



PLANNING & PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew T. Struck, Director

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

MEETING MINUTES

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD

WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 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 (CPB) was held at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Room A-200. Chairperson Ross called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
B. Ross	Chairperson, Supervisor, District 19	Present	8:49 AM
T. Maguire	Supervisor, District 15	Excused	-
R. Holyoke	Supervisor, District 22	Present	8:58 AM
S. Rishel	Supervisor, District 14	Absent	-
T. Richart	Vice-Chairperson, Supervisor, District 12	Present	8:43 AM
D. Vogel	Alternate – Supervisor, District 10	Present	8:54 AM

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

Others present: Robbie Robinson, Senior Planner – Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), Mirande Page, Planner – 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 (June 18, 2025)

Motion made Vice-Chairperson Richart, seconded by Supervisor Holyoke, that the June 18th, 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)

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. Meetings/Correspondence with Municipalities (Town of Port Washington, etc.)

Mr. Struck stated that there are currently no new updates to the Chapter 4 text. Mr. Struck met with the Town of Belgium and confirmed that they would like to be participants in the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP); they will work on their required zoning changes.

Mr. Struck also met with the Town of Fredonia; they have now decided not to participate in the FPP due to a combination of factors. The Town of Fredonia talked to some of their agricultural landowners and felt as though the landowners were not interested in participating. There is a high potential cost, time, and effort required to make the zoning compliant. The Town of Fredonia does have farmland zoning currently, but some effort would be required to make it compliant. The Town of Fredonia Chairman and Clerk emailed Mr. Struck with their final decision.

Mr. Struck met with the Town of Port Washington at a recent Town Planning Commission meeting and Town Board meeting. The Town of Port Washington may have interest in participating in the FPP, but want to do some additional investigation. After the Planning Commission meeting, the Town of Port Washington decided to discuss the option further with agricultural landowners in the Town before pursuing participation. The Town of Port Washington Chairman did note that the Town had opted out of the FPP in the last plan for multiple reasons. The Town of Port Washington has a non-compliant zoning district (farmland and conservation subdivision), so significant changes would be needed to their land use and zoning. The Town of Port Washington would need to make changes to their Comprehensive Plan. The Town of Port Washington also didn't want to exclude the possibility of a landowner developing their land if they desired (e.g. conservation subdivision / farmland land use). The Town Board members are largely different than they were 10 years ago. The Town Chairman was also concerned about some of the regulations at that time of the previous FPP (e.g. land use penalty, conservation practice compliance, etc.). Most of the Town Board members were open to further discussion about the FPP now and wanted to discuss it with the agricultural landowners in the Town of Port Washington. The Town of Port Washington requested that Ozaukee County provide mapping of what could potentially be eligible for the zoning for the FPP tax credit. The Town of Port Washington has lots of parcels that are zoned as hybrid ACS-1 Agricultural/Conservation Subdivision District. The Town of Port Washington could convert just some of the ACS-1 parcels away from that mixed use zoning. The Town of Port Washington was also interested in Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs). Mr. Struck explained to the Town of Port Washington that an AEA could cross over town borders. The Town of Port Washington was also very interested in agricultural conservation easements. They are still having discussions about the annexation of the data center. With agricultural conservation easements, the easement would be in perpetuity. The Town is still coming to terms with the data center situation and all the details.

Supervisor Vogel asked what percentage of the Town of Port Washington was sold for the data center.

Mr. Struck stated that he believes around 2,000 acres were sold and are being annexed, and there were about 8,000 acres of farmland within the Town prior to the annexation based on the last FPP.

Chairperson Ross mentioned the required FPP timeline for Ozaukee County. Port Washington is still thinking about their participation; it will take time to give them mapping of possible eligible land.

Mr. Struck said that the timeline is a concern, but staff will work with the timing of their decision.

Supervisor Holyoke asked Mr. Struck if he thought Ozaukee County would be having this discussion about the FPP with the Town of Port Washington if it wasn't for the data center.

