

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
March 11th, 2015 9:00 AM
COUNTY BOARD ROOM

Chairman Brandt called the meeting to order at 9:04 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 Jon Schultz. Rick Geske was not present as he had a conflicting Farm Service Agency meeting.

Staff/Advisors present: Mark, Carlson, Jake Budish and Virg Gamroth. Mark Kunz – NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service), DeWayne Snobl – USDA-APHIS-Wildlife Specialist, County Board District #17 Supervisor Ernest Vold, DLM staff members Vickie Stalheim, Meghan Wessel and Larry Gilles were in attendance for a short time. Kevin Lien was absent as he was attending the WLWCA (Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Association) Convention.

Others present: Aaron Bagniewski, Renee Bagniewski, Edward A. Nelson, Jim Sadowski, Tom Forrer, and Donna Brogan.

Adoption of Agenda - Nelson made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, Skoyen seconded. Brandt stated there are two new staff members in the Department so at approximately 10:00 they will come down and introduce themselves to the Committee. Motion to approve the agenda carried with no opposition.

Adoption of Minutes - Nelson made a motion to approve the February 11th, 2015 meeting minutes, Skoyen seconded. Motion to approve carried with no opposition.

Wildlife Damage - DeWayne Snobl

Snobl introduced himself stating he works for USDA Wildlife and covers five counties; Trempealeau, Jackson, Clark, Buffalo and LaCrosse. Snobl provided the Committee members with a report of the Wildlife Damage Program numbers which is on file in the DLM office. Snobl stated it is that time of year to go over last year's claims in the County.

Shooting Permit Harvest Exemption (if needed) - In regard to the agenda item, Snobl explained that when a landowner with a claim does not meet the quota for a shooting permit, then the Committee has to decide whether to grant an exemption for that or not. Snobl said that fortunately everybody that had a claim met their quotas so the agenda item is not needed at this time.

Review and Approve 2014 Wildlife Damage Claims – Snobl stated there were four landowners that enrolled fully in the program and requested a formal appraisal by Wildlife Services. There were more people in the program in Trempealeau County as there were twenty farms enrolled however only four requested appraisals.

	<u>Appraised Loss</u>	<u>Payable Loss</u>	<u>Crop</u>
Daniel Erickson	\$ 364.90	0	Soybean
David Nelson	\$6,004.19	\$5,403.35	Corn & Soybeans
Steve Ravnum	\$1,095.04	\$ 595.04	Corn & Soybeans
Greg Tollefson	\$3,336.03	\$2,836.03	Corn
Total	\$10,800.16	\$8,834.42	

Snobl noted that these are all state funded dollars and there are no County dollars involved. Brandt stated this represents the rate the Committee approved, per bushel, last fall. Snobl responded it is basically what he appraised out in the fields, bushels lost and then multiplying it by the price that was set by the County/Committee. Discussion took place as to how many permits/tags are issued and when the appraisal is done. Upon Skoyen asking if those tags included regular season deer, Snobl responded they do not because this is an “abatment” tool to reduce the amount of damage, so once the permit is issued,(as in Dave Nelson’s case because he goes over \$1,000) he has to have a permit prior to February 15th so he is shooting ready. Snobl emphasized that the totals don’t include any of the regular hunters that are filling their own tag. As soon as the DNR permit is issued, it becomes effective and is good until the end of the year, technically through any open season. Snobl explained the different permits and how one becomes eligible for the program. Skoyen made a motion to approve the 2014 Wildlife Damage Claims for payment as presented, Britzius seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

2014 Deer Donation Update- Snobl presented final totals for deer donation
(2013 Totals)

- Buffalo - 72 (137)
- Clark - 2(8)
- Jackson - 63(62)
- LaCrosse -37(43)
- Trempealeau - 18(15)
- Statewide - 1,350 (2,265)

Snobl stated given the changes in seasons and the number of “buck only”, the total donation is down as one would expect. Snobl thought this was probably as low as it is going to be. What really stresses deer is the deep snow and even the cold weather, so with this winter being relatively mild, production should be pretty good. With there being only one processor in Trempealeau County, some of those deer donated could have been processed in Jackson or Buffalo County. The Statewide total is down about 40%.

