

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
June 10th, 2015 9:00 AM
COUNTY BOARD ROOM

Chairman Brandt called the meeting to order at 9:05M.

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, Kathy Zeglin, and Jeff Bawek and Jon Schultz. Rick Geske and Curt Skoyen were absent.

Staff/Advisors present: Kevin Lien and Virg Gamroth. Carla Doelle, Mark Carlson, Mark Kunz – NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service), County Forester Dan Dehmer, Corporation Counsel Rian Radtke and Elsa Kulig from Human Resources were in attendance for part of the meeting.

Others present; David Kamla, Attorney Fred Berns, Chris Dettinger, City of Arcadia Mayor John Kimmel, Tom Forrer and Ron Weltzien.

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

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service) Update

Kunz wanted to talk about the Conservation Reserve Program as Trempealeau County has one of the highest participation rates in the State (we are usually in the top three). They have about 140 existing contracts that will be expiring at the end of September 2015. One of the things Kunz has been working on is going out and looking at a lot of the continuous type practices which are adjacent to streams. According to Kunz, Dan Dehmer from DNR has been out looking at the tree plantings to make sure they meet NRCS standards because these people have the opportunity to re-enroll if they choose so long as they meet the standard of the practice in the program. The Secretary of Ag also announced that there will be a general CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) sign-up starting December 1st, 2015. Kunz isn't sure what all the parameters will be for that but a lot of the fields that are in our County, if people are interested, they can qualify under the HELI (Highly Erodible Land Initiative) option of the continuous CRP sign-up. One has to meet certain parameters relative to the potential erosion on that field basically based on slope. Kunz noted they are updating the soil rental rates and those values could be pretty competitive with rental rates around the County right now, so that is always an option for a person who is looking to eliminate that steep field that they don't wish to farm anymore. Lien asked if the new sign-up would bring the possibility of more tree plantings. Kunz responded the landowner always has the option to identify what type of habitat/cover they want to establish. Kunz noted that we have to be cognizant of the types of trees that are planted because some of them turn out to be a food source instead and then the landowner finds out that they are not at the minimum stocking rates that they need to be at. Kunz stated they have quite a bit of construction going on. They have approximately 15 new EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentive Program) contracts approved. They had a cover crop signup that concluded last Friday so they will be looking at possible approval on some of those. They are waiting to hear on their Targeted Driftless Area Conservation Initiative sign-up also. Overall they are up over 90

EQIP applications in the County this year. Upon Brandt asking how NRCS gets the word out, Kunz responded they try to get information into the papers, put flyers up in the buildings and there are news releases that go out into the larger type outlets that the Madison office sends out. Kunz added that occasionally there are some public service announcements. In regard to the new EQIP sign-ups, Schultz asked Kunz how many of those happen to be timber improvement, etc. Kunz responded so far there were three. Kunz explained they take their allocation and break it up though their local work group process into sub-funds that are to be allocated within certain land cover types so some goes to farmstead, some to crop land and some goes to wood land and so they try to make sure that they spread it out and it doesn't all go to one project. Kunz thought their system seems to be working really well.

Forester Report – Brandt referred the Committee to a report entitled Tree Planting Summary (This report is on file in the DLM office). County Forester Dan Dehmer with the Department of Natural Resources introduced himself. Dehmer informed the Committee that the other County Forester Scott Laurie is now retired. Dehmer went through the Tree Planting Summary noting that there were 40,800 trees planted in the County from the State nursery. Dehmer said that was very low and it is the lowest year we've had yet. The County tree planting machines planted 4,200 trees. Dehmer presented \$114.00 to the Committee. Dehmer stated it was their wish to get out of the tree planting all together. As far as DNR, they used to schedule plantings with the people that were planting. It doesn't make sense that the County has the tree planters, takes in the money and all the liability so therefore they are not going to be scheduling any tree planting anymore and if the County still wants to be in the business of tree planting, Dehmer would refer them to the DLM for scheduling, etc. Brandt asked if there would be a replacement for Laurie. Dehmer responded there is a plan but he doesn't know, noting the Governor's budget and other vacancies, whether it is a high priority. Dehmer stated there are people that do custom tree planting. They also get their trees from private nursery's, deliver them to the people and do a wonderful job, so they would be able to handle the tree planting in our County right now. Brandt clarified that the Forester's office will not be coordinating tree planting with our County planter. Dehmer responded that was correct except for delivery of trees. Dehmer's recommendation to the Committee was either to keep the machines and continue renting them out or sell the machines and let the private contractors deal with it. Lien commented he thought the machines were old Conservation Corp. machines from the 1930's, but they are simple machines, so with a little welding they kept running. Lien's concern was, as a County, that if the numbers keep declining with tree planting what is the future of the County. What direction are we headed. Lien asked if Dehmer had ever worked with any of the mining companies on restoration plans or if we could do something with them on future tree plantings. Dehmer stated he has never seen a restoration plan for a mining company and he wasn't sure if the County had. Lien responded he has but he hasn't seen a good forest plan as far as reclamation. With more mines and less trees Lien asked what the future plan is for the County related to that and forestry. Dehmer responded we have more trees in the County than we ever had before. Dehmer elaborated and discussion took place on the CRP (Conservation Reserve Program) plantings. Brandt stated we will accept the report that Dehmer would no longer be coordinating the tree planting using the County planters. Brandt asked what the wishes of the Committee was as far as keeping the planters. Britzius suggested keeping them for now in case we see a sensible use for them in the future. It was mentioned there are three planters and they are stored at the Highway Department building in Arcadia and they haven't charged us any rental. Britzius thought we would do well just to hang onto them and see how things develop. Brandt agreed with that. Upon Britzius asking if Dehmer had any idea as to how many trees were planted by private contractors, Dehmer responded that private contractors have received trees from private nurseries and it would only be 10% of what we got at the State nursery. Dehmer explained that the State nursery is not in it for profit so they have to do it at cost and the private nurseries are pretty close to our State nursery cost and some species are unavailable from the State