Mr. Struck stated that it is difficult to say whether or not; possibly not. Mr. Struck thinks their reconsideration was partly because of the data center. The Town of Port Washington had great questions and were very engaged at the Planning Commission meeting that Mr. Struck attended. Mr. Struck told the Town of Port Washington that a final decision needs to be made by August 2025. Ozaukee County can provide the Town with a map of their current agricultural land in a relatively short timeline, though a full analysis would take more time. Ozaukee County could continue to work through the process with the Town of Port Washington through September 2025. For now, Ozaukee County will proceed assuming that the Town of Port Washington will participate in the FPP

in some way, until we hear otherwise.

Chairperson Ross asked what would happen if the Town of Port Washington doesn't get their zoning adjusted by the time that the FPP is published.

Mr. Struck stated that if the Town of Port Washington is working towards that effort, the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) will probably say that it is fine, but landowners may not be able to take the FPP tax credit the first year. For example, for the last FPP, the Town of Fredonia had a farmland preservation area in the plan, even though they didn't take advantage of it. The farmland preservation area just needs to be in the FPP for the Town of Port Washington.

Chairperson Ross asked what is needed from the Town of Port Washington to include them in the FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that the Town of Port Washington will need to provide their decision in writing to Ozaukee County and an intent for completion of the land use and zoning changes.

Supervisor Vogel asked whether the written decision can just be a note, or if it needs to be an official document from the Town Board.

Mr. Struck stated that he will have to check with DATCP. The Town of Port Washington may be able to provide DATCP with the minutes from a town plan commission or board meeting for the land use and zoning change.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the Town of Port Washington's interests are a defensive move.

Mr. Struck stated that he doesn't think that is the case; the Town of Port Washington knows that things have changed since the last FPP. The Town could decide to only have some of their land eligible for the credit. Though not specifically said, Mr. Struck interpreted that the Town of Port Washington feels that it's unlikely that the area around the data center will stay in agriculture; it might transition to housing or something else.

Mr. Struck stated that he reached out to the Town of Saukville and the City of Mequon about participation in the FPP, but no response has been received yet. Mr. Struck had previously talked to staff at the City of Mequon, and they said it was unlikely that the City would participate.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that he had previously sent a draft letter for the remaining communities to Mr. Struck and asked if Mr. Struck thought there could be value in mailing it.

Mr. Struck stated that he thinks the letter could be valuable and that he would send the letter to the remaining communities that have not made a formal decision.

Mr. Struck stated that he hasn't communicated any further with the Town of Grafton or the Town of Cedarburg, due to their limited agricultural land and not participating in the FPP last time. Ozaukee County will move forward with including the Town of Belgium and potentially the Town of Port Washington in the FPP and modifications can be made as needed moving forward. Mr. Struck doesn't have any future meetings set up with municipalities at this time.

Mr. Robinson noted that the Town of Port Washington is about 11,400 acres in total, and agriculture takes up about 7,800 of those acres.

Supervisor Vogel noted that the new data center will be a big portion of that agricultural land; that information helps put things into perspective.

Mr. Struck stated that he suspects that a vast majority of the data center land is agricultural.

Mr. Struck stated that no action is currently needed on Chapter 4 of the FPP from CPB. Any meetings with the municipalities will be documented in Chapter 4.

Mr. Robinson stated that one of the criteria for the FPP is to include the existing municipal boundaries. For the Town of Port Washington, the data center annexation likely won't happen prior to October 2025. So, the FPP boundaries won't be certain, but a good estimate on the annexation boundary can be made at the time.

Supervisor Vogel asked, from discussions with the Town of Port Washington, if Mr. Struck thinks that it sounds like anyone is seeing the data center as an opportunity.

Mr. Struck stated that the Town of Port Washington seems to be thinking the situation over still. It's almost certain that the data center will be built now, so they are trying to change their view on handling it as an opportunity. There was a boundary agreement in place with the City of Port Washington, but it was set to expire prior to the annexation and development of the data center. However, if the City of Port Washington annexed land, it was noted in the agreement that they would provide / share infrastructure with the Town and Town Center. It remains to be seen if sewer, water and electricity will be available beyond the annexed land for areas within the Town of Port Washington. Some businesses and residents are already asking the Town of Port Washington when they will get city water. Mr. Struck stated that he thinks it sounds like the City of Port Washington is trying to honor the agreement for water service to some of the areas of the Town of Port Washington, but that he is not sure.

