

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
February 11th, 2015 9:00 AM
WHITEHALL CITY CENTER COMMUNITY ROOM

Chairman Brandt called the meeting to order at 9:07 AM.

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

Committee members present: George Brandt, Michael Nelson, Wade Britzius, Curt Skoyen, Kathy Zeglin, Jeff Bawek, and Rick Geske. Jon Schultz arrived at 9:15 AM

Staff/Advisors present: Kevin Lien, Virg Gamroth and Jake Budish. Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke, Mark Kunz – NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service), Highway Commissioner Dave Lyga, County Board Chair Dick Miller and Carla Doelle were in attendance for a short time.

Others present: Mark Nelson, Judy Boland, Paul Boland, Bob Luethi, Johann Bragger, Beth Killian, Matt Hieb, Chris Kusilek, Michael Spellmeyer, Darin Maliszewski, Ed Maliszewski, Jim Sadowski, Ed Patzner, Jacob Bork, James Bork, Tim Zeglin, Mike Chitko, Anita Adams, Jim Schwartz, Tom Forrer and Ken Schreiber.

Adoption of Agenda - Nelson made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, Zeglin seconded. Motion carried with no opposition.

Adoption of Minutes - Britzius made a motion to approve the January 15th, 2015 meeting minutes, Geske seconded. Motion to approve carried with no opposition.

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service) Update

Brandt acknowledged Mark Kunz from NRCS who was in attendance. Kunz stated they are working on their program sign-ups particularly the EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentives Program) and the CSP (Conservation Stewardship Program) sign-ups. Kunz is working closely with Carla Doelle and they are trying to make it so that they can offer an overlapping of NRCS and DLM programs to try to optimize the ability for landowners in the County to implement practices on their land. Kunz stated that Keith VerKuilen designs some of them and NRCS designs some of them and there is no reason to double up on some of this work if we can save each other time and energy and make it easier for farmers to be able to do these practices. One of the things that Julie Dokkestul at FSA (Farm Service Agency) has asked for is to have DLM staff review the CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) contracts as they come through. Kunz had brought some contracts over earlier this week and met with Doelle. She reviewed the contracts and signed off on them. Kunz thought it was another opportunity to see what it is they are doing with some of the federal programs. Lien asked when the end of the sign-up was for EQIP. Kunz responded that right now they are reviewing and ranking and approving the sign-ups from the ranking period that started last fall, but they do have some money under the Driftless Area Land Conservation Initiative and they also have additional money in Wisconsin here and one of the targeted county's is Trempealeau. Kunz and Doelle had talked about taking new sign-ups on targeted practices in Trempealeau County and possibly being able to approve those for this year. Kunz added that is not

completely finalized yet but they will take applications any time. Kunz stated that if DLM has some folks that are interested in doing some practices they should be sent out to him.

Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit -Livestock Siting Permit-Edwin J. Maliszewski-Town of Arcadia Chairman Brandt called the public hearing to order at 9:12 AM. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Brandt announced that this is the only public hearing today. Everything else related to the mining permits or other conditional use permits are going to be reviews that the Committee will be doing. If there are members of the public which have information that is pertinent to the discussion specifically, Brandt stated the Committee may call on them to get that information otherwise it is pretty much a discussion amongst the Committee members. Brandt gave instructions regarding public hearing procedures. Brandt called on DLM staff member Carla Doelle to give an overview of the CUP. Doelle stated she received an application from Maliszewski's to expand their livestock facility. The Livestock Facility Siting Permit comes into place in Trempealeau County for any facility over 300 animal units. They are seeking to go to 1607 animal units over a course of 5 years, so they are not there now but their goal is to move towards that number. Doelle explained that parts of their application include the initial application describing what the proposed livestock operation in detail is – it is a dairy facility. They also fill out an odor management score because they will be over 1000 animal units and that takes into consideration different types of waste storage structures that they have, the odor management practices used, distance to nearest neighbors and the density of the neighbors in the area. In addition, they look at their existing waste storage that they have on their facility, new or existing and show that it meets today's standards and specs for the 313 Standard from NRCS. We also look at their runoff management from their livestock facilities to make sure that they are in compliance with NR-151 and not having direct discharge from their lots to the stream. In regard to setbacks, Doelle stated because they will be over 1000 animal units, anything that is new will have to be 200 feet from a property line. Anything that is existing is already considered "grandfathered" in. Doelle explained they also developed training and response plans in order to look at things like how to handle incidents that happen on the property for mortality, spills or odor events. They also do an employee training guide on how they train their employees and when they meet and how they document attendance to address such things as how to handle manure and odor management as well. After reviewing their application, Doelle determined that their application was complete. Once the application is complete, they are allowed the public hearing process which is what we are having today for them. Upon Brandt inquiring if Ed Maliszewski had anything to add, Darin Maliszewski responded saying he is a partner with his father in the dairy operation. D. Maliszewski stated it has been a long journey to get here and that they applied for the DNR State permit first because they are over 1000 animal units and a lot of the requirements that the State imposed on them is over and above what the County imposes on a livestock facility, so Maliszewski feels that they have been meeting the County livestock requirements already for quite some time. D. Maliszewski added there are more improvements that will be made on the farm and the deadlines are determined by the State such as bunkers which they are moving onto the west side of the highway to control leachate runoff. There are some other external lots that will have to be updated to control/contain runoff and those have deadlines on them as well. Everything will complete by July, 2016. Brandt called for any testimony from the public three times. Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:20 AM. Doelle read a letter from the Town of Arcadia dated January 27th, 2015 which stated the Town of Arcadia Board of Supervisors passed a motion at their January 19th, 2015 meeting and have no objection to the E & LU Committee issuing a CUP for a livestock facility. Lien reminded the Committee that even though this is a CUP, we are no longer allowed to put conditions on these facilities. Lien stated Doelle's role is to review the CUP applications for completeness and compliance. At the point where she has determined an application is complete/compliant, it comes before the Committee. Lien added that anyone who is aggrieved by the application can appeal that to a State review board. Because of Ag Livestock Siting, the Committee can no longer place conditions on this type of permit, but CUP's are still required at 300 plus animal units in Trempealeau County. Doelle is mainly