nursery because the State nursery can only plant natural trees that are native to Wisconsin. Most of the time it is cost effective for the private contractor to go through the State nursery depending on what species you want. Zeglin asked where the County is standing on oak wilt and emerald ash borer. Dehmer responded oak wilt will always be here and they are trying some biotic little non-stinging wasps on emerald ash borer so it will take a little while to get the population up on that to resist the emerald ash borer. Dehmer stated it started in Perrot Park and right now it is in Arcadia and he is sure it is other places but it doesn't show up until it is infected until after about five years. Dehmer noted there is also some root rot in the County which affects pine trees, there is oak wilt, they are spraying for Gypsy moths, and emerald ash borer is here, so trees have a hard life here. Invasives such as buck thorn, garlic mustard and red maple, etc. are invading the woods. Dehmer elaborated on the timber industry in the County. Bawek asked Dehmer what the no harvest time line was to prevent oak wilt. Dehmer responded if you have oak wilt in your property, we want to wait until October but it is usually from April 15th to July 15th when the beetles are most active. If one is clear-cutting you don't worry about it, but if one is thinning oak you're damaging the other trees while felling and beetles would be attracted to that wound and then spread the disease. In regard to mining, Dehmer mentioned that 370 acres of Managed Forest Law have been withdrawn in lieu of sand mines. There are 49,600 acres in Managed Forest Law in this County. Upon Nelson asking about clear-cutting, Dehmer gave a brief explanation about that. Some discussion took place about invasive species, etc. Zeglin made a motion to accept the \$114.00 tree planter rental income, Nelson seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit – Slope – Christian G. Dettinger and Carol Dettinger, Landowner/Petitioner, Mahtomedi, MN – Town of Trempealeau

Chairman Brandt brought the public hearing to order at 9:35 AM. Brandt instructed anyone who wishes to speak at the public hearing present to fill out a form. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Carlson stated that under the Trempealeau County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Chapter 3.03(8) it requires that any slope between 20-30% shall require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and that is why Dettinger is here and the reason for the meeting. Carlson has taken photo shots out there and those can be discussed during the question and answer period. Carlson noted that Mr. Dettinger and his Attorney Fred Berns are here and there are members from the Town of Trempealeau Board present. Carlson stated he has not received any e-mails or calls or any letters since the notice to adjoining landowners was sent out. Carlson had received some calls about a year ago, but nothing since the hearing notice was sent. Brandt clarified that a building site for a home was being addressed. Carlson explained this is a property that is very hilly. According to Carlson, Dettinger had another area where he wanted to build but Carlson pointed out that site was in excess of 30% which is not permitted and would have required a variance so it was decided to go for the CUP because a variance may or may not be granted because there are other options to get to the site. Carlson pointed out on the overhead aerial photo displayed where the home was to be located and the previously proposed site. Carlson showed a photo looking up towards the park and pointed out the access to the property. Carlson pointed out a spot, that with the driveway requirements, it would have to drop back 6 inches for the first 20 feet and in that case he would have to cut two feet out of there to get that. Carlson noted that one could see from the deposits there that the water does flow along the road and there is no definite road ditch like in a normal situation. Carlson stated it is pretty limited to what we can actually do. Carlson had a photo looking up towards the driveway while standing in the driveway of the apartment complex. Carlson displayed a photo of the well casing; he didn't know if it was currently in use or just left there. Brandt stated that gives us an idea of why we are here and what the project looks like. Brandt asked Attorney Berns if there was anything he wished to add to what Carlson said. Berns stated that Dettinger is attempting/wishes to build a residence and he needs a CUP because of the slope of the driveway and he meets all the other requirements as far as Berns knew for the siting of the building. Berns explained the

original plan was different and he (Dettinger) changed it to meet the requirements of the Zoning Committee. Brandt called for public testimony.

David Kamla, Trempealeau – Registered to testify in opposition. Kamla stated he and his wife, Cheryl, own the property at 25702 Sullivan Road, south of Dettinger's property and east of it. Kamla's major concern is where this road is going in and his runoff water, he wants to run off on Kamla's driveway. According to Kamla, all of Sullivan Road has an erosion problem, it is steep and every driveway washes out there. Another concern of Kamla's is where the proposed septic drain field was. Kamla said the picture shown by Carlson was correct of his well and that it is south of the site. In the future, if Kamla wants to expand his rental business, and put another unit in, if his septic drain field is right there, Dettinger will be contaminating Kamla's ground where he wants to build as water does run down hill. Kamla reiterated, that if he does want to expand in the future, there is a concern there mainly because of all the runoff water. As of right now, Kamla said he doesn't have the road in but he or whoever comes out has been using Kamla's.

