



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

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

**MEETING MINUTES**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD**  
**WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2025 AT 9:00 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 9:02 AM.

| Attendee Name | Title                                     | Status  | Arrived |
|---------------|-------------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| B. Ross       | Chairperson, Supervisor, District 19      | Present | 8:52 AM |
| T. Maguire    | Supervisor, District 15                   | Excused | -       |
| R. Holyoke    | Supervisor, District 22                   | Present | 8:54 AM |
| S. Rishel     | Supervisor, District 14                   | Excused | -       |
| T. Richart    | Vice-Chairperson, Supervisor, District 12 | Present | 8:51 AM |
| D. Vogel      | Alternate – Supervisor, District 10       | Excused | -       |

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

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner – Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)

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

Mr. Struck provided assurance that 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.

#### **4. Approval of Minutes (April 16, 2025)**

*Motion made by Supervisor Holyoke, seconded by Vice-Chairperson Richart, that the April 16th, 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 (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)**

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5.

##### ***a. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 4, Public Involvement for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050***

##### ***i. Review Results of the Target Audience Opinion Survey – Agriculture Owners/Farmers/Users, County Board, Municipalities, Residents/Public (Presentation by Paul Roback, UWEX)***

Agenda item 5.a.i. was skipped temporarily while Mr. Roback set up the presentation projector.

##### ***ii. Meetings with Municipalities (Town of Fredonia, Town of Port Washington, etc.)***

Mr. Struck stated that over the last month and a half the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department (Department) staff have been trying to meet with Ozaukee County municipalities to discuss participation in the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP). Mr. Struck met with the Town of Belgium; they were very interested in participating but will also need to have their farmland zoning updated. The current zoning was based on the FPP 10 years ago. So, changes will need to be incorporated to make the zoning consistent with the new FPP map. Chapter 5 will be revisited once more info is received from the municipalities.

Chairperson Ross asked if discussions were had with the City of Mequon.

Mr. Struck noted that he did talk with the Assistant Director of Community Development, but that no further discussions have been had to date. Mr. Struck met with the Town of Belgium and the Town of Fredonia; he talked to the Town of Fredonia and Town of Belgium Chairman. The Town of Fredonia went through the process of designating land for the last FPP but ended up not participating. Mr. Struck noted that he has hard copies of the handouts that were provided to the Town of Fredonia and also at the Kickoff Meetings, and they are included in the agenda packet on pages 58-111.

Mr. Struck noted that there are two ways to go about claiming farmland preservation tax credit. Both ways require areas to be designated as farmland preservation areas in the FPP. Then, either the municipality needs to have zoning for farmland preservation (consistent with State Statute for Farmland Preservation Zoning), or less common is to work with (petition) Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) to designate an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA). An AEA requires a minimum of five willing landowners/farmers with contiguous land/tracts, but there is no minimum acreage. The Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department is willing to work with municipalities and landowners on submitting the formal petition needed for designating an AEA through the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). DATCP then reviews the petition and must certify (approve) a designated AEA. Some towns have been hesitant to participate in designated FPAs because of staff time and expense of reviewing and revising their zoning ordinance, particularly in regard to Farmland Preservation Zoning that is consistent with the State Statute. Several Towns and the City of Mequon currently have zoning districts that do not meet or allow for Farmland Preservation Zoning that meets the Statutory requirements, so it would require a change.

The Town of Fredonia would likely need to modify their zoning to have a farmland preservation zoning district consistent with State Statute; they have used a professional consultant, staff and consulting attorney to revise their zoning ordinance in the past. There is a cost and time needed to revise zoning ordinances. A