Supervisor Vogel asked if anyone is arguing that the data center area needs to be covered in solar panels.

Mr. Struck said that he doesn't believe so currently.

Chairperson Ross mentioned that in the agenda packet, on page 27, there are articles discussing electrical demands, and asked if that could stop the data center development.

Mr. Struck stated that We Energies will be providing electrical service for the data center. We Energies has final draft plans and has been given the go-ahead. The power will be servicing the area from the Fredonia substation, as Mr. Struck understands it. Electrical lines will be run down along the Ozaukee Interurban Trail. June 1, 2026, is the deadline We Energies has for completion of the electrical service to the site. So, there will be major construction coming from the north and west from the Fredonia substation. It is not anticipated that much if any electrical power for the data center will come from the Port Washington Power Plant.

Supervisor Vogel asked if any new power plants will be built.

Mr. Struck stated that he did not think so and that the power would come from an existing power plant, outside of Ozaukee County.

Supervisor Vogel asked if Washington County has any say in the electrical changes.

Mr. Struck stated that he thinks the work is under the current capacity of the existing power plant.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the We Energies situation is public knowledge.

Mr. Struck stated that the data center power information is very new; Mr. Struck heard about it just last week based on construction along the Ozaukee Interurban Trail in the coming months.

b. Review, Discussion and POSSIBLE ACTION – CHAPTER 5, Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs) for A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2050
i. Town of Belgium

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5.b.

Mr. Struck stated that Ozaukee County is moving ahead with including the Town of Belgium in the FPP. Mr. Struck expects their farmland preservation area to be similar to their area in the last plan. The Department will work with the Town of Port Washington on any necessary processes also, unless the Town of Port Washington decides otherwise on participation.

Mr. Robinson handed out two hard copies of new maps that will go into Chapter 5 of the FPP with narrative: Map 5.1: Farmland Preservation Areas in Ozaukee County: 2050 and Map 5.2: Farmland Preservation Areas in the Town of Belgium.

Mr. Struck stated that staff will confirm with the Town of Belgium that the map is accurate and will move forward with preliminary mapping for the Town of Port Washington. The Town of Belgium's map had some US Fish and Wildlife Service owned parcels removed since the last FPP, but the map is largely the same.

Mr. Robinson noted that some parcels in the Town of Belgium were also combined since the last FPP.

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

i. Program Prioritization (from Chapter 6 Programs) – Results from CPB Member Responses and Ranking Methodology

Chairperson Ross introduced agenda item 5.c.

Mr. Struck stated that for the last FPP, the entire FPP Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC) and Land Preservation Board (LPB) completed the FPP program rankings and CPB just reviewed the rankings. Mr. Struck handed out a hard copy of the ranking spreadsheet from the last FPP. Last time there was a much larger number of individuals who ranked the programs (N=19). This year a slightly different methodology was used, as there was some confusion and difficulty with ranking a large number of programs in order for each section versus just high, medium and low. For the last FPP, each member ranked each section from 1 to X (X being the number of programs in each section). The members ranked each program, and they also ranked the 3 major agricultural goal areas from 1 to 3. Those scores from 1 to 3 were the weightings. The rankings from the last FPP provided more separation in program scores, so there weren't many duplicate scores. But, due to feedback from this CPB, we tried to simplify the process by ranking each program from 1 to 3 (low, medium, high) based on priority. The results provided multiple programs with the same scores (see agenda packet pages 13-26). The weightings used, shown on agenda packet pages 13-20, were from the last FPP because we did not have this CPB rank the overall agricultural goals. The weighting values could be re-done today to come up with new weighting for this FPP. When staff simplified the ranking process, it was realized that there would be multiple scores with the same number. On agenda packet pages 21-26, shaded cell areas were programs that had the same scores. The results became more homogenized this time due to a smaller number of individuals ranking and because we simplified the scale. Only six CPB members completed the rankings this time. The bottom line is that this was an exercise to collect objective input on program rankings, but CPB can adjust any programs around as desired for priorities (as was the case with the last FPP). This year the Department does not have the benefit of the FPP CAC or Land Preservation Board conducting the rankings. Prioritization of programs is required by DATCP for the FPP, but the methodology is self-determined.