Brandt called twice for any other public testimony twice. Carlson stated he did receive a letter from the Town of Trempealeau but it was dated March 26th, 2014. Carlson explained Dettinger initially went to the Town for their approval as part of deciding to go forward with this public hearing. Brandt asked if it was germane for Carlson to read it now and if he could do that? Carlson added that if the Town members present have other comments that would probably supersede the letter. Carlson read aloud the letter which stated, "on behalf of Chris and Carol Dettinger I have enclosed the following letter of no objection, (Carlson added they actually gave us the CUP application on his behalf) but they had no objection to the County having a CUP hearing or allowing it to happen. Gamroth asked for the record, who gave Carlson permission to read the letter. Ken Farley, Town of Trempealeau Chairman stated he gives his permission to read the letter. In addressing the septic situation, Carlson said it does meet the requirements for setbacks from a septic, it is 50 feet from a drain field which is the requirement for a well head. Carlson stated he has an at-grade system which is somewhat of a diversion because it is above the ground. Carlson pointed out on the map where that was to be located so it could be made to divert the water off. Carlson thought the water could run down the driveway and he didn't think it would cause any problems such as running onto the next property. Brandt clarified that Carlson was talking about surface water. Carlson reiterated the requirements have been met for the septic. Brandt called for anyone who wished to speak to this issue. Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:43 AM. Brandt stated he needs the Conditional Use Permit because of the 15% slope and wanted clarification if this was because of the driveway slope or the site slope. Carlson replied it was for the site slope. Carlson explained the 15% was the township requirement and the County requirement is 20% for the driveway and that the CUP hearing is basically because if it is greater than 20% but less than 30% and this is a pre-existing condition and for the construction of anything on that site. Carlson added he will be constructing the driveway in between those two parameters and that is the reason for the public hearing. Upon Brandt re-clarifying this is for the slope of the driveway, Carlson responded that was correct. Carlson stated the building site itself is flat and it is going to be a somewhat smaller, two story type home. Carlson said the site is fine, but the construction of the driveway could not meet the parameters of that 20-30%. On Carlson's behalf, Lien handed out the driveway requirements in Chapter 6.05 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. Lien also referenced Chapter 10.04 (5), Basis of Approval which is the basis of approval language (Lien suggested the Committee take a few minutes to read through) when making decisions related to this type of issue. Lien had a couple of questions for Dettinger. Lien stated he and Carlson have been working with Dettinger for over a year on this issue. The last time they met, they had talked about a concern that things look good on paper and that the driveway access is pretty narrow- approximately 40 feet. Dettinger said that was right. Lien stated we had talked about that

Dettinger was maybe going to do some cross sections showing some small retention ponds to hold runoff. Lien asked if Dettinger had been able to do that yet. Dettinger stated on the original building plan there are drawn, along side the driveway, some retention areas and they are listed "as needed". Lien stated he had looked at minimum widths for driveway construction and height clearance, etc. for access and with that forty feet and the amount of cut that needs to be made there, those are going to be tough to put in. Lien added that is why he had asked Dettinger for those cross sections to show that it will fit in that forty foot width. Upon Lien asking if Dettinger remembered that conversation, Dettinger said he didn't. Lien stated you're going to pull a straight grade up through there to get the 15% and Lien was concerned as to where that water is going to run because we know the Kamla property is right below and we had discussed putting in some little retention ponds and according to Lien, Dettinger said he would include them in his drawing. Lien is wondering how feasible it is to fit it in that forty foot width. Dettinger replied he did provide some original drawings with retention ponds showing although Dettinger believes they are on the right hand side of the driveway going up. Lien clarified the easterly side versus the west. Dettinger said that was right. Dettinger thought it was left as kind of a decision that once excavation would start, the excavator would know best where to put them. Lien replied that part of the requirement/deal with the Town of Trempealeau was that it would be a black top or basically impervious surface driveway. Dettinger agreed. Bawek asked if there was supposed to be a minimum of 100 feet of road frontage. Lien answered this is a pre-existing lot, so it is a "grandfathered" lot as far as being in existence, but to build on it, it still needs to meet conformity, i.e. getting an approved septic system, well and meeting the driveway and building requirements. Lien reiterated that the lot itself is grandfathered which means it was pre-existing prior to the adoption of the Ordinance. Bawek asked if that was for the 100 feet. Lien responded yes. Bawek asked if the frontage didn't used to be 60 feet. Lien responded prior to March 11th, 1998 there wasn't a requirement and this lot pre-dated that date. Upon Bawek asking if this lot is alright, Lien responded this lot is ok as long as he can meet all the other requirements. Carlson noted that he did find the drawing that Lien had referred to. Carlson had the drawing in front of him and noted that it has on it the depressions, check dams and all that drawn on it, so he was going to address that situation. Attorney Fred Berns stated that he assumed the map that Carlson was looking at meets the requirements. Carlson responded it would meet the requirements as long as it didn't have any sedimentation, etc. running down onto the road or if it slowed it down. Carlson noted they didn't do any calculations on how big the retention pond had to be. It is not a requirement because it is not a storm water requirement but it would slow the water down which was the intent. Carlson added it wouldn't prevent everything from running down onto the road if we had a really bad rain. Lien explained that what they had talked to Dettinger about was not creating additional runoff down there and when one looks at the site, it is going to be hard. The septic system will divert some water but the driveway itself from the building site down, if that is a straight grade, one is going to want to tip it where you can to not concentrate flow, because if one takes the length of that driveway and concentrates that flow down, a small little retention pond isn't going to hold it. Lien added our concern was that the excavator construct it in a manner to get the water off of, instead of concentrating, because the impervious surface is going to just keep collecting more water. Lien thought that is where Dettinger had the engineer draw the retention pond on the plan. Carlson noted that on the plan they call it the depression area. Carlson added it is just a theoretical drawing and it is not calculated as to how much water the retention pond was going to hold, if any, or if it was just going to slow water down. Berns questioned, if the CUP is granted today, does Dettinger have to build according to the drawings and stated if that is so, he will do so. Berns just needed to have some clarification from Lien and Carlson that this drawing is acceptable and if he builds exactly the way the drawing is, there isn't going to be problems. Lien response was the drawing was not detailed enough to answer that. Brandt commented that we have technical ability on the staff's part to determine what is needed based on projected rainfall, length of slope, length of the driveway and the size of the slope and there are plenty of techniques for