Snobl explained that Trempealeau County is no longer designated Zones 61 and 59C, it is Trempealeau County either private or public. When one applies for antlerless tags you apply for Trempealeau County private land tag or a public land tag, it is no longer distinguished by 61 or 59C. Every County has established a “Deer Committee” to go over and establish what the goals of the County is which are very general. Basically one would like a stable herd or a decreasing herd. Snobl talked about the new “online” hunting registration. Snobl also explained the logistics related to the number of processors who handle deer. Discussion took place about the number of deer in the County.

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service) Update

Brandt acknowledged Mark Kunz from NRCS who was in attendance. Kunz stated he had a contractor call him this morning who wanted to get started on a waterway. Kunz thought that makes them (NRCS) feel good as the farmers are in a good mood with the way the weather is. Kunz voiced that programs are going good. They are still waiting to hear as to who is approved on a couple of their programs. They are still not sure if there is going to be a general CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) sign-up this spring but they do have some opportunities so if you know some landowners that are interested in participating

or they have some things that they want NRCS staff to come out and look at give Kunz a call. Kunz stated they (NRCS) is working a lot with DLM staff in trying to make these practices as financially realistic as possible by “piggybacking” cost sharing in some cases. Brandt reminded Kunz that the County now has their own cost-share program. Kunz commented that one of the things that came out of the 2014 Farm Bill is that they are seeing some new faces over on their side of the office because they have linked federally subsidized crop insurance to the cross compliance provisions of the Farm Bill, so NRCS is getting some folks, updating their plans, or in some cases writing new farm plans. They are sending some of those people to the DLM office because they are in Farmland Preservation also and to make sure that they have that up to date. Kunz added that there is a lot of training this time of year to get ready for the Spring. Brandt asked Kunz to report back with some numbers next month. Kunz responded he would and added they are right on this cusp of getting things where they are going to get approved and getting some folks going on practices that, in some cases, they have been waiting on since last fall when they signed up with NRCS, so NRCS is working on it. Kunz is pretty excited about some of the opportunities that they have to offer.

Public Hearing – Land Use Change/Rezone – Transitional Agriculture (TA) to- Commerical (C) - Retail Greenhouse Business - Dennis Bagniewski, Landowner, Renee Bagniewski,

Petitioner– Town of Arcadia Chairman Brandt called the public hearing to order at 9:30 AM. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Aaron and Renee Bagniewski made the Committee aware that since the filing of the rezone application, Aaron has purchased the land from Dennis Bagniewski. Carlson reminded the Committee that their business plan was included in the paperwork that was sent to the Committee. Carlson stated the Bagniewski’s need to rezone to commercial because of the paragraph in their application which states they are going to be bringing in a lot of different products to sell, so it doesn’t really fall under a home or home accessory occupation. On an overhead aerial photo, Carlson displayed the area where the greenhouse business is to be located. Carlson stated they are meeting all the requirements of parking (16 cars which is based on the size of the actual retail structure thus so many spaces per square feet). Carlson had received a letter from the township and one from a neighbor, Glen Bawek. Carlson reiterated it has to be rezoned to commercial because it is basically a store and not all products are going to be grown there. Brandt asked Bagniewski’s to describe the operation. Renee Bagniewski explained they are putting in a 30 X 72 greenhouse. This year they intend to buy a lot of the plants just because of the timing in putting the structure up, where next year they intend to grow a lot of them. Bagniewski explained the Ordinance limits that when over 25% of the sales are resale then a rezone is required so that is the point of them being here today. R. Bagniewski added they plan on doing some fresh produce there as well. They are waiting on a grant to see if they get approved for a hoop house through the NRCS office. Bagniewski said they just have some different stages that they want to work on. They did “pick your own pumpkins” last year which she thought went over well. It was located back on a field road where obviously this year they will do the pumpkins right around where the greenhouse is so it will be more visible with a lot better parking area. They plan to have a small animal petting area. Brandt called twice for any public comments. Carlson had a letter from Glen Bawek which was neither testimony in favor nor against just more general comments. Bawek’s letter stated he is the closest neighbor to the greenhouse and he has no objection to the greenhouse business. Bawek is concerned as to why the rezone meeting and the expense of a meeting when then greenhouse is already being put up. Carlson had called and explained to Bawek that they could put up the greenhouse but no official business could be conducted until the rezone took place. Bawek had concerns about it being in a low lying area, but Carlson has checked into all that and the greenhouse isn’t being located in the floodplain or anything like that. Bawek had concerns about parking on the road. Carlson addressed that by saying there will be a designated parking area with the required number of spaces. In response to Bawek’s question as to where the water would be coming from, Carlson stated there would be a well there eventually. Carlson felt that he had addressed all of Bawek’s concerns and that Bawek was alright with it. Carlson read a letter from the Town of Arcadia which stated the Town of Arcadia Board of

