

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
January 15th, 2014 9:00 AM
COUNTY BOARD ROOM

Secretary Mike Nelson called the meeting to order at 9:02 AM.

Nelson verified that the Open Meeting Law requirements had been complied with through notifications and posting.

Committee members present: George Brandt, Tom Bice, Michael Nelson, Ed Patzner Kathy Zeglin and Jeff Bawek. Hensel Vold has officially resigned from County Board and Jay Low was absent.

Staff/Advisors present: Kevin Lien, Virginette Gamroth, and Jake Budish. Keith VerKuilen, Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke and County Board Chair Ernest Vold were present for part of the meeting.

Others present: Gary Bixby, Mary Ann Bixby, Tom Forrer, Tim Zeglin.

Adoption of Agenda – Brandt made a motion to approve the amended agenda, Zeglin seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke stated he had received a letter from an attorney regarding the removal of the Chair at the last meeting and whether it was consistent with Open Meeting Law because it wasn't on the agenda. Radtke stated he did some research on that topic and he doesn't change his opinion as to whether that needs to be on the agenda or not, but with that said, what is on the agenda today, is the "Election of Chair" and the Wisconsin Statutes, Chapter 59.12/13 talks about the County Board Chair person and that they serve until a successor is elected, meaning that if a new Chair is elected, the old Chair is unelected, if you will. If someone (and Radtke wasn't saying there was an open meeting violation, there is no complaint filed) were to file a complaint, the Court would be deciding whether there would be a violation or not. One of the potential remedies would be to void any action that was done as part of any violation of Open Meeting Law. Having this on the agenda and voting today on a new Chair, in Radtke's opinion, would correct any procedure (if there was a mistake and Radtke wasn't saying there was) that might not have been consistent with Open Meeting Law at the last meeting. As this is on the agenda today, it would be appropriate for the Committee to consider and take action on it, thus making any possible violation no longer voidable, if you will. With that said, Radtke just wanted to let the Committee know that (Radtke isn't saying there is a violation) he was forwarded an opinion by another attorney who said it may have not have been consistent with Open Meeting Law. Radtke wanted to let the Committee know that before it took action on election of the Chair that any action today, in Radtke's opinion, would cure any defect if there were any at the last meeting.

Election of Chair – Secretary Nelson called for nominations for Chair. Zeglin nominated George Brandt. Nelson called for any other nominations three times. There being no further nominations, Nelson closed the nominations and asked for a second to the nomination. Patzner seconded the nomination. A voice vote was taken with Bawek, Zeglin and Patzner voting in favor. Nelson voted in opposition stating that he felt since there were only three meetings left things could have been left as they were. Upon Gamroth inquiring if Nelson was the only one voting in opposition, Nelson asked Bice if he had voted. Bice stated he did not and that he was abstaining from the vote.

Nelson stated he had questions that he wanted to ask at this time. Nelson stated there was a gentleman that spoke at one of the public hearings about two or three months and said that Bawek received payment from a

mine company. Nelson has received several calls about that as to how Bawek could be serving. Nelson asked Bawek if that was true or not? Bawek responded that was not true and that he did not get a payment. Nelson commented that there was no problem as he has had several calls about that issue. Upon Nelson stating that it was just an accusation that wasn't true, Bawek replied that was correct.

Nelson asked Zeglin if she was attending the Towns' Association meetings to bring feedback every month to the E & LU Committee from those meetings. Zeglin questioned "feedback"? Zeglin stated she did not attend the last meeting because she had been personally assassinated at the prior two, but as far as "feedback", she felt there really hasn't been anything that she can bring back to this forum. Nelson stated he was questioned about that also and that he was just doing his job. At this point Nelson turned the meeting over to Brandt.

Chairman Brandt stated the fifth item on the agenda was to convene into Closed Session and inquired if the attorney was present. Radtke stated Attorney Ron Stadler came up the prior evening and took ill. He had to call another attorney, Aaron Graf and he is on his way. Radtke was anticipating that he would be here around 11:00AM. Upon Brandt asking Radtke to describe what the attorney's reason for being here was to whatever extend he was able, Radtke replied he didn't think he could in Open Session. Further Radtke stated he didn't know all the details that Graf is going to speak on and suggested the Committee continue on through the agenda and take a recess if needed if Graf is not yet present.

Adoption of Agenda – Nelson made a motion to adopt the agenda as presented, Brandt seconded. Motion to approve the agenda carried unopposed.

Adoption of Minutes – Zeglin made a motion to approve the minutes, Nelson seconded. Brandt made mention that the Committee can change (add in, take out) the minutes at any time. Brandt and Zeglin noted several changes to the minutes. Motion to approve the corrected minutes passed unopposed.

Review Draft of Communication Towers, Antennas and Transmitters Ordinance Revision – VerKuilen handed out copies of the Ordinance that Radtke had revised from last month's meeting. Brandt directed Radtke to go through the changes. Radtke stated what is being handed out now contains revisions, based on Radtke's notes, from last month's meeting. Radtke went through the language in the Ordinance that was new since last month. Radtke referred the Committee to Page 5, f and g, stating that both are language from the current, existing Ordinance regarding the statement, "the structure be constructed to accommodate two additional mobile service facilities" basically requiring that they build it to be able to be expanded. Radtke added that was in the existing Ordinance but is not in the Statute but it was actually one of those things that we could do. Radtke thought that after listening to last month's discussion it was something that was important to the Committee so he put that back in. The same with "g" which is a plan for abandonment and a surety to provide that money is available for the costs of tearing down and removing the structure. Lien reminded the Committee that the reason we have to go through this is that the existing Ordinance is no longer in harmony with the State Statutes that have been adopted as far as regulating towers and we are trying to modify our Ordinance to be in more harmony with that and meet the requirements of the State. The Committee moved on to Page 8. Radtke stated again this was language that was existing in our current Ordinance relating to the painting or lighting of such towers and that they be consistent with FAA (Federal Aviation Administration) requirements, i.e. strobe lights during hours of darkness. Radtke reiterated that was something that was in our existing Ordinance and the new Statute that regulates/limits the local regulation on cell towers does not say we can't do this and after discussion last month Radtke again thought that was important to put that back in. In referencing #9, Radtke thought that was in our existing Ordinance and requires a security fencing area to keep people out and also for an access drive to the site. Brandt inquired if that drive would be maintained by the owner as it doesn't say that, but it was something that was implied last month. Upon Radtke inquiring what Brandt meant by "owner", Brandt questioned if the owner of the tower maintains the drive? For example, Brandt stated let's say the build a tower at the end of Chenoweth Lane and they have to go the larger road in order to access it with emergency vehicles, Brandt asked who was responsible for plowing the snow. Lien responded the applicant is responsible for maintenance and upkeep of the road because it is not public road, it is a private drive. Radtke clarified that