reviewing for completeness and compliance with the State and County regulations. Skoyen made a motion to approve the CUP, Nelson seconded. Brandt stated that as Doelle was reading the list of requirements that have been met in terms of the odor management, setbacks, runoff etc., he remembered the conservation from the 90's and 2000's when this issue was front and center in the County and the work that has been done here and around the State related to the nutrient management issue and the expansion of livestock agriculture. Brandt commented it isn't the hot issue that it was 15 years ago but it is still important. Britzius asked how many animal units Maliszewski's were at now. D. Maliszewski responded they are at 973 animal units currently. D. Maliszewski explained that an adult cow equals 1.4 animal units which are basically based on the amount of manure she generates, a 1000 pound heifer is 1, a small calf equals .1 and they are looking to get to 1,607 animal units which are 700 milking cows, 100 dry cows and supporting young stock. Upon Britzius asking how many cows they have now, D. Maliszewski responded they are milking 443 cows. Doelle stated as far as their application, they are able to submit the WPDES (Wisconsin Pollution Discharge Elimination System) permit which is issued by the DNR in lieu of some of their requirements for the State Livestock Facilities Siting permit so that they aren't duplicating services such as having to hire an engineer to sign off on their pits again because they have already shown that they have met compliance for DNR and also for their existing external lots. As D. Maliszewski had addressed their silage leachate, Doelle added that would all be tied into their DNR permit so that is all related as to how it is approved through our permit. Zeglin stated she understood that the facility has already been built. D. Maliszewski pointed out on an overhead photo where a 4 million gallon lagoon was built in 2011, and south of that another 5.12 million gallon lagoon was just built and south of that another 279 X 371 foot long barn was built in 2010 and south of that is where the new bunkers will be constructed. Those bunkers have to be completed by June 1st, 2016. Currently the bunkers are across the highway which is a low lying area and it is impossible to control leachate runoff therefore abandonment is the best option and then moving them to a new place which will be safer because they won't have to cross the highway as much. Motion to approve the CUP passed with no opposition.

Review of progress on Conditional Use Permits for Hunts Valley/Prokop Mine Site/10K

International Mine Site-discuss possible extension of deadline to meet conditions. Chairman Brandt turned the meeting over to Jake Budish. Brandt reminded the Committee that each request should be taken on its' own merits. Brandt noted that this is a review of a CUP and not a public hearing, so if there is something that someone feels might be able to help the Committee, they should let Brandt know. Matt Hieb, Auth Consulting, introduced himself as the engineer who has worked on the project. Michael Spellmeyer, owner of 10K introduced himself. Hieb stated that as part of their packet they had put together a letter which summarized each of the items on the list that was to be completed and the progress and status of each. Hieb continued by saying the mine was approved July 2012. Hieb announced he would read through each of the items and elaborate on them. The first item was the Road Use Agreement. Hieb stated they had been reviewing a road use agreement and thought they were in pretty good shape and then Mr. Radtke had informed 10K that there was, Hieb believed, a policy change and the agreement needed some revisions so 10K was waiting for the consulting firm that the Highway Dept. hired to revise the agreement. Hieb thought 10K got a copy of that recently, so they are in the process of getting that reviewed. At this time, Corporation Counsel, Rian Radtke arrived at the meeting. Brandt announced that there are a couple members of the Highway Dept. here also. As Brandt understood the issue, 10K did not have a clear understanding of what their requirements were related to a Road Use Agreement based on policy changes that were being developed by the Highway Dept. Hieb thought there was a change in policy throughout this process. They/10K thought they had the original one ready to go and then there were some changes. In order to answer more about the Road Use Agreement, Spellmeyer commented that they received, via e-mail, the new proposed Road Use Agreement (he thought) on January 30th and their/10K's next scheduled board meeting is February 19th to approve it. Brandt acknowledged Highway Commissioner Dave Lyga. Brandt stated the question is

related to the status of Road Use Agreements in general in terms of policy and how that's changed in the last few months. Brandt asked Lyga to elaborate on that. Lyga explained he took over as Commissioner in June 2014. His predecessor, Jim Johnson started working with road use agreements in about 2012. Lyga stated they have had some successes and some issues but basically they had gone to a system similar to Chippewa, Baron and Monroe County's which is endorsed by the Wisconsin Towns' Association, Wisconsin County's Association and the WCHA (Wisconsin County Highway Association). Lyga continued that basically what they are doing is going to a 3rd party engineering firm to help determine how strong the roads are, what type of frequency of loads and weight of loads the road can handle, and if there is going to be frequent hauling – what needs to be done to these roads to strengthen them in order to keep them safe for the general public. That is the direction that Trempealeau County has gone. They have a Highway Hauling Policy and they use that to follow the road agreements. Lyga reiterated that they use a third party engineering firm. They start by coring the road to see how strong the road is underneath the blacktop and what kind of base there is and what type of blacktop thickness there is and then they use the ESAL (Equivalent Single Axle Load) which is the single axle load frequency which has a formula which can tell how long that road will last if nothing is done to it. Basically, they make a recommendation based on the permits that people are trying to get and the number of loads they are asking to haul and the weights and then the engineering firm tells the Highway Dept. how the road should be strengthened. Brandt clarified that the Hwy Dept. uses that information in developing the Road Use Agreement in terms of how much life is left in the road and what the Hwy Dept. wants it to look like after the project is done and assign a price tag to it. Lyga agreed and added that some mines only have a 10 year life or some might be 20 years and they also take that factor into consideration. Radtke stated that previous Highway Commissioner, Jim Johnson and Radtke himself had been working with 10K, since back in 2012, towards a Road Use Agreement. This obviously was prior to having a uniform policy. At some point, 10K no longer pursued the matter and Radtke hadn't heard from them. More recently, in the past half year, Radtke has heard they are interested in moving forward again. Radtke stated there was a meeting which he thought was in October which included a discussion about a Road Use Agreement. Radtke stated there are active drafts out. Radtke explained the way we were dealing with it back then; a "draft" Road Use Agreement was sent in October, shortly after that meeting. Radtke thought in January, we received that copy signed; however the Board met and developed the uniform policy that Lyga had just discussed. Radtke thought that was around November 18th. Radtke sent an e-mail on the 19th to Mr. Spellmeyer indicating to him to disregard the previous "drafts" and then Radtke described the uniform policy and then indicated that he (Spellmeyer) should be in touch with Radtke regarding any new Road Use Agreements. Radtke stated we didn't have that conversation until the end of January whereas there must have been some miscommunication about that e-mail as Mr. Hieb was more of the contact and not Mr. Spellmeyer and so we gathered data, we got it ok'd by 10K to have our engineer finish up and finalize the engineering report to be consistent with the policy. Lyga got them to work and within a couple days they were able to get out and get the work done and had an estimate shortly thereafter and we sent the Road Use Agreement consistent with the new policy around January 30th (the engineer's report was dated January 26th). Radtke hasn't heard anything since then. Brandt commented that is what Spellmeyer pretty much just said. They have a copy of the Road Use Agreement and your Board of Managers have a copy of the Road Use Agreement and will be looking at it within a couple of weeks. Representatives from 10K agreed. Budish stated there is also a town road associated with this. Budish was told there is a new bridge put in on Wolfe Road. Budish had talked to the Town Chairman and 10K has yet to develop a Road Use Agreement with the town and that was a condition of the town and the County. Hieb stated the next condition was the well and structure inspections within 2,500 feet of the mining area. Hieb explained that they have in the packet an estimate that their firm did to provide the well and structure inspections. Hieb said their structural engineers would like to wait until the frost is gone from the ground to do the inspections so those have not been completed but they do have a process in place to begin those once weather permits. The next item was the permits from the DNR or Trempealeau County. Hieb stated in regard to the grading permit