Supervisors passed a motion at their February 4th, 2015 board meeting that they have no objection to the E & LU Committee issuing the rezone from Transitional Ag to Commercial for the purpose of a greenhouse. Brandt called one more time for any public testimony. Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:38 AM. Nelson made a motion to approve the rezone, Schultz seconded. Upon Britzius asking if Bagniewski's lived on the farm right across the road, they responded yes. Zeglin commented it was a very thorough presentation so she didn't have as many questions as she usually would. Zeglin did inquire about restroom facilities. R. Bagniewski responded they are looking into getting a portable potty or compost toilet for now. Carlson commented that for now portable restrooms are fine but if they went to an "indoor" restroom it would require a certified POWTS or septic system, i.e. drain field or holding tank. Brandt recapped that there is a motion and a second to approve the rezone, motion carried with no opposition. Brandt reminded the Bagniewski's that they would need to attend the County Board meeting on the following Monday evening. Once the rezone is approved by the County Board it is final.

Public Hearing – Land Use Change/Rezone – Exclusive Agriculture (EA) to Residential - (R-8)- Land Division – Janna M. Allen and Jeffrey E. Nelson c/o Edward A. & Pamela A. Nelson Life Estate, Landowner/Petitioner – Town of Hale Brandt called the public hearing to order at 9:40 AM. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Carlson stated the only reason for the rezone is that the current zoning is Exclusive Agriculture (EA) and according to the Table of District Requirements- 3.02 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, only one parcel per thirty five acres is allowed. Carlson displayed on the overhead aerial photo the area which they are proposing to separate off thus keeping the homestead and selling off the rest. Carlson received one phone call regarding the rezone and the person was just wondering why the rezone needed to occur. Carlson explained everything to them and they were alright with it. Carlson had no other correspondence from the public. Upon Brandt mentioning that the rest of the Town of Hale is zoned Residential-8, Carlson agreed and explained that the County tries to correspond the zoning to what is in the area so that is why Residential-8 was chosen. Brandt commented the property was perhaps in the Farmland Preservation Program thus the reason for the current Exclusive Agriculture (EA) zoning. Brandt acknowledged Edward Nelson who was present. Upon Brandt's asking, Nelson responded things were pretty much as Carlson had explained. Nelson stated he had a Certified Survey Map (CSM) done of the property. Carlson read a letter from the Town of Hale which stated the board had made a motion and accepted and that the Town of Hale has no problem with this change. Brandt called three times for any public comments. There being no comments from the public, Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:46 AM. Bawek made a motion to approve the rezone, Skoyen seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition. Brandt reminded the applicants that the rezone has to be approved by full County Board before it is final, therefore it will be on the County Board meeting agenda this coming Monday. Brandt commented that when land comes out of Exclusive Agriculture zoning, the townships are encouraged to consider zoning to the predominate zoning in the area. Carlson added that the County really doesn't want "spot" zoning, so we prefer to do something that is similar to the surrounding zoning.