Brandt was talking about a road “off” of Chenoweth Lane. Zeglin asked if some wording needed to be included about the maintenance of the road. Lien stated we have “minimum” under “b” and it says “access to service drive providing access to the structure shall be minimum necessary to provide movability to service or emergency vehicles. Committee consensus was that more detail was not needed here. Brandt commented that in reading the minutes from last months’ meeting, it seemed to him that the most important point of the discussion revolved around whether this was going to be a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) or an administrative decision. Brandt continued saying the guy from the cell tower company had said a number of county’s are going to administer the decision as oversight. The Zoning Administrator decides if the application is complete and if everything is in order and then just issues the permit. The language that we have here continues this as a CUP. Brandt asked if Radtke and VerKuilen had talked about that. Brandt referenced Page 5 (1) –New Construction of Mobile Service Support Structures:

1. The Conditional Use Permit is required for the siting and construction of any new mobile service support structure facility.

Brandt assumed that means the permit would require a Conditional Use Permit or a public hearing related to that. Radtke responded that was language that he had added in there. The Statute does not say that it has to be a CUP. Radtke had gotten that from, while drafting the language, the Table of Uses indicating that there are a few circumstances where it would be a permitted use but more circumstances where it would be a Conditional Use so that is why Radtke added that language there, that a Conditional Use Permit is required. Radtke asked Lien if he had other thoughts after meeting with some of Lien’s local colleagues. Lien stated that when he attended the last district meeting, he and his counterparts talked a little about this issue. Several of Lien’s counterparts are going through the same amendments that we are right now and it is somewhat mixed. Some are doing a CUP and some are doing an “over-the-counter” permit. Historically, any new site has required a CUP, but collocation, if they are not modifying the height of the tower, has only been a zoning permit if they are building equipment housing at or over 150 square feet. If they are not modifying equipment housing they don’t even need a permit. Lien thought that covered the majority of the work done to cell phone towers. Lien referenced #7 where Class I collocation is considered a Conditional Use Permit and required for Class I collocation. Lien suggested referencing our Ordinance there and stated that it would be a Land Use Permit only if they are at or exceeding 150 square feet with equipment housing. Lien felt then they would be modifying a footprint on the ground. Lien added that unless they were adding height to the tower, we haven’t required the CUP for collocation. Lien explained that some of the problem is with older towers, when one co-locates on them, the structure cannot take the weight of the cable, so collocation becomes a problem which has to do with the way the original structure was built. Brandt commented that Radtke had mentioned in discussions last month that what was necessary from the applicant, based on the changes in Statutes, is a written statement that they had investigated and found that collocation would not meet their needs or would be overly expensive in which case our Ordinance is not in a position to require someone to co-locate if they find it to be inefficient or too expensive. Brandt questioned if we were within the Statute changes with the language we have here. Lien commented that the applicant’s in the past usually had provided a colored map of where the proposed tower will be, the coverage area and then what is out there existing and the reason why they can’t co-locate there. Sometimes they can’t co-locate on an existing one but hopefully is doesn’t overlay the area they are trying to cover. Lien restated that usually the applicant does provide that. Radtke thought “e” and “f” are consistent with each other. “e” is simply saying (and it is part of the Statute) that they have looked into co-locating on another location or tower and it is not going to work. “f” is saying if one puts a tower up it should be built in a way that it can take on other collocations. Radtke didn’t think they were inconsistent and there is nothing in the new Statute that says we cannot do that. Lien referred the Committee to the next page, #6, “the County may disapprove an application if an applicant refuses to evaluate the feasibility collocation within the applicant’s search range and provide the sworn statement described in paragraph B(2). Lien felt this issue was sufficiently covered. In regard to a Class I collocation versus Class II, (was being discussed last month but nothing was settled) Radtke had listed Class II collocation as a permitted use which as Lien had referenced would be a type of “over-the-counter” permit. Brandt inquired where the CUP public hearing process stopped and the “over the counter” permitting started? Radtke responded it is up to the County or this Committee to decide how they want this Ordinance to read and whether you would want Class I or Class II collocations to also go through that type of CUP or just a land use permit. Other counties are looking at doing the entire thing as a land use