they are finalizing some of the plans so that will be submitted in the near future. Upon Brandt's inquiry, Hieb responded they are preparing, and as Hieb understood, DNR is re-approving their general permits, so they are not even issuing a permit form – they are temporarily holding off on mines until they get the new general permits approved so 10K is holding off to see if there is going to be any changes that they will need to adjust for. In addressing financial assurance, Hieb stated they did receive (as they had requested an updated and exact amount a couple of weeks ago) the information and getting that in place as part of the whole process also. Once 10K gets all the rest of the items in, they will just get the bond in place at that time. Brandt questioned if, in regard to the plans that 10K submitted in 2012, the nature of the mine had changed in other words they are working with the same plans that were submitted in 2012, therefore whatever bond Budish comes up with will be based on that. Hieb stated that is 100% correct, yes. Hieb added there are no changes, so Hieb was assuming he would have based it on the plans and currently what is anticipated in today's dollars to establish the bond. Hieb addressed the Traffic Impact Analysis by saying they have the actual impact analysis and that the DOT had provided a letter early on with their recommendations as to what they are going to be requiring and they had provided that to Mr. Brueggen (former County employee). Hieb stated they have since developed some of the plans for that. Their survey crews went out (Hieb referred to State Hwy 93 and County Road X on the overhead aerial map) and shot in all the information necessary to do the design of a bypass lane and the de-acceleration lane. Hieb showed a geometric layout of the proposed improvements on State Hwy 93 and stated there was more to the plan. Hieb explained this has been submitted to Brent Pickard at the WI DOT and they are waiting to see if DOT has any final comments before they finalize the whole permit submittal. It is fully underway; they are just waiting to see if they get any feedback from DOT. Brandt clarified that the Traffic Impact Analysis was done by the DOT and this is 10K's response to their requests. Hieb responded that is correct. Hieb explained that in May 2012 they came up with the traffic counts and told 10K what needed to be done and so this is the plan associated with it. Once 10K gets the final approval from them it will also involve a schedule as to when they will want it implemented. If Hieb remembers correctly the original approval, before any mining/hauling occurs the improvements need to be in place and built. Hieb thought they were making good progress on that. Hieb addressed the stormwater ponds next. Hieb stated they needed to account for 100 year rate control. The ponds have been re-designed but they did not need to be re-sized as it was just a matter of adjusting some of the outlet structures but they were originally designed to contain a 10 year event, now they are designed to control the rate for a 1 to 10 and 100 year events, so that has been completed. In addressing the final item on the list, Hieb explained that during the original submittal process they submitted for an endangered and cultural resource review. The DNR indicated that the area (Hieb couldn't remember if it was based on how old the siting was) was flagged for a barn owl. Hieb read aloud the note directly from the DNR review letter which stated, "prior to commencing land disturbing activities a infinite survey of the area will be completed to determine if any barn owl nests are there and if they are then 10K must take the necessary steps of contacting the DNR to get further guidance if they are there". Brandt acknowledged Attorney Bob Luethi. Luethi stated he is representing Paul and Judy Boland and wanted to confirm something with Mr. Spellmeyer and that it was related to the mine site. In assuming that the County gives 10K this extension, Luethi asked if that will affect the deal with Boland's. Spellmeyer responded, "no". Brandt stated there was apparently some agreement made as part of the process. Hieb stated they probably could touch a little more on that when he gets to the next item on the agenda. Hieb continued by saying the way that these two sites are tied together is not only the common ownership, 10K International, but when the County approved this site we are looking at right now, they tied together overall the amount of loads that could be hauled out between the two sites. Hieb thought he had covered the items that were on the list that needed to be addressed. Brandt asked Budish, since he has been the staff member working with them, if this was a fair representation of the process so far and where they are at. Budish responded yes and that they had a couple of "sit-down" meetings around July and August, 2014 to discuss what was being talked about for the site, etc. but there was no action being implemented on the sites. Budish commented there was a lot of talk in person, but not much other

correspondence, i.e. e-mails or phone calls. Brandt asked for Committee input. Brandt stated the conditions that are listed are related primarily to agreements; financial bond, Road Use Agreement, the permit from the DNR related to natural resources, the engineering for the storm water runoff and the inspections are something that is going to wait until spring. Brandt asked Hieb how long of an extension 10K was asking for. Hieb responded, obviously they asked for a year on the original request, but Hieb didn't think it should take them a year. The biggest one, timing wise, was the well and structure inspections as they would like to wait with those until it warms up and we have some decent weather plus they have to contact all the landowners and schedule the inspections and the testing, so Hieb thought if they had 6-8 months. Lien stated that last year the Committee had a lot of discussion about public coming forward and saying, "we have a permit preliminarily approved" and people want to know if they are going to be living in a neighborhood with a mine or is it not going to happen. Lien added the moratorium has been lifted and anyone can apply at any time. Lien stated the permit was approved in July 2012 and DLM sent a letter out last January 2013 and we heard little to nothing from 10K until recently and Lien felt that was because of the letter. Lien continued that when we go through the actions items, to most of them 10K had said "we haven't done anything or we're planning to". Lien asked Hieb to explain to the Committee what the hold up has been since July 2012. Lien questioned if it was because of the letter that DLM sent out saying the permit would be revoked, or has something changed in the company that the Committee would feel that 10K is going to have an active mine site here. In response to Lien's first question, Spellmeyer responded that the DLM letter has not made them move any faster. Spellmeyer acknowledged there have been several things within the company. As far as management leadership roles, Spellmeyer stated people have been removed. Spellmeyer reiterated that the letter did not make them move any faster and that 10K moved as fast as they could. Upon Brandt asking if it was Spellmeyer's intention to move forward with the project, Spellmeyer responded "absolutely and that they have invested a quite a bit of time and money into it in the last six months and they intend to move forward". Spellmeyer voiced that he had to take responsibility for this; not fully understanding the structure review to be done and that now it needs to wait until spring time, one can call it ignorance on his part or whatever. Some of those things Spellmeyer didn't think they were going to require as much time as it is. Brandt opened up the floor to the Committee for questions. In referencing the condition about the 10 year storm water pond and then going to a 100 year storm water pond, Bawek asked where did that come from; that the stormwater pond should be increased from a 10 year event to a 100 year event. As far as where the requirement came from, Hieb responded he thought that was during the very original approval, it was discussed during the Committee meeting that day and the Committee said that they wanted it increased to a 100 year event. In following up on that, Bawek asked what was changed to go to the 100 year event, was it pond size. Hieb responded that the pond sizes were large enough all that was needed was to remodel and show it as the ponds were all ready big enough to handle the 100 year event. Bawek asked what that was based on as Hieb is saying it was for a 10 year event but then also saying it was big enough for a 100 year event. Hieb reiterated the ponds were already big enough for a 100 year event. The modeling that Hieb originally did showed the 10 year event, it didn't show the 100 year event. Bawek asked if that had to do with a draining area. Hieb responded each pond is specific obviously to the drainage areas. What they do is delineate the drainage area; they look at the ground cover. One picks the event that they are going to actually show. Hieb can show it for a 50 year event too. When they did the original modeling to show, they showed the 10 year event but the ponds were big enough, at that time, to hold/do the 100 year rate also. Bawek asked if that was proved to Budish and that is why that was done by the Committee. Budish responded that was prior to him starting with the County and referred the question to Lien. Lien stated the original plan had demonstrated modeling to a 10 year event and because of all the storm water issues we had related to industrial sand and DNR citations that were issued and DNR input, it was staff recommendation that all storm water ponds be designed to a minimum 100 year storm. Lien added that what Hieb is saying is that their pond was designed that way; he just showed the runoff of a 10 year event. Hieb stated that was correct. Lien added the original design could handle a 100 year storm. Bawek asked if they were

