for farm products)

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that an Opportunity could be education of the public. (Opportunity: Education of everyone)

Supervisor Vogel stated that an Opportunity could be for farmers to get out of commodity cropping into other niche farming aspects. (Opportunity: Farmers to get out of commodity crops)

Chairperson Ross stated that he thought adopting a different model for Farmland Preservation could be an Opportunity. His concern in these processes is that there is a pretty fixed process of getting to something that state law requires; there may be other models out there. (Opportunity: Adopt a different model for farmland preservation)

Mr. Struck stated that the County definitely tries to open up the whole toolbox and look for other methodologies and models (e.g. Town of Dunn discussions). The minimum requirements that need to be identified in the plan are addressed, but then the plan expands on other models and methodologies. In the past, the plan has gone beyond the minimum requirements of statute or state programs. Ozaukee County might need to step outside the state farmland preservation program in order to make that change though and it does require resources (e.g. financial, time, staff).

Chairperson Ross stated that Ozaukee County could invest, educate, or invest in education. There's a risk of just checking the box. (Opportunity: We could invest, educate, and use zoning to preserve farmland)

Supervisor Vogel noted that none of that is directed by farmers. He stated that he thinks if Ozaukee County doesn't get direction from farmers, we don't have a chance to succeed. (Opportunity: To get buy-in from farmers on a new model)

Mr. Struck noted that it takes input from everybody, but especially farmers and agricultural owners.

Supervisor Schoessow stated that it's the farmer's investment. Like anybody, farmers want to see their things grow and be successful; it's tough.

Mr. Struck noted that it is a partnership. It takes other people to assist with the farmers' visions regarding policy, education, funding, investments, etc.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that budget initiatives could be an Opportunity.

Chairperson Ross noted that he had the same thought. Ozaukee County is incrementing away the available resources on each one of the initiatives that was talked about without the strategic vision of the county, as opposed to saying what the model should be. He asked if Ozaukee County should be investing in conservation easements. (Opportunity: Budget initiative – buying development rights and conservation easements)

Supervisor Vogel asked if the Town of Dunn bought conservation easements.

Mr. Struck noted that they mostly bought agricultural conservation easements, but he believes they also purchased some land fee simple. The Town of Dunn raised funds via a tax levy increase (passed by referendum) and worked with landowners. Their strategy was to reinvest in farmers for long-term agricultural resources. They have the threat of the continued growth of the Madison area. They invested in protecting agricultural land, which also allowed new and younger (next generation) farmers to farm the land to reduce the expense of the land cost. There have been different models for the purchase of agricultural easements and fee simple agricultural land. For example, the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust owns and protects land and then rents it out to farmers with stipulations for the use of best management practices. Again, with the Town of Dunn, the pressure that they were feeling was increasing land value. Farmers could not afford to keep land in agriculture. Each landowner has a decision to make with regard to what is most viable. The town was trying to keep agriculture viable.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the land could change hands with the easement on it.

Mr. Struck noted yes; typically, the easement (often permanent, in perpetuity) goes with the land. By purchasing development rights, there isn't the possibility of development. Usually, these types of easements are in perpetuity. Mr. Struck wasn't sure if the Town of Dunn had any shorter-term easements.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if there is a way to remove an in-perpetuity easement.

Mr. Struck answered not really; not if it's drafted in-perpetuity correctly.

Supervisor Vogel asked what Supervisor Schoessow's opinion of that idea is.

Supervisor Schoessow stated that what's driving the changing of land is the aging of farmers. He asked, is there a next generation, does family keep land or re-sell to a larger farm. In Mequon some people are buying multiple farms and taking them back to nature. On the other hand, they drive the land values up.

Mr. Struck noted that idea is similar to what the Town of Dunn was experiencing. Younger farmers starting to farm had very little ability to purchase or find suitable land.

Supervisor Schoessow noted that if you go to a bank, you can't get a loan, you need quite a bit of ownership on the land for the bank to give more money.

Chairperson Ross said that maybe partnerships that allow for entry of farmers to farming and owning land could be an Opportunity. The Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT) could be an example of such a partnership. (Opportunity: Partnerships that lead to new farmers owning land)

Supervisor Schoessow said that OWLT has leased land to a farmer in the past. He noted that he doesn't think the land was put up for bid and wonders why. It brings up the question of what's fair and what's not with some of these nonprofit organizations.