Governmental Responsibility Resolution – Brandt referred Committee members to a copy of the resolution in their meeting file. Gamroth mentioned that Carla Doelle had talked to the Committee at a previous meeting about this resolution which basically is appointing who will sign for/on the DNR (Department of Natural Resources) documents. Brandt commented that the Committee approved the same resolution in March of last year and every year the DNR and DATCP (Dept. of Ag. Trade & Consumer Protection) are requiring that the Committee designate the people in the County and/or DLM who are going to be signing the grant applications, etc. Brandt noted that the three people designated are the Committee Chairman, Director of Land Management and the Fiscal Manager. Stalheim explained that this resolution is just so the Committee is aware as to who is responsible for each portion of the TRM (Targeted Runoff Management) process. The DNR wants to make sure that the Committee is aware of what is going on. Stalheim will send the resolution in to the DNR for their files. Zeglin

made a motion to approve the resolution, Nelson seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition.

At this time, two new employees in the Department of Land Management were introduced. Meghan Wessel introduced herself. Wessel stated she is implemented the Farmland Preservation Program which is working into the Working Lands Initiative –Agricultural Enterprise Area so she is trying to get some farmers into that program. Wessel explained the program is really about conservation planning and preserving farmland and preventing urbanization of areas that are prime farm land and so with that there is conservation planning and nutrient management plans for farmers. Wessel gave some background on herself stating she grew up in northern Illinois, she spent 3 years in Hayward Wisconsin during high school. She did her Bachelor's degree in Environmental/Public Health with minors in Biology and Chemistry in Eau Claire. She started out her second bachelor's degree at River Falls for crop and soil sciences and then she moved to Idaho and got her Master's in soil and land resources there, so she has done a lot of research on soil physics and implementing a method to map water content without having to intrusively go into the land (dig soil pits or take soil samples). Brandt asked how one does monitor water content without doing that? Wessel explained she had a device that measures electromagnetic induction. What that does is measure the conductivity of the soil water and so one can use that conductivity to determine where the water is concentrated. Wessel said it really doesn't give how much water one has in their soil but if you take it over a timeframe and you take several measurements over the course of the year or years, one can see where there are areas in the field that have more or less water and which ones are, over time, losing water. Upon Brandt asking if she was talking about topsoil and not groundwater, Wessel responded that was correct. Brandt asked Wessel if she had been involved in the Soil Judging Contest. Wessel responded that she had gone to California to participate in a Soil Judging Contest at which they received 3rd place. Britzius asked about the term "urbanization" Wessel had used when talking about the Farmland Preservation Program. Wessel stated that in order to keep our prime farmland, "prime" and to prevent a lot of businesses or buildings in areas where there are really important agricultural soils or land that is very productive (as farms are very important to our culture, economy and socially) it is important to preserve those areas, so Farmland Preservation or those types of programs help to implement that and gives tax breaks for farmers that are keeping farm land versus selling it therefore keeping the businesses in the city. Britzius asked what differentiates "prime" farm land from "not so prime" farm land. Wessel responded generally it is productivity for crops which is based on the soils, water holding capacity, etc. Upon Britzius asking if that has all been mapped out for Trempealeau County, Brandt informed him of the Trempealeau County Soil Survey. Wessel responded for the most part those soils have been mapped and the County is also actually, currently working on updating that Farmland Preservation plan and finding out where there are farm lands that we can say this area is important to us to preserve it as farm land. Wessel added that NRCS, in their mapping of soils, has soils that are designated as prime farm land based on the area, but here in Wisconsin we are changing that in order to do the Farmland Preservation Program. We are saying, based on this information, we want to keep these soils for agricultural lands because it is important to Wisconsin. Zeglin questioned if, with the changes in Farmland Preservation that are going on now, and that this year might be the end of a lot of contracts coming up, Wessel was going to be more in the planning area? Wessel responded we still have contracts from 1990 that are still valid today, so it just depends on the contract (if they signed up for 10, 20, 30 years). We still have about 180 contracts that will still be in effect for quite some time and those contracts still have to meet conservation standards. Zeglin asked if those would eventually be expiring. Wessel responded yes, and that she didn't know what the last year was for contracts, she knew there were some expiring in the year 2030, but that she would be doing conservation planning with those contracts. Wessel was hopeful that the County would be able to get some landowners into the new Working Lands Initiative Program. Bawek asked if there were any producers in the County actively pursuing the Working Lands Initiative contracts. Wessel responded there are a "handful" that are interested, however it does require at least five landowners to