permit. Obviously that is not consistent with our Table of Uses but there is a lot of flexibility here. Because Radtke wrote this as a draft doesn't mean that he is saying the Committee should approve this, he just went with the statutory language and just made it consistent with our current Ordinance. Bice commented we can do a lot more regulation here but we need to remember that if we get too difficult on this industry, they are going to go to the State and the State is going to come in and say you have abused your right to regulate this and take away our ability to look at this. Bice's opinion was to do as much of this as administratively possible, rather than make them come down, pay the money, and go through the hearing as we get nothing out of that. Brandt asked Lien to clarify if the Class I collocations were an "over-the-counter" permit. Brandt didn't recall anyone coming in for a CUP for a Class I collocation. Lien didn't think there has been one as a Class I, in Lien's opinion it would require modification to the tower/increase in height. It is not real clear when one looks through the Class I. Class II is basically what the County has been doing where it is an "over-the-counter" permit when one adds to a tower. Ironically, Lien stated, in regard to what Bice said, that is why we are doing this as the State has already taken our ability away. Lien explained we had an Ordinance in place and so did many other county's regulating this and then it was turned over to the Public Service Commission (PSC) to come up with these recommendations that gave us strict guidelines which Radtke has reviewed. Now we are modifying our Ordinance to meet those guidelines by the State. Lien thought that when towers first started to be built, they were much more controversial than they are today. That was before everyone realized that a cell phone was useless if one didn't have a tower nearby. Lien stated there were huge meetings here for cell towers because people didn't want them on the landscape and then once more and more people bought cell phones, he thought they relaxed on the issue. Lien felt across the State there was so much controversy that the State stepped in and said this is going be the sealing on your rules. To answer Brandt's question, Lien stated to himself it isn't real clear, the definitive decision is a judgment call between a Class I and Class II. Lien thought it was ok to have it in the Ordinance because if someone came in for an existing tower and we would review the information and they are going to modify the height (especially if they are exceeding 200 feet) then FAA requirements immediately "kick in". In Lien's opinion, if we don't have that as an option, one wouldn't want to give an over-the-counter permit for something that is exceeding 200 feet because there are lighting and other FAA requirements that must apply. Lien was alright with the language from a staff perspective because staff reviews the applications all the time making a judgment call between a Class I from a Class II. If they are not modifying the height, the collocation would just be an over-the-counter permit similar to the Class II now. If someone comes in regarding a pre-existing tower and they are going to extend the height (especially exceeding 200 feet) Lien thought it should come back before the Committee as a CUP. Brandt asked if VerKulien had anything to add to this. VerKulien suggested using the definition of "Substantial modification" (Page 4) to "weed out" what we would deem as over-the-counter or conditional use. Brandt questioned where one would add the language "substantial modification" in relationship to defining Class I or Class II. Radtke stated a Class I collocation is defined as "where there is a substantial modification", so Radtke believed it would already be in there. Brandt clarified that what he is hearing is that Radtke and Lien are in agreement that the draft is sufficient to cover the concerns that both had related to either being consistent with the statutory change or being friendly to the staff and their ability to process permit applications. In continuing on, Radtke noted the only thing he has highlighted is Chapter 10. Radtke continued by saying the way the existing Ordinance reads, regarding applications, it asks that the application provide the information in #1 though 4 and the information that is required under 10.04. Radtke explained that 10.04 (3)(b), it says the applicant must provide the following information (1-4) and the other information in 10.04 which is information in the Ordinance regarding general requirements for a CUP. It has a section on applications and what type of information needs to be in an application. In 10.04 it says, "all information required under a land use permit listed in 10.01 which specifically lists; name and address of the property owner, signature of property owner, agent, proof of ownership of parcel, tax parcel id, deed, legal description or other identifiers of subject property, accurate plot plan drawn at a scale which produces a clearly legible drawing showing the following; boundaries, dimensions, spatial relationships of the site to abutting public highways, right-of-ways, easements, navigable waters, locations or dimensions of any existing or proposed structures in relationship to any boundaries existing, proposed wells, sanitary waste disposal systems, ordinary high water mark, locations of any highways, access points, parking, private driveways, and then any additional information that may be required by the zoning administrator and also water supply and sewage disposal, satisfactory evidence that a safe and adequate supply of water, approved sewage

disposal facility be provided. Radtke explained this was sort of a “catch all” to get all the information in there. In looking at the draft, the Statutes specifically say what needs to be in that application. Radtke was questioning whether or not that was adequate or whether we need to have the extra information that Chapter 10 requires. Radtke added that what the Statute requires is (on Page 5, subpart II (a) through (g), the name and business address of, and the contact information for the applicant, the location of the proposed or affected support structure, the location of the proposed mobile service facility, construction plan, and then it goes into the explanations of why the applicant did not choose collocation and the required additional space on there. Brandt asked if we need to know where the driveways, septic systems, wells, distances to road are, and is that important and why would it be important if it was. Lien responded that it was very important when we had more restrictive height requirements or setback requirements. Now that has been limited some, however Lien still felt some of those things were necessary. Brandt noted that the setback restrictions were related to the height of the tower and inquired what it was. Lien stated it was height of the tower plus ten. VerKuilen stated in the Statute it outlines that we can’t enforce a setback greater than what has been applied to commercial buildings. VerKuilen, Lien in discussions with Doelle had determined that a 100 foot setback, like that of ag buildings in the County, would be sufficient. Brandt stated we are basically going from a fall zone plus 10 feet to 100 feet. Lien thought that might be a stretch but it was the only thing where we have pre-existing language in our Ordinance that exceeds standard language. If one applies for a new livestock facility, the minimum setback from a property line is 100 feet. Now to call that a commercial facility there is probably some gray area but we have that existing language because it under ag through our Ordinance. Most of that is permitted uses with the exception of new or expanding. We talked amongst staff saying 100 feet is still pretty minimal for these but actually through the state requirements they can have pretty much a zero fall zone because it is a collapsible tower that should fall on itself. Lien added he had talked to the applicant after last month’s meeting and a multiple guide wire failure would need to occur for it to drop. Zeglin asked if there was any setback language in the new Ordinance as written. VerKuilen responded that he thought all it discussed was that an applicant had the option to provide a fall zone letter basically trumping that 100 foot setback that we set. In talking with the applicant from last months’ meeting, he had told Lien that would probably affect 90-98% of the towers today will be that and will provide the letter that it falls within their fall zone, so in reality there is no setback anymore. Lien felt a tower could potentially be placed in any of the zoning districts on Table 2.05 of the County Zoning Ordinance. Lien explained that right now a tower is a conditional use but they can’t be put up in a R8 or R20 zoning district. With the new Ordinance, Lien didn’t think there was any State language that limited where a tower can go, so a tower could basically be erected in a middle of a subdivision. For the language regarding Chapter 10, Radtke thought is sounded like it that would be good information to have in there, so what Radtke had highlighted in yellow he has crossed out and the sentence immediately under it he modified to say, “the application must contain the information required in 10.04 and the following information”, so it is written in a way that is consistent with our existing Ordinance. Radtke noted that would be carried through to Class I and Class II collocation and also under Class II, “the application would include information required under 10.01 which is the land use permit application language and then the following language that is listed. Brandt noted the change to the draft as crossing out “Chapter 10 of the County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance does not apply” and replace with the required information in 10.04 and then on the Page 7, 10.01. Radtke stated, in regard to the fee for the permit, there is a blank line there. The Statute caps the tower itself at \$3,000 and Class I collocations not to exceed \$3,000 and a Class II not to exceed \$500, so there is flexibility. Upon Radtke inquiring what the existing Ordinance requires for a fee, Lien responded he didn’t have that information on hand, but believed the fee schedule was based on height – there is a fee for those under 200 feet and then a different fee for those that are over. Lien added all towers require a CUP which is \$225.00. Lien added the towers that are less than 200 feet only require an “over- the- counter” permit, there is no CUP required for them. Lien stated we haven’t charged these fees. The one thing we have done, which is in harmony with it, is that almost every one of our towers has the standard \$20,000 bond for reclamation removal and this language is consistent with that as it says a presumed reasonable dollar amount is \$20,000 or less, so we are consistent with that. That is under (F) Limitations – Surety Requirement. Lien continued that it would be up to the Committee. We are limited on what we can place as far as conditions now. This will still require staff time and review. Lien asked what the Committee’s wishes were for a fee. Brandt clarified that in the past, there was no fee related to staff time and review, it was just one of the things staff did. Lien thought, that