Chairperson Ross noted that the model itself is different than how it was implemented.

Supervisor Schoessow stated that he owns one farm with a conservation easement on it. He believes that it is through the OWLT. There are ways of doing that, but on the other hand, you need to consider surrounding development down the line.

Mr. Struck noted that the Town of Dunn did similar. They were conscious of not having isolated parcels scattered throughout the town, but rather clustered farmland. If the land becomes too scattered or broken up, then that can make it less viable for farming.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the Town of Dunn went to the farmers?

Mr. Struck answered yes, over time.

Supervisor Schoessow noted that Ozaukee County's farming is already spread out overall, at least in the south end; however, there is lots of contiguous farmland to the north. (Opportunity: Contiguous agriculture in the northern part of the county)

Chairperson Ross stated that an Opportunity could be to have a menu of different approaches to call upon and implement together, depending on the area and different farmers or communities. (Opportunity: Develop a menu of different opportunities to preserve agricultural land)

Mr. Roback introduced the Threats category of the SWOT.

Supervisor Vogel stated that the lack of legal farm workers could be considered a Threat. (Threat: Lack of legal farm workers – current immigration policies)

Chairperson Ross said that encroaching development could be a Threat.

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

Supervisor Schoessow noted that the number of legal farm workers is driven by lower salaries. If values of commodities were higher, those issues wouldn't exist. Ozaukee County could bring in higher priced workers. Market prices result in low wages. Immigration policies would need to be fixed for that. (Threat: Market prices result in low wages)

Supervisor Holyoke stated that the aging of farmers could be a Threat. (Threat: Aging of farmers)

Supervisor Schoessow noted that the majority of farmers who he knows are older - mid 50s all the way to 80 years old.

Supervisor Holyoke asked whether there are some younger farmers in the northern part of the county.

Supervisor Schoessow stated that there are some, through attrition. The problem is that if a farm is smaller and can't expand it might be more difficult for owners to get their children to continue farming their land. It's hard to fight a developer because if you want to borrow money to purchase land, agriculture-wise it's only going to support so much. The threat of development is increasing land values. (Threat: Value of land increasing)

Chairperson Ross stated that the economics of land ownership could be a Threat. (Threat: Economics of land ownership)

Supervisor Schoessow noted that there are landowners that he rents from whose heirs/children live in other states. Those properties will likely go up for sale in the future. In Mequon farming is going to come to an end at some point. (Threat: Landowner succession – the next generation that inherits rental agricultural land may sell it)

Supervisor Vogel noted that it sounds like the northern part of the county is where agriculture could be viable still.

Chairperson Ross stated that he isn't sure he wants to give up on Mequon; a different model is needed.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that tariffs on farmers could be a Threat. (Threat: Tariffs)

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that politics at all levels could be a Threat. (Threat: Politics at all levels)

Chairperson Ross stated that proximity to Milwaukee is a large population center that will exacerbate all threats, though this could fit into all SWOT categories. (Threat: Proximity to Milwaukee)

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that Milwaukee County citizens eat food, so it's an opportunity too.

Mr. Roback thanked everyone for their ideas and stated that he will take these ideas and type them up in a document.

Mr. Struck stated that after CPB members get a chance to see the SWOT ideas again, we can discuss possibly doing some prioritization at that time. CPB members can think about the SWOT and the group will discuss at the next meeting. CPB members can also revisit previous SWOT results from the last FPP.

ii. DRAFT FPP Public Participation Plan (PPP) - Public Summary Document

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5a.ii.

Mr. Struck stated that the public summary document for the Public Participation Plan for the FPP is found in the agenda packet, on pages 15-18. At the last CPB meeting, the full public participation plan that doesn't specify dates was approved. The Department worked on identifying FPP outreach that will be done this year. On the first page (pg. 15) is a summary of how the public can get involved. On the side bar

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

there is a summary of the statutes and some FPP data. The next pages list specific opportunities and dates for public involvement. The kickoff meetings are tentatively scheduled for April 8th and 9th, 2025; however, these dates may change based on staff availability. If needed, a third virtual meeting could be held. These dates have not been advertised yet. The Department will write a press release, post to the Department website and notify the municipalities. We will advertise this document as soon as the dates are finalized. The Kick-Off public information meetings will be high-level meetings, talking about what the State FPP requires and some inventory data from the conditionally approved chapters

Chairperson Ross asked if there was a plan to provide the public survey at the meeting.