also up on all the things such as concrete lining, etc. for the process ponds. Hieb explained this site was not approved for a wash plant and the concrete lining is for an industrial wash plant. This is just a storm water pond. In regard to the well inspections, Schultz clarified that they have not been initiated since July 2012. Hieb responded they have not. Schultz stated that is the one thing of these conditions that he doesn't quite understand as to what the delay on that has been. Schultz understood the issue with the Road Use Agreements and that it was out of the company's control as far as our County needing to get that sorted out. Schultz asked what needs to happen to initiate well inspections. Hieb responded that first they have identified the area that is within 2,500 feet, they have identified the number of structures that will need inspections and the approximate number of wells (until they get out there they don't always know how many). The next step is to contact all the landowners to begin the process. Hieb stated that part of the reason, in working through all these other ones, and we probably could have (as Mr. Spellmeyer said) started that sooner, but often it is good to have those inspections closer to when actual operations start. Geske's comment was going to be that they are better off to wait on those until right before they start then two or three years' before as things change and it might not be because of them, so one is better off to wait. Hieb added that it does also take a little bit of time to schedule them all and it just wasn't started. Britzius expressed that it seems that this has been taking a long time and going slow for whatever reason. Britzius understood that and added that it is troublesome to those people living up that valley as to what their future is going to be. Britzius felt that was an issue that really has to be taken into account here as we go through this whole process. People in the community need to know what is happening. It sounded to Britzius that they were "picking up steam" and willing to work on this. Spellmeyer responded that he didn't think it is a matter of getting interest or the ability to work on it, we are proceeding forward to open up a mine site, and it is not something we're thinking about, it is something we are going to do. Since the two sites are tied to number of loads, Britzius questioned what happens if this extension is approved and the next one isn't. Hieb responded when we get to the next site and go through the items on the list, there are a few that vary, but when Hieb gets to them he is going to say, "similar to the site we just talked about" because they are the same items. Hieb explained the big things that they were tied to were the total number of loads hauled out cannot exceed a certain amount. Hieb added they want to continue along with progress but the well and structure inspections for this site, if we start one site sooner than the other, Hieb thought they could still continue forward with getting them all done or they can postpone the well and structure inspections for one of the sites until they get to that site. They are hoping, either way, that they are going to meet the requirements that have been laid out here. Lien stated the other site is really sort of the primary site and questioned if this one would be to assist that other site as this site is going to get hauled to that site. Lien added if one had to choose an order of progress, this site is more dependent on the next site. Hieb voiced that would be a correct statement, yes. Britzius wanted to bring it to everyone's attention that there is a new report out that it is becoming clear that climate change is happening, it is not debatable, it is fact that it is changing. It is debatable as to what is causing it. Someone has been doing a lot of studying on sea level rise and that sort of thing and one was done in the Midwest. In part of this report, at one point the fellow said, even people/local county commissioners should be paying attention to the fact that when doing highway work you might want to think about putting in bigger culverts because of the variability of weather. What was once a 500 year event may be happening every 3 or 4 years. We talk about 100 year events, storm water ponds and water retention and runoff and how we should be handling that. We really need to take this stuff seriously for the future. In regard to corporate structure, Zeglin understood that the original 10K is no more and your company purchased it. Zeglin asked when that occurred. Spellmeyer responded that 10K still exists and he didn't know where that information got out. Spellmeyer explained that they formed another company that actually owns 10K and GMS. 10K being the mining side of the operation and GMS being the processing side, but 10K still exists. Zeglin asked if they had trouble within the corporate structure. The response was no. Zeglin asked why, up until six months ago, there was absolutely nothing being done on this site at all, nothing done on any of the requirements? There was nothing going on until approximately this last July. Zeglin stated she didn't understand why the