like other county's, when it went to nonmetallic mining, they were charging fees of \$15,000 for a plan review fee and some county's were charging exorbitant amounts for review fees as well so they capped it for that reason saying that a reasonable fee would be \$3,000 or less. Lien commented that we should definitely be compensated for our time which includes the public hearing, posting of publications, the Committees' time, etc. Zeglin suggested splitting the difference and setting the fee at \$1,500. Brandt commented that was a bit of a jump. Lien expressed that what he thought was different now was basically the staff needs to go through the application more thoroughly than they have in the past because the County cannot address the concerns and put conditions on them anymore or only very limited conditions. Lien thought it was probably going to require more staff time for more review and greater detail because staff will be certifying that the application is complete and no conditions can be placed outside of what the Ordinance allows. Zeglin made a motion that the permit fee be set at \$1,500.00, Patzner seconded. Radtke reminded the Committee that there is a Class I collocation permit, Class II collocation permit and then there is the general and questioned which one the fee is applicable to. Radtke also wanted to echo Lien's concern in regard to staff time. Radtke stated another thing this Ordinance will do is require staff to act fast as there is five days in which the applicant has to be notified if the application is not complete – that is almost a drop everything, look at right now kind of approach. Radtke thought that obviously impacts work load. Brandt commented there are actually three places that we need to put in a number in which two of them have a \$3,000 cap and one has a \$500 cap. In Lien's opinion, a new permit application or a Class I collocation are very similar and he felt a similar fee there would be appropriate. Lien added the only thing that would vary from that would be the Class II where we are already limited to \$500 on that one. Lien thought a new site or a collocation require almost the same type of information and the plans to review would be very similar so those two fees could be consistent but when one goes to Class II that is where one gets to an "over-the-counter" permit. Zeglin revised her motion stating that the fee for the new permit be set for \$1,500 and also the Class I collocation permit be set at \$1,500 and the Class II collocation at \$500. Zeglin asked if \$500 was suitable for the amount of work. Lien thought that was more than fair. Patzner agreed to the revision of the motion and seconded it. Bice stated he didn't want to comment on the fees to much but suggested that for the most part all towers are here for two reasons; one to provide a service and the other reason is to turn a profit. Bice thought everyone in the room would agree, unless you have to look at the tower, that they are good things, most people think that cell phones and other communication devices like this are an advantage so Bice would hope that we don't discourage anybody from coming into Trempealeau County and setting up a business because that is very beneficial to the health and safety of the people here in Trempealeau County. Brandt recapped that we have a motion and a second to set the permit fees for a new tower and Class I collocation at \$1,500 and Class II collocation at \$500. Motion carried with no opposition. Brandt stated Radtke and/or Lien had mentioned the turnaround time for permits. Brandt referred the Committee to Page 6, #4, "an applicant submits an application to the County, if the County does not believe the application is complete, the County shall notify the applicant in writing within 10 days". Brandt questioned if that was consistent with the Statute and then #5, Within 90 days of its receipt of a complete application, the county shall complete all of the following or the applicant may consider the application approved". Brandt asked if that was consistent with the language of the Statute and if we have that three month window. Radtke responded that is the exact language verbatim. Lien added the Class II notifications were doable as well. Brandt called for any other discussion and then inquired of Radtke what the next step would be. Radtke stated the next step, since this is a Zoning Ordinance, would actually be a public hearing. Nelson made a motion to approve the Ordinance revision for a public hearing next month, Zeglin seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

Committee input on Letter to all existing Industrial Sand Mines regarding Ordinance amendment to go into effect January 25th, 2014. Upon Brandt inquiring if there was a letter in the Committees' packets, Lien stated there was not. Lien stated what had been discussed through the public hearing process and with the Committee is that upon adoption and implementation of the four revisions to the Ordinance that were approved at County Board, there would be a letter going out to all industrial sand mining companies, with attached conditions that this Committee had placed on them, and informing them that they now have twelve months from the date of the letter to comply with and meet all of their conditions to get the permit issued. The same thing would go out to the ones that have an existing permit that are non-operational informing them that they have

twelve months to become operational be actively producing sand or those permits will be revoked as well. Both of those were kind of on the request of the Towns' Association. They had said they didn't like these mines sitting idle on the landscape. The Ordinance amendments we made, Lien believed remedied that. With the calls that Lien and Budish have already received they can tell that people are stepping up to meet those conditions. Lien noted that no letters have been sent out yet. The applicants that we are hearing nothing from we presume will probably fall by the wayside. Lien added that these requests came from the public as well. There are people that have homes for sale or have sold homes because there is a proposed mine by them and it may never materialize. Lien thought this was a good faith effort by this Committee that if they are going to be actively mining sand then they should move in that direction, if not, reclaim the site or the permit be revoked, whichever the case may be. Radtke and Lien wanted to know if the Committee had any input on the letter to be sent or if they were alright with staff working with Radtke on the letter. Lien's intentions were to have each individual letter be tailored so that it has the existing conditions that the Committee placed on each site attached to the letter so they know what their requirements are. Radtke had asked Lien to put this on the agenda so that we could communicate this with the Committee. Right now the Ordinance is not effective, it would go effective January 25th, as at this point we don't have any objections in from the Towns and so Radtke is anticipating that would take effect on the 25th of January. Radtke stated they are working on a letter as how to communicate that. Radtke was looking for some direction from the Committee as to how we go about that. We are talking about applications that were approved but there is no permit issued because they haven't taken care of the preliminary type conditions. Our Ordinance requires that the preliminary conditions are explicitly stated that these must be provided for or taken care of before the permit would be issued. The old CUP's that were granted don't necessarily identify what are preliminary conditions. The question Radtke has, is the Committee satisfied with the Department just sending a letter saying here is what we believe to be the preliminary conditions and we're now explicitly stating these, and you will have twelve months from the date of the letter to resolve/take care of these or stand to have your approval lapse. Brandt asked Radtke to give him an example of why Radtke thinks the Committee or staff has not communicated specifically what the preliminary conditions were. In Brandt's mind, things like a bond, approval from the DNR, certain testing, etc. is all fairly specific. In talking with Budish, Radtke asked him to look at and see some of these older ones that were approved some time ago and questioned whether any of them expressly state that this is a condition that must be complied with before issuance. Radtke stated the answer was no, but it was understood. Radtke felt now it was important to formally identify the "understood" preliminary conditions for that applicant so that they know exactly since our Ordinance now says that they must expressly be stated that they are preliminary conditions. Radtke didn't think there was any confusion which ones are preliminary; it is just that we need to go through them and look at which ones the Department would require before issuance and the ones that are "understood" and then specifically identify those. Radtke felt that would be consistent with the Ordinance and important to communicate that. Based off that, Radtke questioned if the Committee was satisfied just having the Department send out a letter or would the Committee like to see drafts of the letter before they go out, to whether or not they are satisfied. Another alternative that Radtke thought of was to bring the applicants back in to the Committee to do a review of their conditions and make it more of an action by the Committee. Radtke didn't think that was absolutely necessary but it would be more formal and it would be a direction from the Committee on this. Radtke was just looking for some direction on this issue as to how the Committee would like to see this taken care of. Lien commented that he thought, the preliminary approved ones, come into play when an applicant comes before the County and now that we're talking past tense, permits that this Committee has approved, all the conditions apply, it doesn't matter if they are preliminary, etc., they all apply and all of those have to be met at this point from those individuals. Lien added we can go through and identify them but Lien really didn't think it was going to matter, but in Lien's mind, in twelve months they have to complete all of them so that the County can actually issue the permit. Lien added there are many permits that have never been signed by the Chairman because they haven't done anything. Radtke responded there are conditions, i.e. trucks need to be tarped that are not standard. Radtke was saying to look at the ones that must be done before the permits issued versus the ones that are more operational. Radtke agreed completely that all the conditions must be met prior to issuance but there are some that say you must have these done before we even issue a permit. Lien stated he was hoping the Committee would give staff discretion on them, but stated some of the first permits that were issued we don't have conditions such as trucks must be tarped, etc. Lien thought some of them might not have