Mr. Struck answered yes, the target audience opinion survey can also be made available for attendees. A Countywide Public Opinion Survey was already completed in 2020. Information from that survey will be shared at the Kick-Off meetings. A target audience opinion survey will be given to the Ozaukee County Board members, focus groups including agricultural owners/farmers, and municipalities. The Department spent some extensive time on developing this survey. The Department will also try to send the survey out to the public and residents via various avenues. The survey will be available online and hard copy. The survey will collect data on whether the participant lives in Ozaukee County. Mr. Roback is working on creating the online survey. The survey will debut at an upcoming focus meeting and will be open for most of April. The SWOT analysis will largely be conducted with the CPB. The ongoing CPB meetings are noted next on page 16. The Department coordinated with the Ozaukee Treasures Network to set up a public meeting, which likely it will take place on June 2nd, 2025, at Riveredge Nature Center around 6 PM. This will be a focus group; they have interests in agriculture and natural resources. We will get the date added to the document draft. There will be an Agricultural Stakeholder Focus Group meeting on Thursday March 20th. A short PowerPoint presentation will be given followed by focus group questions facilitated by Mr. Roback (UWEX) and Mr. Struck. The Department will try to get a meeting set up with the City of Cedarburg and the Village of Grafton to discuss their TMDL/Stormwater program and investments in agricultural practices in their watersheds. There will also be two additional focus groups. Next, listed on page 17, Countywide Public Information meetings will be held toward the end of the planning process. By this time, the full FPP draft document will be available and details on the plan status will be shared. At least two public information meetings will be held. A virtual meeting will be considered as well. A public hearing is required; it will be held in the fall at a CPB meeting, likely at the September meeting. Ongoing public comments will be collected throughout the year. The Department will clean up this document and start to use it to market the various public input opportunities.

Mr. Struck stated that a motion on this document would be welcome to codify it as a public handout.

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to approve the Public Participation Plan for the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan public summary document on pages 15 through 18 of the agenda packet with updates (e.g. dates, times, locations) as discussed. Seconded by Supervisor Vogel. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Struck stated that the draft targeted audience opinion survey is included in the agenda packet on pages 19 through 28. The Department used Ozaukee County's own previous surveys, surveys from other nearby counties, and input from Mr. Roback and Ms. Vogeler to compile the questions in the survey. There will be some minor tweaks to the survey. There is a set of demographic questions at the beginning of the survey with information that the Department is hoping to capture, so that in can do some analysis of the response. Next there is a series of questions about farmland preservation for all audiences, including the general public. Next are the audience-directed questions. We have 2 questions for municipalities to answer, related to willingness/ability to provide for farmland preservation in their communities. Finally, there are a series of questions for agricultural operators and owners. These questions will also be used at the focus group tomorrow night and with other focus groups as appropriate.

Chairperson Ross asked if the Department is looking for CPB's approval of this survey.

Mr. Struck noted that it does not need to be a formal motion for approval, but if CPB members have comments or suggested edits that would be appreciated. The Department is hoping to use the survey

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

tomorrow night as well as online soon. He noted that the survey was more extensive than what we originally planned and discussed at CPB.

No comments were shared. The CPB members appreciated the survey and questions.

b. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 3, Trends and Projections for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5b.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department will be looking for a motion from CPB at the end of this discussion. The draft of Chapter 3 of the FPP is found in the agenda packet starting on page 29. Highlighted items need further information added yet; however, the majority of the Chapter is complete. This chapter supplements the inventory in the previous chapter and develops it further with more details and local examples. Mr. Struck went briefly through the subheadings of the chapter.

Chairperson Ross asked if there is a section of the FPP that consolidates the current status of farm economics. He asked, when looking at the number of farms in the county, is there a section that looks at average productivity.

Mr. Struck stated that there are several sections addressing farm economics; however, there is not an average productivity as that data is not readily available. In other words, specific individual farm economics is not collected in any of the available data sources.

Supervisor Schoessow noted that market value trends don't tell a lot without the acreage (agenda packet pages 35, 36, 84).

Mr. Struck noted that this is shown in Chapter 2 of the FPP, but it could also be added to Chapter 4, if desired.

Ms. Page stated that she has this data to be able to add it.