sort of group together. Wessel has just put out a survey, in the past week, to get an idea of any other landowners out there that might be interested. Bawek asked who's responsibility it was to contact the other landowners. Was it the person that is pursuing it? Wessel responded it's multi-faceted as it could be up to the County to do, but Wessel knew that in Eau Claire County it is really the farmers that are pursuing it. Discussion took place about the "Golden Triangle" in Eau Claire County that has a really strong group of people which are writing their own plan for the Working Lands Initiative and submitting it to DATCP and Eau Claire County staff is guiding/advising them, but they are really doing it all themselves. In Wessel's opinion it was better for farmers to hear the information from fellow farmers than from perhaps a County employee saying "Hey, we think you should do this". Bawek asked what the incentive was for doing this, if it was just monetary. Wessel responded the incentive was \$5.00 per acre for Trempealeau County. Wessel noted that Eau Claire County pays \$10.00 per acre because they have the Farmland Preservation Program incorporated into their zoning. Bawek clarified that would be in coordination with the County as we do our comprehensive plan. Wessel responded yes, absolutely. Wessel thought Peter Fletcher from Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission would be talking with the Committee about that and getting a feel for what the Committee wants to consider as agricultural lands. Upon Bawek asking if the payment could go from \$5.00 to \$10.00, Wessel responded yes. Discussion took place as to how many farmers are needed for creation of an Ag Enterprise Area. Wessel explained a little bit about the application process and that the more landowners you have that sign the application or are in support of it, the stronger the application is for getting into the program. Britzius asked about the differentiation between the Ag Enterprise area and the Working Lands Initiative. Wessel explained that the program was first known as the Farmland Preservation Program. The program was then changed/renamed the Working Lands Initiative but it is really the same as an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA). Once a landowner has an AEA then they can sign up for a Farmland Preservation Contract. In regard to Wessel saying that the more farmers involved the stronger the application, Bawek asked if that had any relationship to the amount of acres involved. Wessel responded it would be best if one could have a larger acreage or more area, i.e. the more acreage that you are covering or the more farmers in that area that are interested, the stronger ones application is to claim that area as an important agricultural area. Wessel added there isn't really a requirement for acreage. In order to sign up for a contract, there are requirements but there aren't really requirements for the AEA it just makes ones' application stronger. Discussion followed about the "Bears Grass" area in Eau Claire County which is great farm land.

The new Building Inspector, Larry Gilles, introduced himself. Gilles stated he is the UDC (Uniform Dwelling Code) Inspector and zoning is in his title also although he wasn't sure how much of the zoning he will be doing. Gilles explained he will be inspecting projects that involve one and two family dwellings, whether it is a new house or an addition. Trempealeau County has also adopted detached garages to fall under the UDC code, so any of those that are built for residential use, not Ag, will fall under the building code and be inspected. Gilles stated he lives in the Tomah area. He has been working in central Wisconsin; Wood, Adams and Sauk County for the last 20 years. Gilles has been self-employed in some of those areas in which economy plays a large part. The opportunity to be employed here came up and so Gilles applied for it. Britzius asked Gilles to give some insight regarding the multiple certifications required for this position. Gilles stated he is certified for UDC inspections on one and two family dwellings which includes construction, electrical, plumbing and HVAC (heating and air conditioning). Gilles added that he is also certified to inspect commercial buildings even though the County isn't doing those inspections right now. Britzius commented Gilles will be very valuable for our team. Brandt reminded the new members of the Committee that this is a service that the County offered to the townships or all municipalities, to have an inspector on staff (if they are willing to contract with us) to do these inspections for them. Discussion took place about what municipalities the County inspected. Gilles stated he is going through all the current files. Brandt thanked Wessel and Gilles for coming to the meeting.