few landowners/agricultural landowners were present at the Town of Fredonia Board meeting. The Town Board members spoke and stated that the large agricultural landowners in their town were not interested in the small tax credit; the credit is not enough incentive for them. Even though most of them are already in compliance with the required conservation practices, it was noted that it is not worth it for them to put in the effort to get the credit. The average tax credit received statewide is \$1,537.61 per claim (under Schedule FC-A, in tax-year 2022). There were agricultural landowners who talked to Mr. Struck after the meeting. The smaller landowners are the ones who want to participate in the FPP and take advantage of the tax credit. A Town zoning update could be done to make those smaller farmers eligible. The Town of Fredonia has FPAs and Farmland Preservation Zoning with the large agricultural landowners, and they weren't interested. Mr. Struck mentioned that he had heard from some landowners who were interested in obtaining the tax credit at the kickoff meetings as well. The Town of Fredonia decided not to take any formal action at the meeting; they wanted to talk to more landowners first before deciding. Both the Town Clerk and Town Chairman followed up with Mr. Struck after the meeting. Even if the Town chooses not to make changes in their zoning, they could still pursue designated FPAs like the last plan; then several landowners could work together with the County to petition DATCP for an AEA designation. Mr. Struck mentioned to the Town Chairman and the Town Clerk that they might want to consider still voting for Ozaukee County to go through the process of designating the farmland preservation areas for them at this time, without the immediate need to change their zoning. DATCP will still review the petition to make sure that the areas proposed meet their requirements and criteria for an AEA. Mr. Struck had a similar discussion with the Town of Port Washington Chairman. The Town of Port Washington Chairman was going to put this FPP discussion on their July Board and Plan Commission meeting agendas in early July (July 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>). The Town of Port Washington is in a similar situation to the Town of Fredonia; however, their current farmland and conservation subdivision zoning district does not currently meet the State Statute requirements. The Town of Port Washington has zoning that reflects that they have an interest in developing as well. The data center development and annexation are also at the top of the mind for the Town of Port Washington.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if the tax credit payment is a one-time payment.

Mr. Struck stated that the payment is an annual tax credit. The credit is based on a number of factors but is somewhere between \$10 and \$12.50 per acre. An AEA or Farmland Preservation zoning alone pays a little less; the highest amount is for being in both zoning and AEA.

Supervisor Holyoke mentioned that based on the public survey (both Ozaukee County's survey and the DATCP survey) it seems like, depending on how long the term is, some people don't think it's worth it to be tied down to a 10-year agreement.

Mr. Struck stated that yes, the agreements are tied with the FPP timeline, every ten years. The land use conversion fee no longer exists for the municipalities, but landowners would need to pay back any received tax credit if they backed out of the agreement early. The Department is also working to get a meeting set-up with the Town of Saukville. The Department and SEWRPC talked to the Town of Cedarburg and the Town of Grafton representatives; based on current land use neither has enough farmland area or the required zoning to designate an FPA that DATCP would approve based on the efforts of the last plan (since the last plan only more development has occurred in these Towns). It is also not likely given their recent Town Comprehensive Plan updates. The Department hasn't approached any of the villages or most of the cities based on the lack of farmland areas or even farmland zoning. Mr. Struck did talk with City of Mequon staff and was told that they likely would not have interest. Mr. Struck asked if staff could talk to the elected body about it; they said they could, but they don't expect anything to change (particularly with the zoning). Mr. Struck noted that he hasn't heard from any agricultural landowners in Mequon to date with a strong desire to participate; however, Supervisor Schoessow has also been discussing with his colleagues/agricultural landowners and farmers in the City of Mequon. Back when the City of Mequon was participating with farmland preservation agreements, there were only a few landowners (approximately 3 – 5) who took the tax credit. This was more than twelve years ago now.

Supervisor Holyoke asked whether conservation easements and AEAs are different.

Mr. Struck said yes, they are different. An (agricultural) conservation easement is an agreement that pays

the landowner for their development rights on the property and generally restricts the property from any development in perpetuity. A conservation easement goes with the land (not the owner); therefore, it permanently removes the “development rights” from a parcel to protect it in perpetuity for agriculture or conservation values. An AEA does not acquire the development rights like an easement and is not recorded to the deed like an easement. There is still a minimum 10-year commitment to participate in an AEA. An AEA is more similar to zoning than to a conservation easement, but the area is designated by the State for the purpose of agricultural use and particularly allows availability for participation in the DATCP programs (namely farmland preservation tax credits).

Chairperson Ross asked if it would be helpful if he called the staff at the City of Mequon.

Mr. Struck said yes, it could not hurt to discuss it further with the City of Mequon. The staff know that there would need to be significant changes for the City of Mequon to participate (similar to the Town of Port Washington) given the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning. They would need to rezone land and notify those landowners. It would require significant effort.

Chairperson Ross stated that it would be helpful to know how many landowners previously enrolled in the tax credit.

Mr. Struck stated that this was more than 10 years ago; there were probably around 5 landowners. The LWMD and SEWRPC confirmed this approximate number.