Supervisor Vogel asked why the weight values from the last FPP were used this year.

Mr. Struck stated that the weighting was done for the last FPP to prioritize the agricultural programs over other program areas. The weights from 2012 were used because CPB did not rank the agricultural goals this year. The 3 goals are in the box at the top of page 13 of the agenda packet.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the second goal was ranked highest of the three goals in the last FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that yes, that whole goal area (Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remains viable in Ozaukee County) scored the highest of the three in the last FPP.

Supervisor Vogel asked what the sub-rank column is, on pages 13-20 of the agenda packet.

Mr. Struck stated that the sub-rank is the rank of the program just within the goal area.

Mr. Struck noted that he thinks the overall ranking results are comparable to the last FPP.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that he is okay with the process and the weighting but wanted to bring up a minor point. There are six CPB members, and there weren't any programs where every member scored a 3 (for a total score of $6 \times 3 = 18$). He asked how CPB can show some importance for the programs that received a total score of 17.

Mr. Struck stated that CPB could decide to ignore the goal weighting or add other criteria to show importance or weighting of particular programs.

Chairperson Ross noted that the previous CPB decided that the agricultural goals should have more weight but stated that he believes the other programs shouldn't be lost. He asked CPB how to capture that information to drive priorities in other plans.

Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that this is another opportunity to recognize which programs that CPB identifies as priorities. Maybe CPB could include a paragraph in the FPP to note all the programs that received 17 points.

Mr. Struck mentioned that for the last FPP, CPB decided to adjust the order of a few programs, even though they ranked differently. CPB could also decide to modify the goal weighting. The purpose of this exercise is just to get a general idea of which programs are higher priorities on an objective basis.

Mr. Struck stated that at the last CPB meeting, Chapter 7 was conditionally approved. Chapter 7 includes a list of the top prioritized program areas. In the last FPP, the top 33% were listed in the text of the plan (highlighted). CPB could decide to include just the top 25 programs or whatever other number they chose is important.

Chairperson Ross asked the group, with the list in Chapter 7, what Ozaukee County wants to invest in; Ozaukee County needs to do more work on these programs. Chairperson Ross asked what happened with the top ranked programs in the last FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that the Department and other Departments worked on these top 34 program areas, according to capacity and funding. Funding is available to some program areas and not others. At the end of the day, if a program can't be funded, it can't happen, even if it is the first priority program. Mr. Struck asked CPB if there is money available for a program, should the county take advantage of it, even if it is low priority in this list?

Supervisor Vogel asked if Mr. Struck could go through each program and provide input on whether or not a program is feasible.

Mr. Struck noted that county staff need to have a menu of programs to work on or choose from because funding and outside priorities change (e.g. Towns, State, Federal Government, etc.). However, it is still important to understand Ozaukee County's priorities.

Chairperson Ross noted that understanding how the list of priority programs gets used is important for understanding how to prioritize programs.

Mr. Struck stated that program #1 in the last FPP, on page 117 of the agenda packet from June's CPB meeting, was completed and was incorporated to Ozaukee County's Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan. That program area translates to Ozaukee County's oversight on land divisions.

Chairperson Ross asked about the value of limiting the top programs listed in Chapter 7 to a certain number.

Mr. Struck stated that the program prioritization is required by DATCP as part of the FPP, but how we prioritize and how many we list is up to Ozaukee County. The FPP is being implemented by multiple Ozaukee County departments and each Department will have its own resources, so it is probably better to have a larger program menu to draw upon. What is listed in the Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County and the FPP becomes an amendment to Ozaukee County's Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Robinson noted that the FPP requires program prioritization in a specified sequence.

Supervisor Vogel asked if the yellow highlighted list in Chapter 7 is the final deal, or the spreadsheet in the appendix of the FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that the yellow highlighted items in Chapter 7 are the top priorities from the full program list in the appendix (and those currently listed are from the last plan as we are deciding priorities for this plan now).