delay if they wanted to proceed, why has it taken so long to come forward and start working on these things. Spellmeyer explained that up until January of last year, whenever you all decided to put mandates on and give it a year requirement to finish up the project, as unfortunate as it is, being the size of company and everything, we can't make moves within the company overnight. It takes time and it takes budgets to be put together and that money has to be set aside and appropriated and of course there has to be multiple meetings. People have to put all that together and then it has to be approved by the board managers. Unfortunately we were not able to move as expeditiously as Spellmeyer would have liked to but we followed the operating agreement and our structure as a company will make it happen. Unfortunately that is how long it took to get everything put together. In regard to Zeglin's question, Geske questioned what that matters to this Committee. Geske didn't understand why it matters about their corporation and what they are doing. They are looking for an extension and Geske stated he didn't understand as we have already given them what they need to do. They have stated they need a year. They come in and ask, they told us more than Geske needed to know and if they don't get it done, they don't get it done. Brandt stated the question was asked a little differently earlier on as to what has taken so long and Hieb and Spellmeyer basically said the same thing. Brandt thought the issue that we need to ask ourselves is the one Zeglin's asking and that is are you serious and that is what we have to determine with every applicant for an extension. Are they really serious about this? Geske commented he would hope so as they have spent a lot of money already. Geske is sitting here and he isn't all for or all against the mines, but Geske is all for fairness. Geske thinks that on our part, give them the rules and now they have to follow them but you totally have a year. Geske didn't know how much more we had to go digging into their business; it just didn't make sense to Geske. In regard to the Town Road Use Agreement, Zeglin asked how many miles they have to travel to get to County Road X. Lyga responded the County road is 5.7 miles. Lyga wasn't sure what the Town of Burnside road length was. Zeglin asked if 10K had been in any conversations with the Town yet. Hieb responded not since the original meetings. Upon Britzius inquiring about the bridge out there, Hieb responded there is a relatively new bridge out there. Lyga explained that bridge is at the intersection of Hunt's Valley and Wolfe Road. This past summer the State DOT de-rated it to 10 ton and it had some insufficient wood timber so the wood timbered bridge was concrete decked. As the Highway Dept., Lyga stated they went in and basically encapsulated the wood timbers with I-beams and reinforced it and the State gave the 40 ton rating back, so now it is rated at 40 ton and it a fairly short spanned bridge. Britzius asked if 40 ton was sort of a standard for sand trucks. Hieb explained that the way the mine was permitted, 10K doesn't necessarily have to go across that bridge with the truck traffic. Hieb pointed out the access route and added he didn't think that was going to be an issue. Hieb didn't think it was a change to their plans. In regard to the reclamation plan, Budish pointed out where the haul route would be and explained that is why the one side of the parcel was all delineated out. Budish stated the haul route is actually going to come out on Wolfe Road and that was Budish's recollection of how he factored it in and that is why Budish asked the Town Chairman about that section of Wolfe Road and Hunts Valley and if there had been any type of agreement talked about. According to Budish, the Town Chairman said no. Hieb stated they will meet the requirements of the bridge. There was some discussion about the clarity of the haul route on the plans but Hieb didn't have the plans with him. Regardless, Hieb voiced that they will meet the requirements of the loading on the bridge because they have to if they are going to haul across it, so whatever it is posted at they will have to follow those requirements. Brandt commented the Road Use Agreement would be much like the one being done with the County in terms of what your responsibility is for either maintaining or improving the road for the period of time the project lasts. Geske commented 80,000 is their limit anyway so a 40 ton bridge is adequate to what they would haul. Zeglin explained that the reason for her questions are that the applicant has had two and a half years to get everything in place. You have a lot to do here yet and you've only seriously started looking at things, it seems, like in the past three months. Zeglin said that is why she asked about the corporate structure, moving forward, it seems like you have had ample time to get everything done including the last year where you had a letter saying you have until January 31st, 2015. Zeglin expressed her

disappointment in how things have progressed for 10K. This gave Brandt an opportunity to express the disappointment that he has that this process is taking a long time. This is only the third request that we have had for an extension. It would have been Brandt's desire, not to put you all through this but to let staff determine where you guys are and whether or not an extension makes any sense, but we are apparently the responsible body. Brandt again apologized, as we are trying to figure this out and trying to get it done right with as much information as we can. Brandt is hoping that even though every case is individual that we will sort of speed up this process, but it is important, the points that both Zeglin and Britzius have been making about the unknowns that exist within the community's as they have been very detrimental to people's lives/livelihood and health, so we're trying to make things as "for sure" as possible for people and that's our focus. Geske made a motion to grant them the one year extension on the preliminary CUP that was put forward in July 2012, Nelson seconded. Some discussion took place on a possible amendment to the motion; however it was decided not to make any amendment. After some questions, Radtke clarified for the Committee that anyone can make an amendment to a motion. Brandt reminded 10K that if, in the next year, these conditions have not been met, you are in a position where you re-apply again but this permit will then lapse. Motion to approve the extension passed 7-1 on a roll call vote: Geske – yes, Bawek –yes, Nelson – yes, Brandt – yes, Schultz –yes, Skoyen – yes, Zeglin – no, Britzius – yes.

Review of progress on Conditional Use Permits for Bork/Bragger/10K International Mine Site-

Discuss possible extension of deadline to meet conditions Brandt reminded the Committee that we were here a few months ago talking about condition #9 of this permit. Hieb went through the list of conditions in an abbreviated form because a lot of them are at the same status as the previously discussed permit. Hieb stated Item#1 is the same status, #2 is the same status. In Item #3, Hieb explained they do have the DNR and Corp. of Engineers permits in place, including the grading permit. The air permit is in place. Hieb stated this is for both the processing and mine site. Hieb stated the mine for sure is approved with the DNR, he was unsure as to what the status of the air permit on the processing was. Brandt commented that the Committee found out the previous week that the permitting process for DNR has multiple steps; the acceptance, the review, etc. and Budish is able to access the site which describes exactly where the permit is at with the DNR. Hieb stated they have been issued a Corp. of Engineers permit on November 2012. They were issued a Nonmetallic Mining Operations general permit in June, 2012. The Storm Water Permit has been issued, so that is one step further than the other permit that was just talked about. The financial assurance is the same as the discussion that was previously had on the other permit. Notification to the Dept. of Land Management, obviously 10K knows that needs to occur before any mining begins. The Transportation Impact Analysis is the same as the previous permit as it is the same haul route. In addressing the storm water pond, Hieb stated it is the same answer as the previous permit other than the fact that it was originally designed for and is designed for 1 to 10 and 100 year events based on some of the input they received. Hieb thought that covered all of the main items. Hieb stated he would let Spellmeyer discuss the landowner negotiations separately in order to give the Committee an update. Brandt clarified that this would also be the answer to Attorney Luethi's question. Spellmeyer stated the closing is set to take place by March 15th, 2015. Brandt asked Luethi and Boland's if that is how they understand it. Luethi jested that is on a Sunday. Spellmeyer said that is why he said "by March 15th". Hieb stated he thought it's usually on or before and there is actually a signed purchase agreement with the closing date set. Hieb thought they could work out the details later on this issue as he didn't think the Committee was interested in anything other than that there was an agreement in place. Nelson made a motion to approve the extension for one year, Geske seconded. Upon Zeglin asking when the original, preliminary CUP was issued, Budish responded they first came forth for what Budish thought was originally supposed to be just an extraction site and that would have been the same time as the Prokop site which was July 2012. Budish stated they came forth for processing in what he believed was September 2012 as that was Budish's first public hearing. Brandt commented that if there has been a weakness in 10K's presentation so far it has to do with the lack of

conversation with the town over the town road and that is, of course, one of the conditions and is one of the things that hasn't been moved on at all. Hieb responded they don't have a town road on this site so 10K needs to get started on the Prokop site and get that going. Brandt acknowledged some registration sheets by saying this isn't a public hearing and the people who registered (Boland's and Luethi) have already spoken. Motion to approve the extension passed by voice vote, 7-1, with Zeglin casting the opposing vote. For the record Budish stated the 12 month extension is in place from today, February 11th, 2015 until February 11th, 2016.