Mr. Struck noted that he is waiting to hear formally from the Town of Fredonia. Staff could proceed with the potential FPAs, but it would be a lot of time wasted if the Town of Fredonia ended up deciding that they don’t want to participate in the FPP. Hopefully they will be able to decide by August. The Department is currently waiting to hear back from the Town of Port Washington and City of Mequon too. Mr. Struck’s personal opinion is that the situation feels similar to what it was 10 years ago; there is hesitancy among the municipalities given the required changes locally. The County could proceed with AEAs but they would need to be part of a designated farmland preservation area. Also, the County could still proceed with the purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) even without the State program, but it might be difficult to get outside funding (although there has been funding in the past through federal grants). In addition, Ozaukee County could have its own program and fund purchase of conservation easements as the structure has been established. Historically, several state and federal grant funding programs don’t cover the Town of Belgium, as it is not in the Milwaukee River watershed. Belgium still is on Lake Michigan though and there is Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) funding potentially available there. The Town of Fredonia still has the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area, that is designated. The Town of Fredonia could work within that area, as it might be eligible for other grant funding. Ozaukee County could work with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), or others, to pursue purchase of agricultural easements. Several landowners in the Town of Fredonia were and are very interested in selling conservation easements on their land; however, the funding to purchase the easements has not been available for the last several years; they want to keep farmland in perpetuity. Some federal funding options are frozen right now. There are people on waiting lists to sell conservation easements (with MMSD, WDNR, etc.); however, there is a lack of funding. Mr. Struck suspects that the Town of Belgium is similar.

Supervisor Holyoke asked if there is a heightened interest in conservation easements in the Town of Port Washington due to the new data center development.

Mr. Struck said, yes, there has been some expressed interest. Other people feel that they are too late; so, there are split views. Mr. Struck hasn’t talked to the Town of Port Washington Board yet. As a result of the data center development, agricultural landowners and farmers are looking for new land further out for their operations (and manure spreading); there is an effect around the data center development. Supervisor Schoessow previously mentioned too, the property valuation issue and land availability issue. In the Town of Port Washington, some people are trying to protect what land is remaining for agriculture.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if Mr. Struck encouraged the Town of Fredonia and Town of Belgium to

meet with adjacent towns in our county and other counties?

Mr. Struck said yes, this was mentioned. AEAs can go over county lines as can be seen on page 15 of the DATCP biennial report.

Vice-Chairperson Richart mentioned that large farm owners don't need to participate in the tax credit.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if the Town of Fredonia decides not to pursue zoning, that's fine; it gives them options; however, is Ozaukee County really protecting farmland, or just helping landowners?

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that both large landowners and small landowners all have a vote.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the municipalities feel like they already went through this process 10 years ago.

Chairperson Ross asked if there is any value in communication from this Comprehensive Planning Board to the municipalities.

Mr. Struck said that a letter or other communication from the CPB won't hurt; although he is not sure if it will make a difference in participation either. Some people have their minds made up already. It comes down to vote, ultimately. Smaller landowners are not feeling heard. Mr. Struck encouraged landowners to talk to their town boards.

Chairperson Ross noted that he worries about the CPB missing the opportunities to weigh in.

Mr. Struck stated that any formal communication is appreciated and generally reviewed. On a logistical level, it has been difficult to get to all these meetings set up between the Department and the municipalities given staffing.

Chairperson Ross asked whether Mr. Struck is the only staff member who can meet with the municipalities to discuss this.

Mr. Struck said yes, right now.

Mr. Robinson asked whether the Town of Fredonia has had a large turnover in their board members in the past 10 years.

Mr. Struck said yes, there has been some turnover, but they have the same opinions mostly.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that SEWRPC and the Department have around 2 months to get the plan put together. If the towns prolong their decisions, it will be difficult to get DATCAP to review the FPP in October 2025.

Mr. Struck said that he has been trying to convey that without putting too much pressure on the municipalities.

Chairperson Ross asked what the final deadline is for the municipalities to decide about participation.

Mr. Struck stated that FPA mapping needs to start in earnest by August 2025.

Mr. Robinson, responding to a previous question, noted that the City of Mequon had 3 contracts covering 244 acres, previously.

Mr. Struck stated that Ozaukee County and the Department has tried to get the word out again, but the municipalities' decisions are ultimately needed for participation. Most agricultural landowners are aware of the FPP program's existence.

Ms. Vogeler noted that the Land and Water Management Department does send an annual landowner letter to agricultural landowners for soil and water conservation; so, all owners should be aware that the FPP program

exists.

Mr. Struck noted that the state sets aside a large amount of money for farmland preservation tax credits. It has been discussed in the past that more could be allocated for the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program. It can be difficult for DATCP and elected officials because not all parts of the state are equal with regard to development and the value of the tax credits. In the last couple of years, the state has had a lot of money available, but it has been undersubscribed in the tax credit program.