Supervisor Vogel asked why there are so many programs to rank.

Mr. Struck stated that these are the program areas that we decided upon and that there are many programs included because the FPP lasts for 10 years. Ozaukee County staff review most of the programs listed at some point over the course of 10 years to see if implementation is feasible and desired.

Chairperson Ross asked CPB members how to turn this discussion into action beyond this meeting and asked how the County Board, the Natural Resources Committee (NRC), or the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) does that. Chairperson Ross asked if there could be more columns added to the ranking table that show which committee(s) and / or Departments should take up action on each program, to provide guidance. For example, if

Ozaukee County wants to pursue easement funding, then funding needs to be identified and pursued. Which Committee is responsible?

Mr. Struck noted that the annual County budget is how programs are implemented at the Department level and prioritized at the County Board level. Mr. Struck uses these plan references and priorities of these programs to the NRC and County Board frequently.

Supervisor Vogel asked if conservation easements are always a top ranked program.

Mr. Struck said that during all of our planning efforts, it has been a priority program.

Supervisor Vogel asked how Ozaukee County can work to implement that program area.

Mr. Struck noted that funding is needed to implement the program and one step might be if Ozaukee County had some dedicated matching funds available (perhaps a budget or capital proposal). This was suggested during the last FPP, a proposal to fund easement or fee simple purchases. It's also possible that some programs change or are not possible anymore due to legislative changes, so that's why a menu of priorities is useful.

Chairperson Ross asked if CPB members were happy with the process from the last FPP, having the list of approximately 32 programs. Chairperson Ross noted that he is also thinking about how these fit into Ozaukee County's Strategic Plan document.

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that Mr. Robinson mentioned at the last CPB meeting that Ozaukee County is doing a lot more than other SE region counties in their FPP. Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that he could write a letter / memo to Mr. Struck to discuss priority programs. Some program information needs to get to the towns, villages and cities in Ozaukee County; they probably have more of a role in some program areas. Vice-Chairperson Richart noted that he thinks many individuals throughout the county understand about environmental corridors.

Mr. Struck stated that Ozaukee County has still been doing outreach with the municipalities about environmental corridors. For example, Mr. Struck noted that the Town of Cedarburg didn't recognize environmental corridors in their Comprehensive Plan in 2010, but they are recognized in Ozaukee County's Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Robinson mentioned that the Town of Cedarburg updated their Comprehensive Plan last year, and the plan now includes primary environmental corridors, but not secondary environmental corridors.

Supervisor Vogel stated that he doesn't know how many other people care about natural areas, but he does; these areas have to be protected, or else Ozaukee County will become like Milwaukee County.

Mr. Struck noted that it is difficult for Planning and Parks Department staff to look at one hundred programs at once, so it's valuable for CPB to give priority to the programs, even if it is a starting place and ultimately can't be pursued due to lack of funding or other issues.

Supervisor Holyoke stated that the FPP could recognize the programs that scored 17, 16, 15, and 14 total points and those would be the top priorities from the CPB. The NRC considers the FPP as part of both the Planning and Parks Department and Land and Water Management Department as well as UWEX and other partners like NRCS.

Mr. Struck noted that when the Planning and Parks Department brings an item to NRC, that is because it's identified in a county plan and there are also outside priorities for funding. The top seven programs on the list from the last FPP were worked on significantly, so county staff do use the FPP to guide actions.

Chairperson Ross asked how the Land and Water Management Department uses the FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that the FPP priorities were included in their Land and Water Management Plan. They also work off of the FPP and have looked at these program priorities. There are also some programs that the two departments work on together. The FPP is even used for joint projects with the Highway Department. For example, the County Highway W project was a priority for both the Planning and Parks Department and the Highway Department. Most of these programs take time; they can sometimes require a 5–10-year effort.

Vice-Chairperson Richart asked if more paragraphs could be added to the FPP text.

Mr. Robinson stated that yes, another paragraph that states the top 10 or so overall programs could be created.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks there should be two different lists of programs. One list should include just FPP priorities, and the other list should include overall program priorities.