Mr. Struck noted that the plan uses the most recent data that is available; 2022 is the newest available data for most of this section. Acreages could also be added to the Production section on pages 37 and 38 of the agenda packet. Ozaukee County is seeing higher production on fewer farms; this has to do with technology and efficiency.

Chairperson Ross stated that CPB spent time talking about individual farm level, the individual motivations or drivers, which are affected by broad trends, but the farmstead level is important. With viability and intergenerational issues, he thinks there's something that can be pulled into this to show why Ozaukee County is losing individual farmers.

Mr. Struck noted that those ideas get into each individual farmers' decisions, and he doesn't think that type of data is available; however, we will see how this can be addressed. Of course, that is also the reason behind the survey data (countywide public opinion survey and also the target audience opinion survey) and focus groups.

Chairperson Ross noted that UW Extension has put on presentations about dealing with financial crisis and it seems like they could have aggregated data that would be useful to understanding what is happening on Ozaukee County farms.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department can check with UW Extension, but these studies are few and may not be specific to Ozaukee County. We have used UW Extension studies and data in the past (last plan), but he doesn't think that has been updated.

Chairperson Ross stated that he is not looking for a new effort, but it seems relevant to how to address those issues, for example, market pressures or retirement funds.

Mr. Struck noted that the targeted audience opinion survey has some of those questions. The Department will also follow up on financial viability data with UW Extension.

Chairperson Ross stated that he would like to see what is really causing the loss of farmland in Ozaukee County.

Mr. Struck stated that he thinks it is a mix of many factors (outlined in the previous chapters) and doesn't know if anybody has collected the data specific to Ozaukee County or even the region, but we will look into it further.

Chairperson Ross mentioned there could be lender data that would be useful.

Mr. Struck stated that lenders likely would not be able to provide that data for public use even in the aggregate, but we can investigate further. The downside to any UW Extension data is that it is probably statewide data with the exception of some data that was compiled before the last FPP effort. We can revisit that data, but it is dated.

Supervisor Schoessow mentioned that, when talking about loans, Ozaukee County would preserve more farmland if the development element can be removed to bring the land prices down.

Mr. Struck mentioned that he talked to a young farmer in Belgium who noted there is a young farmer loan program to help farmers buy land. Mr. Struck also noted that this is the idea behind the purchase of agricultural conservation easements, to take the development value/pressure out of the equation for agricultural landowners. He noted the examples we have discussed prior (e.g. Town of Dunn and North Branch Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area in Ozaukee County).

Supervisor Schoessow noted that this program is only for places where land is priced for agricultural viability. The program doesn't work in more populated and urban/suburban areas.

Chairperson Ross noted that the Wisconsin Farm Bureau might have some relevant data, though the data is probably statewide.

Mr. Struck mentioned that it has been more difficult to receive data from them now, due to the Federal Privacy Act. Any data they might have would be aggregated data. The Department can discuss and investigate this further, specific to Ozaukee County.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any CPB member comments from their review of Chapter 3.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that he thinks the chapter is easy to read, is very detailed, and that he learned a lot.

Mr. Struck noted that he doesn't have much additional to highlight in this chapter. On page 93 of the agenda packet is Map 3.1: Change in Agricultural Land Use in Ozaukee County: 1963-2020, which shows graphically the loss in agricultural land. Staff tried to identify both traditional agriculture and emerging agriculture.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that the only area of Chapter 3 that SEWRPC couldn't find updated data for is the equine industry (See agenda packet pages 53-55). The data included there was mostly based on info from the previous FPP. SEWRPC staff also added a paragraph about a more recent equine survey.

Chairperson Ross asked if there were any other comments on this FPP Chapter 3, Trends and Projections. No additional comments were shared.

Supervisor Richart made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 3, Trends and Projections, of the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. A voice vote was taken. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Other Business

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

Mr. Struck stated that all the various parts of Chapter 4, Public Involvement, likely will not be fully completed by the next CPB meeting. Likely the agenda will have portions of Chapter 4 ready for review, and the rest will be revisited in the future. We also plan to have Chapter 6, Vision, Issues and Recommendations, available as a draft.

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

7. Next Meeting Date(s) – April 16, 2025

The next meeting will be April 16, 2025, following the County Board meeting, if needed, otherwise at 9 AM.

8. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Maguire. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 12:14 PM.