Review of progress on Conditional Use Permits for Nelson Diesel & Dozing, LLC Mine Site-

Discuss possible extension of deadline to meet conditions Brandt stated this review is for a mine site on State Highway 53 in Ettrick. Mark Nelson introduced himself as the owner and operator of Nelson Diesel and Dozing, LLC. Nelson stated the site has been open but it was opened by the DOT prior to Nelson finishing all the conditions so they took over the site, so there was a little bit of a delay in that. Nelson explained that on all the conditions that were set at the initial meeting, financial assurance has been set and is in place, the County has that on file. The black top entrance that the DOT required be put in has been installed. The township information was taken care of as far as coming in from a State highway. In addressing permits with the DNR, Nelson said he has been in contact with Roberta Walls. Nelson sent an e-mail in January and Walls has been out and inspected and she wants to do another inspection come spring. She was ok with it. As far as foundation waivers, Nelson explained there were quite a few within the area that Nelson is in that had to get done. Nelson has a little less than half of them taken care of but he ran out of time by the end of the year with the holidays in there. Nelson is still working on them. Nelson came to the meeting today to ask for just a six month extension. All Nelson has left to do is some of the waivers or the inspections to get done. Upon Brandt suggesting this was originally opened as a fill sand site with the possibility of doing some frac sand mining, Nelson stated there is no frac sand industry even talking to Nelson on any of that. Nelson added that what he opened this site for is, as he is an excavating contractor, if you build a shed and need sand or the township needs sand that is what he is focused on. Bedding sand is another prime example of what the site is used for. Lien referred the Committee to the overhead aerial photo of the site. Lien stated a few of the Committee members were here when this site was permitted. Lien clarified that if it were just an aggregate site, there wouldn't be half the conditions on it, but the possibility of being able to sell industrial sand came up during conversation so all the extra conditions got added to this site. Budish wanted to say that Nelson has actually done a lot more than a lot of the other, previous applicants that have come forth for extensions. Budish stated he has established financial assurance and that is on record. He has the black top approach and exit installed already. There are a few erosion control implications as there is stuff out there right now to control it because of the DOT. Brandt commented that everyone who travels up Highway 53 calls and asks if there is a frac sand mine going up there and hopefully everyone who is going to call has because it has been open through that whole road project and the answer is that it was a DOT project and it is fill sand exclusively. Brandt questioned if there was going to be any reclamation before Nelson does any more with it, because there is such a big hole. Nelson responded the face will stay pretty much as it is, but when Nelson gets back into the hill further, it will be reclaimed as one goes back and that is the direction that Nelson is heading. Nelson clarified that the site is heading North now and then will be heading somewhat East once he gets into that ridge, but that ridge has a shale layer and he wants to stay above that so instead of it being a hole, there will be a contour when Nelson gets done. Britzius asked what the scope of the project is. Nelson thought there was 20 acres total that are mineable due to the stream etc. and that there are approximately 4 or 5 open. They can't get too close to the back property owner either. Nelson thought there was 42 acres on the whole parcel. Nelson explained that if one looks at the site, the side of the pit that is open towards the highway, there is a silt contour there and that contour will maintain the length of the approximately 40 acres. Geske asked if there was any time line for how long Nelson can have it open or not. Budish responded this site was opened for the DOT for the Highway 53 project so Nelson has been pretty adamant about trying to get

everything remedied and that is why Nelson has been so pro-active in getting everything taken care. He realizes that this site is open and it is only preliminarily approved and that is why we are trying to get this squared away. Upon Geske inquiring how many years it will be, Lien responded on the application there was a length of time but he didn't recall what that was, but there was a deadline and as long as one is compliant through that they can reapply. Schultz asked what the property setbacks are. Lien responded 50 feet on the side and 50 feet on the rear. Lien added that Budish has the whole permitted area but what is mineable is much smaller than that – which is about 20 acres, so it doesn't come close to that 40 acres. Upon Lien asking if the plan was to get into the wooded area, Nelson responded no. Nelson stated in the plan it says he has to maintain that wood line buffer on the back side of the property and where the wood line “juts out” is actually a valley. Britzius asked if there is a “ballpark” figure on how long it is going to take to sell that much sand. Nelson said it depended on demand because he doesn't have a contract with anyone to buy a certain amount; it is just as farmers need for bedding sand or fill sand in jobs that come up such as highway projects, etc. Zeglin asked when the preliminary CUP was issued. Budish responded he believed it was May, 2012. Zeglin thought he had ample time to get everything done. Brandt recapped that the request is for a six month extension to make sure that the preliminary requirements are met of the CUP. Schultz made a motion to approve the extension, Skoyen seconded. Mike Nelson questioned why only a six month extension? Mark Nelson responded all he has to do is finish up some inspections and waivers with the landowners and then that will be complete and he will be done as he has all the other conditions met. Mark Nelson added that the DOT isn't mining the site right now and he can't mine it until all the conditions are met. Motion to approve the extension passed by voice vote with Zeglin voting in opposition. Brandt stated the extension has been granted for six months and if the conditions aren't met within that six months you are free to come back and re-apply.

Review of progress on Conditional Use Permits for B & B Sands LLC Mine Site-discuss possible extension of deadline to meet conditions. Brandt acknowledged Tim Barth who was present representing B & B Sands, LLC. Barth stated he was present to ask for an eight month extension as he feels within 8 months they would be able to finish up the rest of the things that need to be completed. Barth explained they are currently working on the wells and foundations. Barth met with Budish and they confirmed the 2,500 foot boundaries and where that starts from. They clarified the houses that are in the area of which two are abandoned. They did notify the owner of one of the homes and the other owner is involved in foreclosure or something with the bank and it is actually being torn down. Barth continued that they are working on getting through that and working on some environmental solutions in order to do the wells and the inspections. Budish brought up an overhead aerial photo of the property which is between Dodge and Arcadia. Budish pointed out there are 3 separate little sites; one being in the Town of Arcadia and two in the Town of Dodge. Budish stated Barth has also been pretty active in getting the conditions met as the financial assurance is on record and he has been in negotiations with the Highway Dept. on the Road Use Agreements, etc. Lyga stated not as of recent. Lyga said there was one last fall but it was terminated because the County went to a new policy so we will have to start over. Barth verified he has met the financial assurance putting up the cash bond and with the financial assurance they have been able to start the watershed program and the SWIT plan with Walls at the DNR. They got it the point where they couldn't go any farther without putting up the financial assurance and obviously one waits until the end to put up the financial assurance with the way the bond, etc. is written. It is basically a cash bond, so one puts up the financial assurance and then one begins putting the erosion control items in, etc. and then Walls come out and confirms all that and then one obtains their SWIT plan. Barth stated they do not have any wash or dry process and this permit as it is an extraction only site so it eliminates some of the other questions that the Committee has had. Barth has established the cultural resource with the DNR and the County and Budish can confirm that. Barth had a meeting last fall with the town board just to update and confirm that they still have unanimous support from the Town of Dodge and Arcadia had said they didn't need it. Dodge actually decided to have a meeting