Supervisor Holyoke noted that another table could be made showing all the programs that received total scores of 17 and 16; those are the priority programs for the CPB.

Chairperson Ross stated that columns could be added to the ranking tables for groups like the NRC, Planning and Parks Department, CPB, municipalities, County Board, etc., and check marks could be added to rows for programs that the group(s) have a role in. Certain programs may have check marks in all these groups' columns. This could make the long list of programs actionable by specific organizations.

Mr. Struck stated that staff can attempt to create this table for inclusion in the FPP.

Supervisor Vogel stated that he thinks this would be a good idea, as it ties everything together.

Mr. Struck asked Chairperson Ross to send him the column categories that he would like to include.

Mr. Robinson noted that most of the programs in the FPP were derived from Ozaukee County's Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan as well as the last FPP.

Mr. Struck stated that staff can compile a table of the top 30% of the programs and see how many that is. Then staff can create a separate table for all programs that received total scores of 16 and 17 from CPB members. Finally, another table can be made to show the roles of different groups implementing the programs.

Chairperson Ross noted that the last table could just be a part of one of the other tables, with columns added.

Supervisor Vogel brought up environmental corridors, saying that Ozaukee County could go ahead and propose a tax that goes to what the public desires. If money is the only thing stopping an action from being taken, action should be taken to get more funds.

Mr. Struck stated that the CPB could bring this proposed action to the County Board if desired.

Chairperson Ross stated that he thinks there needs to be a document that states how each program is prioritized, such as a cover letter, executive summary, or separate memo that teases out the priorities for the County Board to view.

Supervisor Vogel stated that he doesn't want this information to get buried.

Chairperson Ross noted that Ozaukee County could establish a referendum to see if public approves of imposing a levy. That won't happen if the CPB doesn't think it should happen; it has to be pushed up to the County Board. If the CPB doesn't say a program is a priority, the NRC won't do it, and the County Board won't weigh in on it.

Supervisor Vogel asked CPB members if they would support moving forward with getting funding from Ozaukee County residents for the purchase of environmental easements, or similar.

Chairperson Ross said yes, if that is a top scoring program from the CPB.

Mr. Struck stated that there are multiple program areas that address environmental corridors. Program #56 is "Protect environmental corridors through the County plat review process." And program #52 is "Further develop the County fee simple and conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program to protect natural resource areas identified on Maps 2.24 and 2.25."

Vice-Chairperson Richart stated that he agrees yes with Supervisor Vogel's question, whether they would support moving forward with getting funding from Ozaukee County residents for the purchase of environmental easements, or similar.

Supervisor Vogel stated that once land is gone, it's gone. There is only one chance to protect it from development.

Mr. Struck stated that a list could be made of the top programs based on overall score or raw score. The CPB could vote to adjust programs related to conservation easements up in the list regardless of their scoring.

Chairperson Ross asked if CPB members would be okay with including scores of 14 and up in the priority list table.

All CPB members agreed.

Mr. Struck stated that staff will work on listing all programs with scores of 14 and up based on the rankings completed as well as the other suggestions for the priority listing noted above.

6. Other Business

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

Mr. Struck noted that former Ozaukee County Board member and current SEWRPC Commissioner, Natalia Minkel-Dumit, was here at the CPB meeting today and thanked her for attending.

Ms. Minkel-Dumit mentioned that she was here just check-in today on the CPB and noted that the SEWRPC budget request is coming up soon in front of the County Executive Committee.

There was no other business brought before the CPB.

7. Next Meeting Date(s) – Wednesday, AUGUST 20, 2025

Chairperson Ross stated that the next CPB meeting will be Wednesday, August 20th.

Mr. Struck: noted that we hope to have a draft of chapter 5 at the next meeting, but that it likely will be conditional based on feedback from the municipalities (e.g. Towns and City of Mequon). We also hope to have additional municipal input to discuss at that time and will discuss the revised and updated program rankings.

8. Adjournment

Supervisor Holyoke made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Supervisor Vogel. All in favor. The meeting adjourned at 10:57 AM.