diverting water and slowing water. It is possible, which is why this is a conditional use permit, to create a driveway that won't contribute significantly and Brandt felt that is what Carlson's goal was is to not contribute significantly to the runoff that already goes to the town road. Brandt thought the town road really needs a ditch. Carlson stated, as he understood, there is a culvert along the road. Kamla stated it runs under the road by Sullivan's. Schultz clarified that water would come down the driveway and then head east along that partial ditch towards Sullivan's and at some point past Mr. Kamla's property. Kamla commented the culvert is totally blocked and he mows right over the top of it and it serves no purpose. Carlson thought perhaps that culvert could be tied into. In relation to the drawings that were talked about, Schultz asked who is fundamentally responsible, if this driveway is a straight shot, and the water is shedding onto the road especially with a spring freeze/thaw (water pooling onto Sullivan road and creating a slick spot) which is basically the high risk. Who is fundamentally responsible for that excess water flow when and if the Committee grants this permit? Lien commented that is why we have the driveway requirements so it doesn't do that as the driveway has to tip back away. Upon Lien questioning Dettinger if forty feet was accurate for the width he had to work with, Dettinger said yes. Lien stated the minimum driveway width is 12 feet so that gives Dettinger approximately 14 feet on each side to construct ditches, berms or whatever to control the water so that is why its kind of tough to fit that in looking at that drawing without some cross sections. In answering Schultz's question, Lien said it ultimately comes back to the landowner. They can't contribute additional runoff water to the public roadway or to neighboring property's. Lien thought that is why Dettinger has a fairly detailed drawing with diverting the water through the septic system and then the retention pond or whatever it would be to try and control some of that runoff. Britzius asked Lien and Carlson if they were confident that Dettinger could do what Brandt had suggested that being come up with a more specific and accurate assessment of what would be required to make this thing meet the requirements. Carlson thought as staff we would check something that was proposed, but we're not going to tell him how big it needs to be. Lien added that is the politically correct answer as our job is not to design or advise the landowner it is to review what the landowner submits to see if it is compliant because staff doesn't take on that liability if something were to fail. Lien explained it is just like the house site. Dettinger has come in to staff with a couple of plans and we've said "Sorry those don't meet the requirements", so Dettinger has modified them and come back. Brandt clarified that Dettinger's hired engineer will design something, he will bring it in and DLM staff will say whether it will or won't work. Lien commented we have specific language as to how a driveway needs to be constructed and it can't contribute runoff. From the beginning, Lien's concern has always been this narrow path in which to fit it all. Lien thought it is something that looks great on paper, but it is a very steep site. Upon Lien asking Dettinger what the rise was from the bottom to the top, Dettinger replied he couldn't say without pulling out his paperwork. Carlson said he took some shots and it varies. Up towards the top on is looking at 25, 27 and then it starts to get less as you're coming down, but if he has to cut down two foot that first twenty feet, it is not his fault that there is not a road ditch to work with. Carlson added it tilts away from the road right now but not twenty feet, it is like three feet and that is where the little swale was that the pictures showed. It is obviously steeper on top then it is on the bottom, but overall once he carves all this in here, (he is going to lower the top part four or five feet) and the more one lowers that, the less the slope is going to be. As far as dropping back twenty feet, and having a culvert in there at twenty feet like the driveway requirement states, Carlson didn't think it fit in with what the upstream and downstream property's have. Lien voiced that towns issue the driveway permits on town roads and the language reflects towns' wishes and this is one of those sites where maybe a culvert doesn't make sense but you still have to divert that water off, so if one looked at a cross sectional view, the road would tip back for twenty feet, crown (so water would run back into the ditches) and then go back up. That way it is not contributing to the roadway and hopefully there are good permeable soils there for it to soak in because there isn't good runoff. Now you can see on the existing sites, there isn't a culvert at the one below and everything is sort

of following the road swale, it isn't much of a ditch but one can see where the sediment is. Lien stated it isn't a site where a culvert makes sense. Bawek asked where the existing culvert was on Kamla's property that is plugged up. Kamla pointed out on the overhead aerial photos where the culvert supposedly is (where Sullivan's parking lot starts, it is sticking up). Kamla commented if there is a heavy rain that comes down that hill, Sullivan's kitchen is going to get flooded eventually. Bawek asked, instead of a depression or a swale, etc. to collect water, if Dettinger had ever considered putting in a man hole and running that culvert down to the road and then put a culvert in and hook up to Kamla's culvert as that might clear up all of these issues for him. Dettinger replied no. Bawek asked what Lien's thoughts were on that. Lien responded that right now Kamla's culvert is pretty non-existence and there isn't much of a ditch. Lien didn't know if any of the Committee had driven down to the site. Bawek stated he has seen it and in his opinion that is how to solve this issue – to put a man hole up higher where he has the swale and you can't run water on other people's property so he could actually divert the water down to the side of his driveway more and hit the manhole and then the culverts. That would keep all the water from running on the main road and allow him to do this. Britzius asked if Dettinger was willing to do what it takes to solve this problem. Berns commented if they have a culvert that is there now and is plugged up, there is nothing that we can do about that. It is not on their property so it is not something they can control. Berns said we don't have any way to solve that problem. Berns added Lien and his staff have told them that they need these certain items and those are designed into this roadway and that is why Berns had asked that specific question of them and if this is granted, they don't want to come back here again in six months and say "Gee you didn't do what you were supposed to do". Berns stated we want to know that this is what we have to do. If this is going to be a "yes" or "no" vote then he knows he has to go to his contractor and that has to be written into the construction contract. Britzius asked if Berns' question was, is that particular design over there good enough. Berns responded that is absolutely his specific question. Berns added they want to make things work too and that they had originally had an idea to take this road up and make it not quite so steep and the problem with that was that it went over some property that was over 30% grade and one can't do anything on that even though that would resolve some of the problem by making the driveway longer and less steep. Britzius wanted to throw out another suggestion and said that he has seen permeable parking lots and driveways. One doesn't necessarily need to have a surface that is going to carry all of the water away. They build a surface that allows some of the water to go down and Britzius wondered if that has been considered. Berns answered they are sort of at the mercy of the township as to what they require at this point. Brandt recapped where the Committee was in the process. Brandt stated we don't have a motion to grant the CUP nor do we have any conditions that we could attach to that motion. An option is that we could grant the motion for the driveway based on the plan and attach the condition that staff review it and approve it. We could also "throw up our hands and say it is too steep let's forget about it". Brandt noted that Dettinger has worked for over a year with DLM staff and has brought in engineers and surveyors to help with the project. He apparently wants to build a house in Trempealeau which is a great thing not only to have more houses in the County but also it is a great view which is, Brandt thought, Dettinger's desire to look at the Mississippi River. For the purpose of discussion Nelson made a motion to approve the CUP, Britzius seconded. Brandt called for more discussion especially on possible conditions. Zeglin questioned Town of Trempealeau Chairman, Ken Farley if there were any plans on the town's part to possibly ditch along Sullivan Road or possibly install some culverts or dig out a culvert that is said to be plugged. Farley answered, as Prondzinski was saying, is that the culvert was probably in way before he was even on the town board or I. Normal runoff from the parking lots have probably plugged it and it is right across from Sullivan's. As far as water flow it is diverted down the side of the road, so to answer the question Farley stated "no" as they think the culvert is over 30 some feet or bigger going across that parking lot. Farley didn't know when that culvert was put in but they don't plan on ditching or doing anything to disturb that right now. This may create a lot