Chairperson Ross asked if the money could be used for other purposes.

Mr. Struck said it would take legislative action; however, he thinks if the State provided more funding for conservation easements it would be far more valuable for Ozaukee County, but possibly not for the State as a whole.

Ms. Vogeler agreed that Ozaukee County is trending that way towards the use of conservation easements to protect farmland.

Mr. Struck stated that tax credits have been undersubscribed, particularly in Ozaukee County, whereas for easements, there is a long waiting list. There is an imbalance for Ozaukee County.

## **5. REVIEW, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050 (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition)**

### ***a. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 4, Public Involvement for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050***

#### ***i. Review Results of the Target Audience Opinion Survey – Agriculture Owners/Farmers/Users, County Board, Municipalities, Residents/Public (Presentation by Paul Roback, UWEX)***

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5.a.i.

Mr. Roback began sharing a presentation titled “2025 Ozaukee Farmland Preservation Plan: Public Participation Survey Results.” This presentation can be found on the Ozaukee County website here: <https://ozaukeeconomy.gov/871/Farmland-Preservation-Plan>

Mr. Roback stated that 396 survey responses were received.

Chairperson Ross asked if 396 is a good number.

Mr. Roback stated that he believes it is a good response. Most people who took the survey were landowners. The Town of Grafton had the highest response rate of all municipalities in the County; he is not sure why.

Mr. Struck noted that he thinks Town of Grafton residents have heightened awareness due to previous farmland preservation efforts at the Town level.

Mr. Roback noted that he is able to see the IP addresses of people who took the surveys; there were not many duplicates. Cross tabulation was used to look at responses in different areas where people live. The northern part of Ozaukee County is underrepresented in the survey results.

Mr. Struck noted that it is ironic to him that in the areas where more input is needed, there are less responses. Respondents from the municipalities that are less directly affected responded in a greater way.

Chairperson Ross noted that participation could be driven more by where survey takers live; in more populated areas people have seen farmland disappear.

Supervisor Holyoke noted that marketing probably also had an impact on participation; the survey was advertised in some areas more than others. Mr. Struck agreed and again noted that this is the difference with a statistically significant survey like those the County paid UW River Falls and UWM to conduct. Those surveys are a random sample of the County versus the target audience survey approach (as so designated).

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that the data center has had a large effect on Port Washington, but not many survey responses were received from there.

Mr. Roback stated that a high number of respondents were retired individuals (41% of responses). This group was oversampled based on the full county population. Lots of highly educated individuals completed the survey. There was overwhelmingly positive support (300+ yes answers) to the question, “Do you think it is important to preserve farmland in Ozaukee County”. Most respondents were long-term residents. Respondents generally agreed with or had a neutral opinion to the statement “Ozaukee County land use supports agriculture-related operations needed to run a farm.” (Please see the PowerPoint presentation for a summary of responses/data to other questions discussed).

Based on responses to the question, “How would you rate efforts of Ozaukee County to guide where development occurs?” and “Agree or Disagree?: Town, village, city or county land use and land division policies should be strengthened to better guide growth”, Mr. Struck noted that he thinks there is room for additional planning at the county level, specifically with land division oversight.

Supervisor Holyoke noted that he is surprised there were so many respondents that agreed with the statement “there is sufficient affordable housing for agricultural workers in my community.”

Mr. Roback noted the question, “Agree or Disagree?: Ozaukee County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space or protect important environmental areas” had significantly positive responses as Strongly Agree (170+) or Agree (70+) and the same with the question, “Favor or Oppose?: Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements from agricultural landowners in an effort to preserve agricultural lands?” with a significantly positive responses as Strongly Favor (130+) and Favor (~90).

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if a county land preservation fund account already exists?

Mr. Struck said yes, a land preservation fund exists; there’s also a policy. It is supported by a resolution of the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks funding a land preservation account is a big recommendation. He noted that if the WDNR Knowles-Nelson Stewardship grant program resolution passes, and Ozaukee County applies for those funds, it will require 20% match from the County.

Mr. Struck stated that the Knowles-Nelson Stewardship grant program has always required 50% match funding, but Ozaukee County has very often used other grants as match. Now WDNR will be requiring 20% match to be supported by the local government.