even required DOT input on them because they were so new. Lien continued that if we see they are going to work towards completing that permit, Lien would like to for sure bring those back to the Committee and review those conditions because Lien's guess is that we have learned a lot in the last four years and some permits have been out there four years. Lien thought the Committee is going to want to add or remove some conditions that are just not realistic. Lien knew for sure that there are some permits that should have conditions added to them, i.e. some we may not even know the haul route. Nelson stated he felt the Department could handle it along with Radtke. Nelson didn't think the Committee needed to be sending these letters. Nelson added the Committee has already approved this and felt the Department should be able to take care of it. Brandt agreed. Zeglin commented we have built the structure already into the Ordinances and she saw nothing wrong with the staff implementing that. Lien commented the Committee can be kept updated every month as to what the staff is seeing for responses back. Lien thought that if some of the early permits with minimal requirements were going to move forward, we probably would want to revisit them. The potential is that it might be a new operator, we have that new language already that if we have a change in operators that the Committee would like to review the conditions anyway. As Nelson remembered, Winn Bay was the first mine that was approved and since then they have sold out and since that they have annexed to the City of Blair and we have no control or questioned what the story is there. Lien explained a little debate is currently going on with Preferred Sands regarding compliance of NR-135 and their annual bill. Lien explained we charge an annual fee for meeting and tracking the compliance of NR-135 and the reclamation. The City of Blair officially took over March 15th and signed a memorandum of understanding with the County, a bond was created with the City and released from the County all on that date. So when Budish send out the annual billing, Preferred Sands was sent a bill which covered January 1st thru March 15th. Lien added that DNR has responded to this issue saying that DNR understands the situation, NR-135 doesn't allow for a breakdown but we should urge the City of Blair to recoup because the applicant has to pay a 12 month fee. Preferred Sands has agreed they are going to pay it all to the City of Blair because they have annexed to them. DNR isn't going to get involved because they're paying the annual fee meeting the requirements. In their letter, the DNR urged the County to work with the City of Blair to recoup the funds from January 1st thru March 15th. Lien added that site is completely under the jurisdiction of the City of Blair but in reading the paper, they have gone to the City of Blair and asked about trucking, which initially that site was prohibited from any trucking because they have rail access. They want to truck material into that site so now again they are utilizing County and town roads. Patzner commented he thought Preferred Sands is going to give the City so much per ton. Radtke advised the Committee that they were getting to far off base. Lien stated the review of the permits was basically done when it was transferred from Winn Bay to Preferred Sands. There have been others that have come in. We have a prospective one in the future that we will bring back in so it gives the Committee that rapport and the opportunity to go through that list of conditions with the current applicant. Once they annex to a different body, we pretty much have no involvement. Brandt stated that Nelson and Zeglin have weighed in on the question that Radtke has posed as to whether the Committee wants any input on letters that are sent after January 25th to existing/currently permitted mines. Upon Brandts' inquiry as to whether there needed to be action from the Committee or not, Radtke responded he didn't think so. Brandt reminded the Committee that Lien had stated that with permitted mines there may be an opportunity to revisit some of those conditions.

Farmland Preservation Planning Grant - Lien informed the Committee that we have the opportunity to apply for a grant through DATCP (Dept. of Ag, Trade and Consumer Protection). Lien explained the grant would be a maximum of \$30,000 that requires matching funds of \$30,000. This would allow us to comply with our Farmland Preservation (FLP) requirements which are one of the elements of the Smart Growth Plan. Each and every County was required to adopt a Smart Growth Plan as of January 2010. The Smart Growth Plan needs to be updated every 10 years, so this Planning Grant money would allow us to renew that one single element. Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission (MSRRPC) has been contacted and the grant has been discussed with them. What Lien learned is that MSRRPC staff time, to develop a plan for us, can be used as the matching, so if MSRRPC charges the County \$30,000 to develop a plan, that is our matching grant amount. In essence, Lien stated we get the plan done for \$30,000 and the State will reimburse us, MSRRPC charges the County \$30,000 and it doesn't cost the County anything. Lien added that the one variable that we would have to review would be if we don't receive the whole \$30,000. MSRRPC has said they will work with