more problems in the very near future, with water flow, and they may have to get that culvert dug out and a bigger one put in, because they do plug up over time. Farley acknowledged there is a concern with water flowing over the road and freezing on the road and that is why they have the driveway requirements to slope it back so we don't have the slippery road but it is a southern exposure so it gets the sun. Farley repeated they don't plan to do anything there right now other than perhaps cleaning out the culvert. It depends on how much water does come out, as no one knows, it is a guess, it could be a lot, might not be any more. Britzius asked if it wasn't the towns' responsibility to clear the culvert out so that it is not plugged. Farley responded yes and that is probably what is going to have to be done. Farley added that if one talks about digging it out then the road would need to be re-blacktopped so it is not a small feat to do it. Upon Britzius commenting that in digging it out, it may be collapsed and it would be a major excavation, Farley commented that is possible. Farley added they looked at re-doing the road but with the money shortage and the Governor cutting back on everything else, they did some other work to make it last. Farley thought the culvert would perhaps end up getting cut out, but questioned what they would put in there then. Carlson responded he knew it would have to be looked at and tying into a culvert with some water flow would be a good idea and would really help the cause. Farley added they discussed it this morning that something would have to be done down there. Zeglin clarified that the town is definitely going to address any problems that pop up. Bawek clarified that the town was going to work with the landowner. Farley responded yes as that is a taxpayer and they want to work with them and encourage development in the town but yet we don't want to create other issues and that is why they work with DLM staff to make sure that what they do and what the landowner does is right and proper and don't create problems. That is why there are zoning and septic permits therefore protecting Mr. Kamla's property and Sullivan's. Farley elaborated on some other problems in that area. Farley reiterated that they plan on working with him. As far as the culvert what is there now has been working but if there is additional water flow, it is going to interfere with his property too. Lien reminded Brandt that Section 10.04 of the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance. Lien referred the Committee to #6- Conditions and Restrictions and stated the Committee has had a good discussion on some possible remedies to the situation along with some town suggestions. Lien added the Committee does have the ability to attach some conditions. Lien noted that Britzius had mentioned something about impervious surfaces. The Town has said they need to have a paved driveway. Lien said they do make pervious asphalt noting that Dettinger might not have to do the whole section. In looking at Dettinger's plan, Lien believed in the upper section of the driveway that water could be diverted from going down the driveway. Lien continued that if the driveway is tipped properly (Dettinger had mentioned if one gets a good excavator) the water can be diverted so it doesn't concentrate and will flow. All driveways should be crowned anyway and if he has "thank you mums" which are little diversions that kick the water off the road, if they can do that to not concentrate the flow that could all aid in the project. Lien was reminiscent about a project he had gone to see in LaCrosse that was pervious blacktop. They hooked up a hose from a hydrant and turned it on and the water didn't go more than 10 feet and it all went down, everything went through that blacktop but they also vacuum it a couple times a year and Lien didn't know how realistic it was as far as maintenance. Britzius said there are other designs for pervious driveways. Lien agreed there are but he didn't know how effective they are. More discussion took place on pervious driveways. To continue, Lien stated there are options, this is a CUP. Lien thought a large portion of the upper part of that driveway could be diverted to not contribute, it is mainly that forty foot width section that is a staff concern as to how that is going to fit in and not cause runoff. If they can get that done then Lien stated we have no objection. Brandt recapped there is a motion and a second to approve the CUP. Brandt asked if the Committee accepts that the property owner is committed to the plan that he has in front of us with staff approval or is there anything else in the current plan that the Committee wants changed or added as a condition. Brandt noted that the Ordinance is clear not to add any significantly more water to the roadway. Brandt added the concern related to the septic system has