Mr. Roback stated that 56% of respondents stated that they would be “willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation to create and sustain a dedicated fund for an agricultural land preservation program.” Question 29 of the survey asked what other thoughts respondents had to share. Mr. Roback organized the responses into themes including Preservation of Rural Character, Farmland, and Open Space, Strong Opposition to Overdevelopment and Urban Sprawl, Infrastructure, Environmental, and Quality of Life Concerns, Community-Led Planning and Local Control, and Balanced Growth and Land Use Innovation. There was lots of data received, which can be found starting on page 36 of the agenda packet.

Mr. Roback stated that the survey format changes to audience-specific questions after question 29, specifically for municipalities and agricultural landowners/farmers. The questions further detailed opinions specific to the State Farmland Preservation Program.

Chairperson Ross noted that the survey results make him want to know more. For example: Is it statistically significant? What are the financial motivators? He wants to understand better what is happening and feels like there is not enough data.

Mr. Struck noted that he thinks that is how every survey leaves you feeling. When looking back at the last statistically significant survey that was completed, the results are similar. Most of the Department's past surveys have been consistent with the findings of this survey, which seems to indicate that it is relevant and representative.

Mr. Roback stated that he thinks that detailed focus groups would be needed to get the level of data that Chairperson Ross is looking for.

Mr. Struck added that more time and a series of events would be needed also.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department would post the presentation slides on the County website so that the public can see the results of the full survey and the various questions.

Chairperson Ross noted that he would like to use the survey to go back to the municipalities to show them what their community members think.

Mr. Struck stated that information could be presented in the letter to the municipalities.

Chairperson Ross stated that it is unfortunate that there's clearly a desire from the public to preserve farmland, but Ozaukee County doesn't have the tools or political will to advance in the areas the public survey indicates that we should advance.

Mr. Struck noted that there is great need for funding the various priorities such as purchase of (agricultural) conservation easements.

***b. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 7, Implementation for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050.***

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5.b.

Mr. Struck noted that because of the deadline to complete the Farmland Preservation Plan (December 2025), the Department and SEWRPC proceeded to work on Chapter 7, Implementation, temporarily skipping over Chapter 5, Farmland Preservation Areas until additional municipal meetings and input can be conducted. More information is needed from the municipalities for Chapter 5, particularly with regard to their participation in farmland preservation zoning. Chapter 7 is the implementation chapter, and the draft is located in the agenda packet starting on page 112; the Department is looking for conditional approval on this chapter from CPB; however, some additional work on ranking programs will be done (yellow highlighted area). One of the reasons that staff have asked for conditionally approved chapters is because the Department and SEWRPC would like to send already conditionally approved chapters to DATCP to start the review process in order to meet the end of the year deadline. The full plan needs to be received by DATCP by October to complete review and adoption by the end of the year. The items highlighted in yellow need more information to complete and are largely carryover text from the last FPP. The large section that is highlighted in yellow is the program prioritization section (the current text reflects the prioritization from the last FPP). This prioritization will be updated with CPB. There's a hard copy spreadsheet on the table for each of you that lists all the programs from the last FPP. Most of the programs in the current draft FPP are similar. So, each CPB member will be filling out an updated program ranking spreadsheet that will be sent via email similar to this one. The scoring and ranking are based on the process that is outlined in Chapter 7, on pages 116 and 117 of the agenda packet. The Department will update the spreadsheet to include the current plan programs and provide a new version for CPB members to complete. Mr. Struck will email the spreadsheet to the CPB members and members should fill it out on their own time prior to the next CPB meeting. The prioritization listing in Chapter 7 will be re-done after scoring results are compiled. The rest of Chapter 7 is fairly straight forward and has been updated already. If there are any programs that any CPB members would like to add, now is the time to get them added before the scoring and ranking process begins.

Supervisor Holyoke asked how the scoring works, if it is using a 1–3-point system.

Mr. Struck stated that the programs will be scored by section and then normalized.

Chairperson Ross asked if the highlighted sections can be segmented.

Mr. Struck said that yes, they can be segmented

Mr. Robinson asked if only the agriculture related programs were included in the listing in the existing FPP.

Mr. Struck noted that he thought the other programs were in the appendices of the current plan. The scoring produced good results for the last FPP. The scores show the top programs across the board. Instructions will be given on how to complete the scoring sheet when it's emailed out to the CPB.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that for the Park and Open Space Plan (POSP), CPB took a look at what recommendations the last plan had addressed. He would like to see what progress has been made for the top priority areas/programs identified in the last FPP too.