the County on that. Lien didn't want to get caught in a circumstance where we apply for the \$30,000 Grant, have an agreement with MSRRPC and then we are only awarded \$10,000. Lien didn't want the County to be liable for \$20,000, but MSRRPC has said they will work with the County on that. Lien wishes were for the Committee to allow DLM to move forward with an application for the \$30,000 Grant and we can see what we get from that, but in our proposal it will contain the fact that the matching will be coming from MSRRPC for their staff input and hours at the \$30,000 Grant level so the County doesn't have to come up with any additional funds. Bice questioned where the grant money is from. Lien responded the \$30,000 is coming from DATCP to meet the requirements of FLP. Lien explained there is a Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 application process and we were on Tier 2. Tier 1 did not utilize all the money so it bumped us up on the schedule as we were originally scheduled for 2015. Peter Fletcher, MSRRPC has encouraged us to move forward with this, as other county's have and he has worked with them. Fletcher already has a sample contract for us that we could utilize in regard to planning services. Lien added that if we get money from them that is a great step because we have to do the planning/work for it anyway. Lien reminded the Committee that every year we put money aside to do three town revisions. So in 2015 we can do our county wide revision to each towns land use plans and then in 2020 meeting the statutory requirements for revising again. Lien stated we budget for that money every year because we know it is coming. If we are able to get the grant that will help us along in the budget process and complete one of those elements that we have to revisit anyway. Bice stated that in working with Fletcher, one is working through Smart Growth and asked if Lien was sure that applies to Farmland Preservation. Lien replied that is definitely one of the elements of the Smart Growth Plan. Lien is worried about the fact that if we don't do this it might look poorly from DATCP's perspective and they provide DLM with staffing grants, etc. If we don't do this, at least move forward with the application process to meet our statutory requirements of FLP, that we might not look as favorably as a County if we're not asserting the right direction in order to comply. Lien thought DATCP was giving us a great opportunity. If we wouldn't get the entire grant the Committee could revisit the issue, but Lien felt we at least needed to apply for it. Brandt recapped that DATCP is offering grants for FLP planning which an element of the Smart Growth Plan. Brandt asked if what MSSRPC is offering is related specifically and only to FLP planning. Lien responded yes it would only be for that one element because that is what the grant is specifically for. Brandt understood what Lien was saying about the Comprehensive Plan and he was hoping that this wasn't somehow going to be spread out over the other planning elements. Brandt asked Lien to talk a little bit about where FLP was at. Brandt understood we have contracts but he also understands that the program is decommissioned, so to speak, it is now the Working Lands Initiative. Lien stated the Working Lands Initiative is the latest version of it but we still have a lot of FLP contracts existing. Every year they drop off a little bit but statutorily we have to maintain those and update them, so this would be solely for that purpose and to be in compliance. We haven't revisited this in awhile, it was definitely an element of our planning grant (in 2010) but they have never offered us money to revisit how this is working. As of right now we have not had interest in a large scale grant application. Lien suggested talking to Judy Betker more specifically, as she administers the program. Lien knew that Betker has had some inquiries about the Working Lands Initiative. There has to be a pool of people and a large number of acres. Lien didn't think that program has been perceived statewide as well as the original FLP program was. Lien knows his counterparts from other counties have done applications and have implemented it but we sure haven't seen the response that we had with FLP. Nelson and Lien agreed that there are a lot of hoops to jump through with the Working Lands Program. Lien guessed this might be a first step to bringing back FLP contracts. Bice inquired as to how much time Betker spends on FLP? Lien responded that Betker would have to be asked specifically, but added that is her primary job function. Lien added Betker's main role is the FLP contracts and she could give more information. Lien stated he could bring information next month as to how many contracts we now have. Lien thought at one time Trempealeau County probably had the highest number in the State, but every year they are expiring and dropping off. Upon Bice asking how Betker was compensated, Lien replied from the DATCP staffing grants. Bice questioned whether any of that money could be used towards the match on the grant. Lien responded no. Lien stated he was looking for a motion from the Committee to go ahead with the two page application process, (that MRRPC is going to work with the DLM on) and getting that submitted to the State. Lien added that MRRPC has sent up a contract stating that if we were awarded that, the 50% match would come from their staff time and labor so the County wouldn't be spending that money out of pocket. Lien reiterated the Committee would only have to revisit that if we weren't awarded the total grant amount. Nelson made a

motion to allow DLM to proceed with the application for the Farmland Preservation Grant, Zeglin seconded the motion. Bawek inquired if the DLM would then be going to the towns' and working with them, basically one on one, to put this together at the township level. Lien responded no, this isn't at the township level, this is at the County for all the individuals that are involved in FLP, but it is one element of that Smart Growth plan. Lien stated Bawek was on the Planning Committee for the town so he knows that was one of the elements that was talked about and discussed in that plan so this will just be updating that plan on a County wide basis. Lien didn't think there would be a lot of rapport for this revision because this is specifically for FLP, but in 2015 those plans will be revisited, with the exception of Arcadia because they just redid their plan and we're waiting for their resolution to come forward (their amendments haven't been adopted yet). Lien added Arcadia knew by going through and spending that money in 2012 and 2013 that they wouldn't be getting an update when 2015 comes around. Motion to approve staff pursuing the FLP Planning Grant carried with no opposition. At this point the Committee took a short recess. At 10:35 AM Brandt called the meeting back to order and noted that Radtke stated that the Attorney that was to be here for the Closed Session should arrive at approximately 11:00 AM. Brandt also asked that County Surveyor, Joe Nelsen come down and give his report to the Committee.