been clarified by staff in terms of the setback from the well head. The Town has indicated a willingness or plan to upgrade or clear out that drainage culvert. Zeglin thought the Committee should have a few conditions on the permit to ensure that the things are done properly. Zeglin stated she would like to see all of the check dams along the east side of the road in the drawing that the Committee has to be part of the conditions. Brandt added there are also the shallow grade of depressions to slow water flow. Zeglin added that would be Condition #2. Brandt recapped that as per the engineers drawing, there be the use of riprap check dams and shallow grade of depressions to slow water flow. Britzius suggested the slope of the driveway or crown of the driveway. Brandt stated basically the Committee is talking about what is already in the plan but we can make those conditions. For clarification, Berns asked if there was a specification for the driveway crown. Lien answered he believed there was through the Highway Dept. and it is minimal. Lien said he could get that for Berns. Berns asked if the Committee could say in this motion that it is according to the County requirements. Lien asked if the town representatives knew what the crown was on a town road for new construction. Carlson commented all the water that is being crowned to this side is going to run to the bottom and go down and be a concern. Carlson thought it just keeps it from running on the east side and everything Dettinger has planned is on the east side (swales, etc.) so we might as well utilize those as best we can. Carlson thought he would tip it all to one side because if you tip it to the other side and there isn't anything over there perhaps it would wash and that would get on the road or one could require check dams on both sides of the road. Farley commented that originally it was sloped one way so that they wouldn't have that water coming down. Bawek asked if water breaks were a little bit safer way to go rather than tilting the road all one way. Carlson responded in a normal situation yes, because you want water to run/flip flop it back and forth but once it gets down to where the sign is, it is all going to be an issue once it gets down to the road because there won't be any culvert there. When the culvert is replaced, they can tie into that. Lien thought that ideally if you tip the one part to the west then the area is utilized well because if it is tipped to all one direction then it is being concentrated in the ditch side. For clarification, Schultz stated these are pretty well drained soils. Carlson said it is pretty sandy and when they did some soil borings up on top (he went down at least five feet) it was like pure sugar, so the water should seep away fairly good, but if we get a major rain (i.e. 6 inches of rain in one night) those aren't planned for even in the designs. Kamla requested the picture of his driveway be shown. Kamla stated his driveway is all solid rock all the way up to that high point, so if one talks about water seeping in, it isn't going to, it is going to run off as that is all hard sand stone. Bawek asked if that is where Dettinger is coming out. Carlson pointed out where Dettinger was coming out and Kamla stated Dettinger's road is on the left. Kamla added his conversions are coming Kamla's way. Carlson replied they wouldn't be diverting water onto Kamla's property. There would be a ditch along side the driveway and it would be ditched into that and then it would run along his (Dettinger's) driveway, so that is what the rock is for. It is not to "check dam" it onto Kamla's property. Kamla said the original drawing or the first one Kamla got shows it just straight off and admitted that Dettinger probably had a new drawing now. Brandt recapped that Lien has made note of the conditions related to the suggestions for the existing plan by the land surveyor and the elements related to that. We clarified that instead of a crown there is going to be a slope to the east on the driveway. Brandt added "approval by the staff" to the conditions. Carlson commented the crown thing was just his own input on it and that this driveway is unique because of what is around it. If this driveway was under 20% slope, according to Carlson no other landowner has to come in and get approval where their water runs but because of the slope we are discussing his driveway, but it still says they have to do it and they are doing it because in a normal situation there is a road ditch and it isn't an issue but this is a unique layout. Carlson thought Dettinger was trying to do what he can to do it right. It might be a struggle during construction if there are issues (i.e. the large amount of rain we are supposed to get tomorrow). As staff we will just have to stay on it and be out there checking it during construction because of erosion control even though we don't do the building inspection in Town of Trempealeau.

Zeglin had asked earlier to make the conditions official. Brandt re-stated the conditions related to the plan that is before the Committee having to do with the riprap check dams, the shallow grade of depressions to slow water flow as well as the slope of the driveway towards the East and approval by DLM staff. Britzius seconded the motion for the conditions. Bawek asked if there has been any study at all as to the possible amount of water that is going to come down there. Carlson's feeling was that the only additional water would be whatever we don't catch up on top with the additional black top. All the other stuff is already all running down the hill. Carlson thought the only additional water would be the impervious area of the driveway itself. Carlson elaborated on the map as to where he thought additional water would be coming from. Carlson thought if he puts in the swales on the sides and slows everything down and the culvert is revamped and they tie into it, it will be very beneficial however he didn't know if it would handle all the water. Carlson felt everything could be made to run elsewhere and not come down that driveway. More discussion took place about the site. Lien agreed with Carlson that if Dettinger does a good job of landscaping up above, the additional impervious surface from the house roof and driveway can be diverted and so one is only really dealing with the impervious driveway and if that is dealt with properly, it should be fine. Bawek asked if the water running to the right was going to limit what the neighbor can do with that property. Carlson responded that if Kamla wants to build another building in here, the only limitation he might have is if he drilled a separate well for that new building, as that would have to meet a 50 foot setback, but if he used the same well and just tied in with everything it would definitely meet the setbacks. The only setback that he would have for a new building would be the 10 foot lot line setbacks. Carlson didn't think it would be an issue. Motion to approve and a second with the conditions as presented passed with no opposition. Brandt reminded Dettinger to continue to work with staff on the driveway issues. At this time the Committee took a five minute break.

Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit –Livestock Facility Siting Permit-Michael A. Weltzien, Landowner/Petitioner, Galesville, WI - Town of Gale

Chairman Brandt opened the public hearing at 9:48 AM. Brandt read the public hearing notice aloud. Doelle stated she received from Michael Weltzien a very detailed, zero discharge facility for a turkey operation for 961 animal units. The site includes a brood barn, four finishing barns and a long term plan of building a compost facility with a roof. Doelle and Weltzien have been working together for the past few months on this plan. This is a brand new facility so there is nothing on the site. Everything is going to be starting from the ground up. Doelle has made the determination that he meets all the requirements of the Livestock Facility Siting Permit for his application; odor management, waste and nutrient management, the waste storage facility requirements, runoff and training and response plans. Upon Brandt asking if Ron Weltzien had anything to add, R. Weltzien responded no and that Doelle had summed everything up pretty well. R. Weltzien explained it was actually an opportunity that was put forward to M. Weltzien to be able to build this complete complex on his own. He is going to sell to a different company than what R. Weltzien sells to. It is completely separate. According to R. Weltzien it is an opportunity of a lifetime for M. Weltzien to get started farming. Brandt asked the size of the buildings. Doelle responded the brood barn is 60 X400 feet, the finishing barns are 60 X 500 feet, and the future compost shed dimensions would be 60 X 400 as well. Brandt clarified that Doelle had said zero discharge as there was a lot of roof there. Doelle replied yes and that they do already have a DNR storm water permit in place, so they have taken those measures. Doelle explained any land disturbance over an acre would require one. For Britzius, Doelle clarified that there were four finishing barns. Brandt called for any public testimony twice. Doelle read a letter from the Town of Gale dated June 9th, 2015 which stated at a regular town board meeting on June 9th, 2015 the Town of Gale board approved a CUP for a Livestock Facility Siting Permit for Michael Weltzien. Brandt called for any other public testimony. Brandt closed the public hearing at 9:53 AM. Bawek made a motion to approve the CUP,