2014 Budget Resolution – Stalheim referred the Committee to a copy of the resolution. Stalheim stated the resolution is needed to balance out the 2014 special accounts, the State grant amounts that DLM receives. Stalheim noted that on the front of the resolution, it states, “the budget is later subject to final allocations and subsequent additions or deletions of funds”. Stalheim explained that the grants for 2014 were prepared actually in August of 2013 so at that time we didn’t know exactly how much money DLM would be receiving from the State so we need to do a resolution just to balance out everything. There is no tax levy money involved as it is all State monies/revenue coming in. It is all reimbursement that DLM has received or will be receiving shortly from last year. Stalheim went through the resolution with the Committee. Stalheim noted the resolution needs to go to County Board for approval. Britzius made a motion to approve the resolution and send it on to the County Board, Zeglin seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

Discussion and Action on Livestock Producer Member recommendations to forward to County Board Chair for appointment to Environment & Land Use Committee.

Brandt stated that Zeglin and Bawek’s terms on the E & LU Committee will expire in April 2015. Their terms are scheduled to expire opposite the County Board terms so that there isn’t a complete turnover of the Committee in a given year. Brandt explained these positions are a “holdover” from the Land Conservation Committee days where it was possible for those Committees to have an Ag producer member, a Towns’ Association member and the FSA (Farm Service Agency) member on the Committee. Brandt thought this County has always had those three positions as so called “citizen members”. Brandt noted that the Committees’ recommendations are just those. County Board Chair Dick Miller is the one who makes the appointments. Upon Brandt asking Bawek if he would be willing to serve again, Bawek responded he would feel privileged to serve again. Brandt asked if any of the Committee members had any other recommendations. Some discussion took place as to how many names should be or had been forwarded in the past. Schultz made a motion to forward Bawek’s name on to the County Board Chair for consideration, Zeglin seconded, motion carried with no opposition. Brandt commented that it would be an honor to have Bawek back on the Committee and that he appreciated the amount of work that Bawek does and the perspective that Bawek brings to the proceedings.

Discussion and Action on Towns’ Association Member recommendations to forward to County Board Chair for appointment to Environment & Land Use Committee

Brandt stated the next item agenda is similar and that the Towns’ Association recommendations were Ron Tuschner and Kathy Zeglin. Upon Brandt asking Zeglin if she would be willing to service again, Zeglin responded she would be willing and honored to serve again. Nelson made a motion to forward these two names to the County Board Chair for consideration, Skoyen seconded, motion carried unopposed.

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

No one from the public was present to comment so the Committee moved on.

LWRM (Land & Water Resource Management) and TRM (Target Runoff Management)

Requests and Payment Approval Carlson explained that Richard Hilton had done a project late last fall and this request was a carryover from that. The project was a critical area along the Black River.