Future Staff position and funding available for position – Lien stated every year at budget time, typically Brandt talks about the possibility of adding future staff to meet the needs of our constituents. Again this year, one or two positions were talked about. Lien explained that the County scored high enough to receive a large scale TRM (Targeted Runoff Management) grant in the Elk Creek Watershed. Along with that money the County gets approximately \$75,000 for local assistance grants for staffing over the next two to three years - it is not long term or endless. With that said and because of the economy in 2013, we have about \$192,000 (this isn't an exact number and is also the most it has ever been) to go back to the General Fund from the DLM this year. Lien gave one reason as being there were a couple of mining companies that paid a double fee for public hearings. Lien stated it used to be this Committee had the ability to decide where that money went. Now this Committee can recommend and then it has to go to full County Board (because the money automatically reverts to the General Fund). Lien wanted this on the agenda to talk about additional staff possibilities. Lien explained it was rumored in 2012 when budgets were being done that our DATCP funding was going to be cut. It actually wasn't and we (WLWCA) successfully lobbied DATCP and got the funding, not only restored, but increased a little, so we received additional state funding of \$19,763. What was recouped from nonmetallic mining fees was an additional \$34,289 above what was budgeted. Building permit revenues were up. Lien noted that DLM is going to start tracking, by township, where our increased building is. Lien noted that not one new home building permit has been issued on the east side of Arcadia along Hwy 95 and there were a lot of permits issued in Ettrick and Hale townships. Lien added there was also an increase in zoning permits. Lien noted that we have met our LIDAR goals. In the past the Committee had put 50% of the excess money into the LIDAR fund and 50% to the General Fund. Lien has been told by Ann Hempel in Land Records that the LIDAR goal has been met. Bice inquired if the \$192,000 was for the 2014 budget. Lien responded this is excess money, beyond what was budgeted that reverts back to the General Fund. Bice clarified that it was the budget that was just drawn up. Lien responded that was correct. Brandt noted that in the past budget excess was due to staff salary savings but this year the excess is due to economic activity within the County which has generated fees. Lien thought some of the increase in the building and zoning permits may be a sign of the times that the economy is coming back around. Lien wanted the Committee to think about this being perhaps a time to bring new staff on. With that said, because of the moratorium, Lien had talked to Budish and he probably will have extra time to catch up on things. Lien emphasized that the large scale watershed grant is going to take staff time and right now Keith VerKuilen is the only technician because Mark Carlson has become the County Sanitarian. This is going to be a big workload and Budish has stated that as time allows he would help out with that as well. Lien added the grant is a short term work load (2-3 years) so that someone couldn't be guaranteed a long term position. Lien also had a resident from Trempealeau County send him an e-mail (Lien forwarded to Human Resources) saying that he has finished college and he is a licensed geologist and is currently working for a mining company but is looking for County employment and wondering if we had a geologist on staff, which we don't. Lien stated a geologist would be a benefit to the mining program. Brandt stated that Lien has thrown a lot of information at the Committee. Brandt asked when the money for the Elk Creek Project comes to the County. Lien responded the money is available in 2014 and practices will be put in beginning in that year.

Lien added it is like a mini-watershed and the funds can only be used in the Elk Creek area and upstream. It cannot be used for the impoundment as we have already looked into that. Lien mentioned that a lot of focus will be on stream bank work, waterways, sediment control structures, possibly fixing up some of the old barnyards that are still in operation and somewhat dilapidated. Lien thought that watershed was in affect in the late 80's. Brandt clarified that Lien was talking about a position for 2-3 years that will coincide with the Elk Creek Watershed project. To fund that Brandt thought Lien was talking about the \$70,000 plus some of the money that is carryover. Lien threw that out there because the Committee can make a recommendation to the County Board. Lien understood that full County Board has to approve what these funds would be used for but as it stands now, any excess funds from our Department reverts back to the General Fund. Lien felt this Committee could make a recommendation to set some of those funds aside for future staff or current staff, whatever, this could be a possible good use for that, keeping in mind that the watershed grant is a two-three year grant. In Lien's mind if DLM were to hire additional staff (it is probably poor timing this year because of the moratorium) that staff would work with Budish part of the time and work with VerKuilen part of the time on the large scale watershed. Brandt asked if Lien was talking about an amendment to our budget this year or something to look at for 2015. Realistically, Lien thought 2015 because one has to create a new job description, advertise, etc. In talking with staff, Lien though Budish, because of the moratorium, was willing to help out VerKuilen for this year but Budish also needs to catch up on all the stuff that has gone by the wayside because we have been swamped with mining in the last few years. Brandt clarified that Lien didn't have a job description written and no numbers in terms of what additional staff would cost. Lien stated he was just bringing it forward to the Committee because he didn't realize until the end of the year how much excess money the DLM would have. In regard to the \$75,000 available for staffing from the DATCP grant, Lien didn't think staff knew at the time of the application that those funds would be available. Lien thought it was something the Committee needed to look at now because with the moratorium in place, the budget will change drastically in 2014. Brandt requested a job description with numbers, but also recommendations for this \$192,000. Brandt asked if Lien had recommendations for what the Committee might recommend to the County Board. Lien's recommendation for now, in looking at the \$75,000 (one usually doesn't hire someone with just wages, there are benefits, etc. that come along with it) was that the Committee put \$50,000 into a non-lapsing fund for a future staff position and see how the summer starts out as right now the moratorium goes until approximately the end of August. Lien felt things might be slow until then if the moratorium is carried out for the full twelve months. Budish and Lien have had a least four mining companies come in that are working towards developing a plan, securing contracts and when the moratorium is over there is going to be an increased work load – the mining thing isn't going to go away. Lien felt that after the moratorium there is going to be an increase in mining applications. Lien wasn't asking the Committee to commit to anything but added there needs to be a decision made because the budget money reverts back to the General Fund. Lien added we also have the \$75,000 for a short period where we could use it to offset our current staff now, if it is more of a work load than what VerKuilen can do (because there is a window of time in which all the projects have to be implemented in and right now we don't know how many people are going to be interested). Right now there is a "gangbuster" approach to saving Bugle Lake so with that being there, if there is money available one would sure think the people upstream would want to get involved. The problem with that is there is always matching money required. This last year hasn't been the greatest for the farming community. We have seen trends. When the farming community income is on the rise, they are willing to pay to do conservation practices. When it is on the decline one doesn't see conservation practices going on the land. Upon Brandt's inquiry as to what the percentage was for cost sharing, Lien responded 70/30. Nelson mentioned that he thought there was a program through NRCS where the two programs can be "piggybacked" together for funds as he had talked to Mark Kunz about it. Lien has been talking with Kunz, Diane Szczepanski and Mary C. Anderson about the whole issue. Lien stated if there is a great response from landowners in the Elk Creek Watershed for this grant we may not have staff to implement it all. Lien added the same goes for the mining. Right now Budish has everything under control, but Lien didn't ever want to get to a point where Budish is taxed too much and he can't get anything done and gets frustrated and leaves because then we would have to start all over again. Brandt commented that in the past this Committee has had other money to put towards those matching funds, in other words instead of 70/30 perhaps it would be 80/20 because we were able to kick in that 10%. With this money Brandt suggested that might be a recommendation that we could send to the County Board. We have a