Nelson seconded. Some discussion took place on the Avian Bird Flu outbreak and how it is affecting the Weltzien's. R. Weltzien noted that was one reason they were given the opportunity to build this facility as they are located where there are no other turkey's and the spread of disease is more unlikely where Weltzien's are. Britzius asked where the turkeys will go for processing. R. Weltzien responded the turkeys from this barn will go to the Barron, WI Jennie O turkey store. A brief discussion took place on turkey's and the Avian Bird Flu virus. Brandt stated we have a motion and a second to approve the CUP. Zeglin noticed that the manure management plan is circled "no" on the application and questioned Doelle if nothing was required. Doelle clarified that information was on the Livestock Permit, which it was. Doelle stated what is happening here is that Michael's turkey manure will go to Ron's compost facility at this time. None of it will be land spread so it is all going to be composted and sold therefore there is not a manure management plan for this facility. Doelle added it is a contract operation between Ron Weltzien and Michael Weltzien and then there is also a contract/long term lease agreement with the compost facility buyer. Britzius stated he was ignorant on all this and questioned if all the manure was going to be composted and sold off and for what purpose? R. Weltzien answered that it currently goes all over. R. Weltzien currently owns a composting facility so Weltzien does the composting. R. Weltzien said it sells all the way to Green Bay down to Illinois to wherever he can find markets for it and most all of it is for farming purposes; corn, soybeans, alfalfa, organic, non-organic. Doelle added that the beauty of this whole story is that over time R. Weltzien has been able to draw down soil test phosphorus by not applying to his fields so there is a positive to the story. Motion to approve the CUP as presented passed with no opposition.

Well Head Protection Ordinance - Brandt stated that City of Arcadia Mayor John Kimmel was present as it is the City of Arcadia that is petitioning us to amend our Well Head Protection Ordinance specifically related to the Arcadia municipal wells. Lien has been in contact with Chris who is the attorney for the City of Arcadia. He had forwarded this to County Clerk Paul Syverson and asked that it be forwarded to the E & LU Committee to be placed on their agenda. Lien had called Chris with a couple of clarification questions and Chris basically told Lien to bring it forward to the Committee and those questions/concerns can be brought up at that time. Lien said that during the meeting break he had mentioned some of his concerns to Mayor Kimmel. Lien informed the Committee that UW-Extension Community Development Professor Pat Malone couldn't be here as she had another commitment and so has sent a letter. Lien referred Committee member to the Ordinance in front of them, noting that it is generated from the City of Arcadia but it also affects the Town of Arcadia. Lien referred to the last page of the Ordinance which contains a map that shows where the existing wells are. Lien asked if all those wells were in place right now. Mayor Kimmel replied that Wells 4, 5, and 6 are up and drawing at their capacity that is needed depending on where they are going to draw the water from and what the reservoir and use levels are. Mayor Kimmel said Well 3 is a fully functional well however at some point it is going to be replaced with (on the southeast corner of Arcadia) Well 7. Mayor Kimmel explained that Well 7 has not been built yet but it has been sited and they anticipate the build date as sometime in the next five years. Brandt asked Lien to describe why we are here. Lien stated the County is being asked to adopt this Well Head Protection Ordinance to protect the lands that lie outside of the City of Arcadia (represented in blue in the Ordinance map). It pertains to that area and if one looks through the Ordinance, it is about land use and what takes place in those areas. Some of Lien's concerns were, as far as the language that wasn't very clear to him, were some of the same concerns that Malone had. Lien read aloud from Malone's letter in regard to the Well Head Ordinance. Malone's comments were "Add spreading of animal waste as a prohibited activity in the zones", Lien noted he had talked to Mayor Kimmel about that during break and according to Lien, Mayor Kimmel said that because most of that use was there prior to the well, it is a use that is allowed to continue. Mayor Kimmel said that is correct and it was never the intention of the Ordinance to not allow any farmers to be able to fertilize their field.