LWRM

<u>Name</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>New CSA Total</u>	<u>Reason for Change</u>	<u>Town</u>
Richard Hilton	Contract	\$ 10,986.14	\$10,986.14	Critical Area	Gale
Richard Hilton	Pay Request	\$ 10,986.14		Certify Critical Area	

Upon Brandt asking if the work is done, Carlson responded yes and Hilton will be doing more work in the future as this is just one step. Carlson explained, that as mentioned, the project is along the Black River and there are some areas where the banks are huge. Hilton's area isn't like that, it kind of goes down into a flood plain area but then there is an old ditch coming down and washing into the stream and this project has taken care of that ditch so the next step would be riprap along the stream bank itself. Nelson made a motion to approve the pay request, Britzius seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval

Brandt referred the Committee to the County Surveyors report and payment request as prepared by Joe Nelsen. Nelsen stated his report shows the progress of monument maintenance. It also itemizes time for drafting and completing tie sheets associated with T20N, R10W of the remonumentation project. As one can see by the report, Nelsen stated that in T19N, R7-8 project, they reviewed 126 of the corners. The maintenance has been completed for 100 of them, 9 of them will require additional field work due to the monument being disturbed and/or damaged. Nelsen has discussed this with the Committee before and the maintenance can be as simple as replacing the cap as someone has removed it. Sometimes in the process of taking the cap off they have also moved the monument in other words, worked it out to get the monument out of the ground. Upon Brandt mentioned that we aren't encouraging them to do that, Nelsen stated it is against the law and the warning sticker says something to that effect. They had hoped that federal law would discourage that. Nelsen does put a white "T" post near each of the markers especially on the corners that are "off road". It is a really good idea when Nelsen wants to find them but then everyone else can find them too and he thinks that "T" post might be as detrimental as it is a benefit. Brandt inquired if Nelsen was taking that in when revising the maintenance program. Nelsen responded it is a "double edged sword" as surveyors like the "T" post because they are able to walk right to the monument and save their client a lot of time, but then Nelsen goes there and it looks like someone tied a cow to it or something and it got jerked all over the place, so it seems like the post is a big flashing light for someone to go up to it and damage it. Nelsen wonders, if in this maintenance program, he shouldn't be replacing that nice white "T" post. For every post that Nelsen doesn't replace, there is the person that comes in with some type of big machinery, we lose the monument, and he says if there would have been a nice white "T" post near it, he wouldn't have done that. At this point Nelsen is going to keep putting the "T" posts by the monuments because the benefit seems to outweigh the detriment. Schultz questioned what percentage Nelsen has to do maintenance on. Nelsen responded roughly around 8% have to be revisited and the marker replaced. Of the 100 where Nelsen doesn't have to replace the marker, they've replaced the cap on probably 8-10 of those. Nelsen added that caps aren't a big deal (except for the cost of the cap) because when they visit the marker they also take the tools to replace the cap if they have to. When they actually destroy the monument or bend it to try to get the cap off or just plain vandalize it, then Nelsen has to go back with a crew, and set up their equipment to set that monument back where it belongs. Nelsen asked the Committee to keep in mind that the corners he is working on probably were set 15 years ago, so a five year maintenance plan would keep that percentage down to perhaps 2%. Britzius asked if there is a maintenance plan in place. Nelsen responded that what he is working on right now is a plan that visits those corners every five years. This is the first organized maintenance since Nelsen set all the corners as his time spent in the past has been getting the corners remonumented. Now that he has done that, Nelsen is going back and revisiting the corners that he set initially (15-17 years ago). The plan budget wise is to set it for maintenance every five years. Part of this maintenance is rating these corners as to what timeframe we think they serve, i.e. a corner that sits in the road probably needs a higher maintenance level than something that is in the middle of a woods. Nelsen will rate the corners and then in the future maintain them based on this rating system. Brandt noted that in the DLM Annual Report there are some great pictures of identifying

corners and the effort that went into identifying where those corners are going to be. Nelsen commented some of those corners originally had not been remonumented since the original government survey of 1850. More discussion took place on the “T” posts and/or other options for marking the corners. Skoyen made a motion to approve the report and payment, Britzius seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

Confirm Next Regular Meeting Date

The next special meeting date of the E & LU Committee was set for Thursday April 2nd, 2015 at 6:00 PM. The meeting will run from approximately 6-8:30 PM. The next regular meeting date was set for Wednesday, April 8th, 2015.

At 10:45AM, Nelson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Zeglin seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Michael Nelson, Secretary