Mr. Struck stated that effort for the POSP was more significant than time will allow with the FPP, especially since multiple Departments are implementing the FPP. There were some program areas that Ozaukee County did complete or make progress in and staff will try to summarize for the current FPP

Mr. Struck stated that the Department will send out spreadsheets for CPB members to fill out soon. The Department will compile the results for the July CPB meeting.

Chairperson Ross asked if a deadline for completion of the scoring sheets will be given prior to the July meeting.

Mr. Struck said yes, the spreadsheet will be sent as a digital spreadsheet or can be printed and filled out as a hard copy. The Department will take the programs from Chapter 6 and compile them into a spreadsheet. Mr. Struck noted that the rankings will likely be due back to the Department right after the July 4<sup>th</sup> Holiday.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks this is a good approach to help identify priority programs, but he feels that there is a connection to strategic planning that is still missing. He asked how this will get implemented and how it will be funded.

Mr. Struck noted that the language in the FPP can be modified if desired, but ultimately it will be up to the oversight Committees and Departments in partnership with the municipalities to begin to implement the programs according to the FPP. As with most programs, the County Board will need to authorize funding as part of the annual budget or grants received to amend the approved budget.

Chairperson Ross asked if there is an executive summary that will capture overall ideas and a takeaway from the plan.

Mr. Struck stated that he thinks the cover letter was well received for the POSP.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks there's something missing from the FPP, in terms of making financial decisions.

Mr. Struck stated that if CPB members feel like something is missing from the FPP, it could be added. If CPB wants Ozaukee County to collect additional data or survey information then it needs to show up as a goal, objective or program in the FPP.

Chairperson Ross said that he isn't certain, but it seems to him that Ozaukee County isn't fully accomplishing the FPP's purposes. There's the state requirement that Ozaukee County needs to complete and get certified, but there's more that Ozaukee County Supervisors and residents think should be done. He asked the group what their attention should be focused on; he believes that's where the bulk of the opportunity lies.

Mr. Struck mentioned that the goals, objectives and programs can be modified in Chapter 6 to address Chairperson Ross's concerns and comments but given the timeline to complete the plan and need to meet the minimum Statutory requirements, we need to understand those additions soon.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if there was an advisory referendum recommended or if it could be recommended as part of implementing a given goal, objective or program.

Chairperson Ross noted that is an example of what he is talking about; there's an action item outside of the program.

Mr. Struck stated that this is typically where the Natural Resources Committee (NRC) or other oversight committee would say more information is needed or Ozaukee County needs to do some action to complete this program. He also noted that it is complicated with the FPP because the municipalities are also an integral implementing agency.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks the struggle is due to the disconnect between what constituents are expressing and the political will or the financial dynamics that drive farmland preservation decisions.

Mr. Struck noted that there are many outside influences that affect land use and in addition many of these decisions are driven at the local level. Mr. Struck requested that CPB members look at the programs in Chapter 6. The Department will send a revised spreadsheet for CPB members to fill out with their rankings soon.

Mr. Struck stated that conditionally approved Chapters 1,2,3, and 6 will be sent to DATCP to start the review process as there is concern about getting feedback in time for adoption by the end of the year.

*Supervisor Richart made a motion to conditionally approve Chapter 7, Implementation for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050. Seconded by Supervisor Holyoke. A voice note was taken. Motion carries unanimously.*

Mr. Struck stated that the conditional approvals also show DATCP that progress is being made on the FPP and the FPP grant.

Mr. Robinson noted that DATCP's review will provide more time for SEWRPC and the Department to address any issues, edits or changes.

Chairperson Ross asked what feedback is usually received from DATCP.

Mr. Struck stated that usually the feedback is regarding technical items identified in the Statute and to make sure that the FPP meets the DATCP criteria and statutory requirements for the various items that need to be addressed in the plan. Sometimes DATCP asks for more data to be added if it is part of a statutory requirement (e.g. housing and housing density).

Mr. Robinson noted that Ozaukee County has a very extensive FPP compared to other counties in the area.

Chairperson Ross noted that he will contemplate and discuss with Mr. Struck regarding a possible letter to send to the municipalities who are on the fence about participating.

## **6. Other Business**

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

Mr. Struck noted that there are a few other relevant articles (agenda packet page 155-156) and documents included in the agenda packet, including documents demonstrating the Department's efforts to promote the target audience public opinion survey.

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

## **7. Next Meeting Date(s) – Wednesday, JULY 16, 2025**

Chairperson Ross stated that the next CPB meeting will be on Wednesday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

## **8. Adjournment**

*Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Richart. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 11:16 AM.*