and take a vote and Barth still received unanimous support. According to Barth there was no written or negative concern that showed up at the local meeting, in fact, according to Barth, there were some people with some positive input. Barth stated the road agreement has been their biggest hurdle- trying to find a way to come together on it, as it is quite far and they are going down a nonbonded road. Within 7-8 months they had five meetings and at the last meeting Barth was at, they came to an agreement and then the Board voted to adopt an agreement that would go forward with a one year “sunset” being that the County Board would come forward with some type of unanimous road agreement which would be even and fair for everybody. According to Barth, some of the issue was that people were going without bonds, etc. and it was trying to find that fair playing field for everyone. Brandt clarified that the conversation that Barth was having with the Highway Dept. triggered the uniform policy that now exists. Barth responded absolutely. Barth stated he was notified on the 28th of January that there is a new policy in effect and Barth actually just got home yesterday so he stated we haven’t had any time to go through it. Barth added he just really needs to get educated about the new policy and work from there. Barth finished by saying that is really all he has, he just feels that now that there is hopefully a uniform Road Agreement (as he spend eight months trying to get that done) and he has everything else completed. Upon Brandt clarifying that Barth was asking for an eight month extension, Barth stated yes and that he feels now that with eight months that completing the conditions is attainable. Barth acknowledged that he knows he is limiting himself by four months, but he feels it is attainable in eight and he needs to get it done as he has a contract. Nelson made a motion to approve an eight month extension, Schultz seconded. Brandt was vaguely aware of the discussions that went on around Barth’s Road Use Agreement and the end result, so Brandt appreciates how that may have been a limiting factor. Mike Nelson elaborated on a meeting that he was at in the Dells and three of them ran into a gentleman from Chippewa County who had been here and talked to them about the fact that the County needs to have a uniform agreement so that no mine is getting favoritism and everyone works the same. M. Nelson specifically asked the gentleman if they didn’t have any “mom and pop” mining operations up there. M. Nelson asked how he gets them to work as they can’t afford to put up these big bonds. That gentleman told M. Nelson that they have to “partner” with somebody else to come up with the resources to make it work and he said it works out fine. Barth responded the problem is that the site is so small they don’t have the volume to bond the three and a half million plus Trempealeau County’s bonding is a little different than Chippewa County at this time, but Barth didn’t know what the new agreement was at the County. Barth added that any bond in Trempealeau County is cash. M. Nelson responded that is how Chippewa County operates. The gentleman told M. Nelson that these people come to Chippewa County to mine and they want them to succeed as it is going to help Chippewa County also. They (Chippewa County) want a road agreement and for the amount of miles that one is traveling on their county roads, it is going to take 2 million. Lyga agreed to what M. Nelson was saying. Upon Brandt asking Lyga what the policy is for the new Road Use Agreement, Lyga responded it is money upfront or repair the road. We give them the option of reinforcing the road before they start hauling. Zeglin inquired as to when the original CUP was preliminary issued. Budish responded he believed it was July or August 2012. In order to be consistent, Zeglin stated she believed Barth had more than enough time to get things accomplished. Britzius happened to know that the road Barth was using is popular with bicyclists, so Britzius requested that, as Barth develops this thing that he keeps that in mind or consider that reality because it would be good for all of us. Barth responded he is a bicyclist too and so he is very respectful of that. Brandt recapped that there is a motion and a second to approve the extension for eight months for B & B Sands, LLC mine site on County Road J. Motion to approve passed with Kathy Zeglin voting in opposition. Brandt reminded him that this would be extended until October. At this time the Committee took a short recess.

Discussion regarding Joint Meeting being planned to discuss Annexation Issues

Brandt called the meeting back to order. Lien stated he received a letter from the Town of Arcadia for this meeting as did County Board Chair Dick Miller, Town of Burnside Chair and Town of Lincoln

Chair. Lien acknowledged two Town of Arcadia board members who were present; Beth Killian – Clerk and Mike Chitko- Supervisor as well as County Board Chair Dick Miller. Lien wanted to extend the invitation to the Committee. Lien stated he and Miller have had discussions about this meeting. Lien thinks the meeting is a great idea and it is overdue. Lien thought there are some mixed feelings as to how the meeting should take place. Lien thought the meeting should perhaps be countywide because of the annexation issue as the City of Blair, Town of Preston, and the Town and City Arcadia are dealing with this issue also. Lien thought this Committee should attend the meeting. Lien thought this is a much bigger issue than just the few invited. Lien put this issue on today’s agenda so that the Committee could discuss the issue. Brandt stated this has been discussed for some time. It was also a recommendation of the Health Impact Study Committee that communications between the municipalities be addressed and improved. Brandt’s opinion on the matter is the sooner the better. Miller stated he had a rather lengthy discussion with Britzius and Britzius brought up a few interesting points. Miller thought there were some other ideas besides meeting as a whole. Miller thought the conversation needs to be with other municipalities other than just the three mentioned. Miller would just as soon take counsel from this group as to how to proceed as the Town of Arcadia has approached us, which we appreciate. They have set certain guidelines and Miller felt they should have some input on this since they called the meeting. Miller didn’t want to say that we should take over their request for conversation. Lien asked Beth Killian if others have responded to the invitation. Killian responded no, she has not heard from anyone else yet. Killian gave a brief history as to how the letter came about. Killian stated they (Town of Arcadia) had a meeting on January 23rd at which Mr. Bawek and Mr. Chitko were present. The discussion centered around the annexation of Town of Arcadia land to the City of Independence. During that discussion it was decided to invite Town of Burnside, Town of Lincoln, the Environment and Land Use Committee and the whole County Board to a meeting to start the discussion. Killian stated they were not excluding other people but that was the focus of that meeting. Lien asked Killian if the Town would be opposed to having more people involved or is it the Town Board’s wish just to keep it to who was invited. Killian had only talked to Town of Arcadia Supervisor Ivan Pronschinske and his comment was, (off the record) “to start off small because if you have too many people you’re not going to accomplish anything”. Brandt called on Mike Chitko for his comments. According to Chitko, their feelings are that they don’t have to control the whole meeting, the important thing is getting the people together, but our preliminary feelings for the meeting would be, as far as a setup, with Board Members and members of the Committee only, opened to the public so the public can hear what is discussed at the meeting. Public input could be made in advance but not at the meeting as they want the first meeting to be discussion amongst the board members and open for the public to hear. Chitko thought the meeting could be anywhere; the main thing is just getting people in those chairs and talking. Britzius appreciated that what seems to be a top priority in all the discussions is that we should do something. Britzius has been hearing it for a long time but stated we haven’t done anything, we haven’t made a move, so now the Town of Arcadia has made a move and Britzius thought we need to respond to that and make the agenda’s meaningful so people don’t go away grumbling that it was a waste of time. Chitko agreed and stated we don’t need a dissertation of what has been happening as we all know but we need to sit down and first of all, recognize the problem, recognize the cause and provide solutions going forward. Chitko didn’t know if there was anything that could be done about what is “water underneath the bridge” thus far. Discussion took place in the room. Brandt volunteered Jon Schultz as a person to work with Chitko. Bob Tenneson stated he has been listening to the meeting this morning and Zeglin, numerous times stated “what has taken you so long”. Tenneson stated if you check your records, in February 2012, he (Tenneson) made the comment, “You’ve got to do something about this annexation” and George looked at him and said, “What is your point?” That is the exact words that you said. Tenneson stated, “I told you to get at this three years ago”. In the meantime we’ve lost 1700 acres in the Town of Preston and are about to lose another 550. This should have been done a long time ago, and like Zeglin said to the others this morning, why haven’t you done it. Schultz responded we have new leadership at this Committee and on the County Board. Tenneson responded