program, we think it is important that as many people as possible who want to be involved can be involved financially and then we put aside a certain amount of money for the matching grant – that is also a possibility. Bice stated proper representation of government is that excess money should go back to the General Fund. If we need matching money in the future we go to the taxpayer or full County Board and say, “we need some money for this program” and that is what we should vote on at that time. This Department should not put money in a kitty so that we can spend it however we see fit. That money belongs to the taxpayer and should be back in the General Fund. Bice knows that in the past Lien has said, “but Tom a lot of that money was generated by money other than direct levy money”. That is true but that money is generated through fees and other things are a result of using the public infrastructure; it didn’t come in here because we were lucky, it came in here because we had an infrastructure and a system in place to raise that money so that money still belongs to the public. Bice is a firm believer that if you are going to represent the people that elected you, you need to put that money in the General Fund. Brandt commented as Bice said, it is the County Board that determines where it is this money goes, we don’t act as a “kitty maker” but rather as a recommending body so with the suggestions that Lien has put out and this one having to do with matching funds, Brandt asked if there was anything else that this Committee sees as worthy of it advising the County Board to embrace. Lien commented he hears every year at budget time the lack of funding for the Highway Department and the road degradation. Lien felt you could say this Committee directly contributes or not to that by CUP’s that we issue or whatever. Maybe it would be a wise use of some of the money to recommend in aiding some of that. Nelson is on the Highway Committee and stated they are desperate to find money. The last couple of years they have had a little bit but just “seed” money basically. Nelson commented they are on the verge of developing a ten year plan so some road construction is done every year and is planned for ahead of time, but it will not be as much as we can handle and that is without hiring any new men. Nelson added that if some of this goes back into the General Fund perhaps it will end up at the Highway Department. Brandt felt Lien’s rationale was sound as well as the permits we grant here contribute directly to the increased use of the County highway system. Brandt asked Lien for a timeline, for a recommendation to the County Board, as to when the money goes back. Ernie Vold, County Board Chair was present and stated the money that is in excess in the budget is for 2013. When the County auditor gets done, it all goes into a resolution and goes to the County Board. Recommendations could be presented then that a certain percentage of those dollars would revert because of the need indicated. Vold added the County Board would have to vote on that and it would have to pass by 2/3’s majority. Vold thought it could be February, March or even later depending on when the auditors get done. Vold knew in February there were some budget adjustments made and thought the Committee would want to make that decision in February or as soon as possible (even today) and bring it to the Exec./Finance Committee first and then to County Board. Brandt thought it would be important to communicate with the Exec./Finance Committee as well as to where we are at here. Brandt thought timing was important here. We talked about some things but we have no specific recommendations. Brandt is concerned that any opportunity for recommendations may come before it can be communicated to the Exec./Finance Committee prior to the February meeting. It has been done that way in the past but Brandt questioned what the rest of the Committee thought. Zeglin wanted clarification as to if all of the \$192,000 goes back to the General Fund of which the County then disperses as they will or just keeps it in the General Fund and that all Lien asked for is to hold back \$50,000 of that \$192,000. Lien responded that was a suggestion and that the money be designated for future staff because of the large scale watershed and potentially increased mining workload. Zeglin asked if the \$75,000 staff grant for the next 2-3 years was \$75,000 per year. Lien responded yes. Brandt clarified that if we don’t use the money this year that could be used by current staff when we’re working on the projects. Lien responded that was correct. Zeglin clarified that ultimately the County Board decides if the DLM is going to be allowed to keep that \$50,000. Lien responded that was correct, he thought it had to go before full County Board. Radtke clarified that excess money doesn’t go before full County Board, it is automatically returned to the General Fund, so what DLM would be doing is basically a transfer from the General Fund to the 2014 budget to increase it for the costs of staff to be added and fund that through the General Fund. Brandt commented he thought there was time as it doesn’t get spent as soon as it gets to the County Board. A budget amendment can happen at any time during the year. Brandt asked Lien to put this back on the agenda for next month. The Committee then moved to item #5 on the meeting agenda.

Convene into Closed Session per WI Stats 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel for the County concerning a strategy with respect to litigation in which the County is or is likely to become involved.

Nelson made the motion to go into Closed Session by reading the preceding statement, Brandt seconded the motion, motion carried unopposed.

At 11:59 AM, Nelson made a motion to reconvene into Open Session, Patzner seconded, motion carried.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval – Lien instructed the Committee to look at the reports and bills in their folders. County Surveyor Joe Nelson has been working in the Arcadia Township. Nelson made a motion to accept Joe Nelson’s report and approve payment, Patzner seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Approve Surveyor Contract Agreement – Lien stated we have been signing a yearly Surveyor Contract Agreement with Joe Nelson. Lien read the agreement aloud. Bice made a motion to approve the contract for 2014, Nelson seconded the motion, motion carried unopposed.

Set Next Regular Meeting Date - Lien discussed some issues with the regular meeting dates for the next two months as there are a lot of staff trainings plus the Committee wanted to meet before the next County Board meeting. In the course of discussion about whether to skip next months meeting, it was requested that County Surveyor Joe Nelson be summoned to the meeting to discuss the timing of his payment approvals. After some discussion, the next regular meeting was confirmed for Thursday, February 13th, 2014 at 9:00 AM in the County Board Room. Brandt requested reports from some of the other staff members to see what is going on and what issues related to conservation, nutrient management, etc. are going on. Brandt requested that Judy Betker come to the next meeting to talk about the Working Lands Initiative and Farmland Preservation as that came up today and there were a number of questions. Brandt felt the Committee should take the opportunity of a less strenuous schedule to come “up to speed” on other issues that are related to the Committee. Vold reminded Committee members that the Audit Committee meets on February 13th. Bawek asked Lien if the TRM grants are not used, if they were lost. Lien responded TRM grants are site specific for an individual and if the money is not utilized in two year to implement a project then the money reverts back. Bice commented which means it doesn’t get spent in Trempealeau County but it gets spent somewhere else. Lien explained that typically every fall the DLM gets e-mails from all other county’s out there requesting if anyone has any unused money that might revert back because other counties are looking for it for perhaps project overruns or for projects that didn’t get funding. Bawek thought it would be a good time to have a plan in place or something on paper for the Committee to look at for the next meeting for staff funding. Lien responded that funding was for the large scale watershed grant that we have already and that one is unique because we have never had one before and it encompasses a certain geographical area and anyone that lives in that area, so right now we don’t know how many people are going to be involved or participate. Further discussion took place on the grants.

At 12:15 PM Nelson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Patzner seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Michael Nelson, Secretary