that George was notified three years ago and your Board. You check your records as Tenneson had printed it out at home of himself making that comment. Tenneson added he thought it was way too late to start now, “the horse is already out of the barn”, this should have been done three years ago and we probably would not have lost all this land. It is getting to be a sore subject. Brandt acknowledged it is a sore subject. Tim Zeglin commented that the resolution that the County Board passed about a month ago called for a discussion of this nature that Town of Arcadia has proposed. The resolution called for discussion between all levels of government and this letter from the Town of Arcadia seems to exclude the cities, the incorporated municipalities who are doing the annexing. Zeglin would have to agree that there are too few people named, too few people invited, this might be a meaningless conversation. If they were to have a discussion about the annexation problem, invitees should include every municipality in the County, every town chairman or a representative from every township in the County as well as the County Board. This does not have to be a discussion between the County and the Town of Arcadia, which limits it far more than it needs to be and makes it really a useless meeting. Brandt repeated the points that Chitko and Britzius had made which is that by setting a base of what the discussion is going to be about, about growing the relationships slowly– starting small as opposed to trying to do it all at once. Just ten minutes ago Brandt had said what Zeglin just expressed that he thought everybody should be invited, there should be a time and a place and let’s go. Brandt is being won over by their arguments that if we can sit down to talk about what we’re going to talk about as an initial step and then make that invitation. Brandt thought perhaps Miller was going to be a deciding factor or making the decision if there will be a meeting as we’ve been talking about. Miller commented he has mixed feelings and he and Lien have discussed this. Miller first saw it as an opportunity to bring everybody together, but he thought the argument of meeting with a smaller group does have some merit. We want to make sure that if we do meet this way, in a smaller group, that somehow the cities, if they were left out, don’t feel like they were being brushed aside because that would indeed not be the case. The Town of Arcadia saw fit to bring some people together around an issue, that is certainly annexation, but it is also around a certain “penny” issue that involves some action taken by some of those town boards, that is why Miller had said before he is here to take counsel from this group. None of us have any answers and if we had we probably would have moved ahead three years ago, as Tenneson had suggested, but when that happened, Miller didn’t think we had any answers in terms of direction to take. A lengthy discussion took place on who should be at the meeting. Schultz suggested Britzius would be a great moderator for the meeting. After all the discussion, Miller commented that he thought the meeting should be a smaller group involving those municipalities that are affected now by the annexations with Britzius as the moderator. The discussion should be how it is affecting each municipality so we can understand why our neighbors are doing what they’re doing and how it is affecting the towns. The County could address how it’s affecting the County and also what is it doing to us as a whole. Miller suggested a letter to the other towns and cities saying this is our initial get together for those that are now affected but you as a municipality might be affected in the future so please feel invited. Miller thought the round table discussion would be beneficial. Zeglin commented a smaller initial meeting would be beneficial but it needs to be clear that it is just a first of many and participation will be expanded down the road. Lien suggested that the Schultz, Britzius and Chitko, or some other representative from the Town of Arcadia make an agenda and pick a date. The three gentlemen agreed. It was decided the City’s would be invited to attend.

Update to Trempealeau County Farmland Preservation Plan-Opportunity for public comment

Lien stated he and Peter Fletcher from the Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission will be attending the Towns’ Association meeting in April to discuss this issue and how it relates to their Land Use Plans. Brandt stated the Farmland Land Preservation Plan update is a requirement for every Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The County Comprehensive Plan needs to have it and it needs to be updated every few years. Nelson stated he didn’t understand the Farmland Preservation as it is a dead issue and it doesn’t exist anymore. You have to get a bunch of farmers together. Lien responded the

County has existing contracts out there which we have to honor and update our plan as to how we are implementing and tracking the existing ones. There is also the Working Lands Initiative which is out there and just because we haven't had interest in our County doesn't mean it doesn't exist and we couldn't have interest in the future. The guidelines really changed with the Working Lands Program and the Ag Enterprise area. It is a viable program and therefore we have to have it in the Comprehensive Plan. Upon Britzius asking if there is a deadline for the plan to be updated; Lien responded our update has to be completed by the end of 2016.

LWRM (Land & Water Resource Management) and TRM (Target Runoff Management) Requests and Payment Approval Lien stated there were no pay requests this month.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval

Lien presented the County Surveyors report and payment request as prepared by Joe Nelsen. Brandt stated Nelsen has been maintaining survey corners in the Town of Gale. Nelson made motion to approve the report and payment, Skoyen seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

View Video of Conservation Speech - The Committee viewed a Conservation Speech given by Hannah Maciosek at the recent Trempealeau County Conservation Speaking Contest. Lien noted the top three winners of the Contest will present their speeches live at the next County Board meeting.

Confirm Next Regular Meeting Date

The next special meeting date was set for Thursday March 5th, 2015 at 6:00 PM. The meeting will run from 6-8:00 PM. The next regular meeting date was set for Wednesday, March 11th, 2015.

At 11:54 AM, Geske made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Nelson seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Michael Nelson, Secretary