They will still be able to fully fertilize their field in any of the areas that are noted in blue here or in any future well sites. Lien stated he was looking at “prohibited uses” and it says “spreading sewage, septage or sludge”. Lien was looking for clarification as to how animal waste fits into that. Brandt commented the very next line says “facilities used to store, handle or treat animal waste or carcasses”. Lien said those are waste storage structures so those wouldn’t be allowed so how would prohibited uses such as spreading sewage, septage or sludge. Lien asked Chris how to define that as to “include” or “not include” animal waste. Lien reiterated that Malone had the same question as far as clarification. Lien stated that any time one is adopting an ordinance it has to be clear what is being enforced or not being enforced. Malone also commented, “This action should not be limited to the City of Arcadia. There are a number of cities and villages with Well Head plans and ordinances that should be included in the process as well. This action would help protect groundwater and unconfined, unconsolidated aquifers. The actual recharge area for the wells, according to their engineering firm is many, many miles away”. Lien explained that Malone’s comment was to maybe even expand on this, when looking through the engineering results, as to what actually recharges those wells. Lien stated those were Malone’s comments basically saying this is a great idea. Lien thought it was a great idea as well. When looking at the engineering data of what actually recharges those locations one may want to expand on those areas. It may be a little larger than what is represented by the setbacks. Lien didn’t know how the towns or city’s feels but he has always said our groundwater is our most important resource in this County. Mayor Kimmel commented that his Water Superintendent would “hang me out to dry” if he didn’t comment on the quality of water in Arcadia with our State and National awards for water, so we take that very seriously. Mayor Kimmel is very grateful that the Town of Arcadia sent a letter of support. Mayor Kimmel said they initially went to the town for an agreement between the town and the city but because they fall under County zoning, Mayor Kimmel wanted to bring it up to the County and petition for that. Mayor Kimmel thanked the Committee for their time and the ability to talk about this as it does impact Arcadia’s water quality. Mayor Kimmel stated they are happy to work with the County Board and the E & LU Committee here, as far as letting this serve as a model for other community’s who also have municipal wells. Lien asked if the City would be in agreement if we expanded this Ordinance to include other pre-existing well head protection that other city’s and villages have, because if we do a county wide ordinance, it would be nice to incorporate the other ones that do exist already and then is the City open to (what Malone had suggested) that if you’re engineering information states that there is a larger area that replenishes those aquifers, to include those areas. Mayor Kimmel responded that what they tried to do is narrow the focus of the land that they were talking about to specifically for our wells and if the County wanted to expand that to include any other acres of land, Mayor Kimmel stated he would caution that we include the townships/landowners in those discussions. Mayor Kimmel added that in their discussions they tried to target the areas (in blue on the map) and minimize the impact. Mayor Kimmel reiterated that their approach with the Town of Arcadia and the landowners was kind of a “who was there first” philosophy. If the City of Arcadia had a well there first, then we don’t want any of the land uses there, but if the land use was there, they wouldn’t site a well in that area, so if the County is going to go beyond that they would appreciate the opportunity to participate in that discussion but he would certainly include the landowners in the township. Mayor Kimmel added the City didn’t want to restrict any more than was absolutely necessary. Fortunately, Lien stated we have the Town of Arcadia Chairman Jon Schultz here so we could get his thoughts as well. Schultz voiced he thought it was a good plan, it’s logical and it is a great start to conversation in taking care of our drinking water. Brandt recapped that the Town of Arcadia is requesting an Ordinance in regard to parts of the Town of Arcadia, outside of the City limits, where a Well Head Protection Ordinance would, based on their designation of Zone A (a radius of 886 feet from well) and Zone B (a radius of 1336 feet from the well itself) being affected by the Well Ordinance. Lien pointed out that the prohibitions are significant here because some of them are vague (our Corporation Counsel would say it has to be specific) but also what would happen

in the event of a Well Ordinance, even in these small areas, as we would be excluding i.e. drycleaners, car shops, cemeteries, etc. from these areas. Mayor Kimmel has pointed out that the City has been looking at minimizing that area. Lien is moving the discussion to a different level which is to say where does the water come from and then how do we protect those sources and the aquifer as a whole, which could be hundreds of square miles and do we start restricting land uses in an area that we might be able to define as the recharge area for the particular well. Brandt continued that there are all these other land uses going on in the township right now and apparently the City of Arcadia Council is going with the “whoever was there first philosophy”, so that is guiding their principle and so we are kind of talking about two different things now – very focused with existing planned wells or an aquifer recharge system which could involve lots of townships. Mayor Kimmel wanted to point out two things. Mayor Kimmel referred the Committee to the mapped site of Well 7 and noted that just to the southwest of that is a cemetery in the Town of Arcadia and the directional flow of that water is to the southwest so that does not impact that. Brandt agreed and said that is the sort of information that we would be taking into consideration, but Brandt’s question to the Committee is do we want to start this discussion about using municipal wells as a limiting factor in land use. In listening, Schultz stated we are talking about aquifers and aquifer contamination but to Schultz we are trying to define the land uses that are approximate to the well head so that the wells themselves are not contaminated by some type of activity and so it begs the question so that now we are discussing aquifer recharge, etc. but really the intent of this is not the aquifer it is protecting the constructed well. Mayor Kimmel suggested a two prong approach to this; #1 – Dealing with the well head protection zones that the engineer’s established and we would ask you to not minimize those distances because their engineers have been dealing with this for decades and established those limits and #2 – A recharge protection which would be an aquifer recharge protection area which would be outside the scope of what the City is looking for and then the County could engage the townships and landowners independent of what the City is asking for and then the two don’t “cloud” each other up. In talking about Corporation Counsel’s concerns, Schultz thought things could be addressed in the initial purpose and intent of authority (the first paragraph) to probably be clearer that it is about protecting the built infrastructure of the well. It is important to mention groundwater and groundwater supply so that we’re not going into that gray area of protecting the aquifer via something like this as this is an ordinance to protect three wells from contamination. Brandt stated under Purpose, Intent and Authority, it could be read to include “the aquifer recharge” because it does talk about the quality of the City’s groundwater supply as opposed to the protection of the well head specifically. Schultz voiced that he was thinking more in the opposite direction such as do we want this Ordinance opening that door. Schultz thought it was an important conversation to have in terms of protecting groundwater supply and our aquifers but is the intent of this Ordinance to protect the well heads from contamination. Mayor Kimmel commented that again because the City didn’t want to over reach, they narrowed it down to the absolute, least amount of feet that they could in asking for that protection. They didn’t want to over reach and what somebody does throughout the rest of the township is more Mr. Schultz’s per view than Mayor Kimmel’s. In address the Mayor, Schultz was saying that in the first paragraph, Purpose, Intent and Authority, it doesn’t ever say “well head”, it says “groundwater supply”, so Schultz thought it would be in the best interest of the intent of this Ordinance to narrow that scope of the purpose. Brandt thanked Mayor Kimmel for taking time to come to the meeting. Brandt stated it was beyond the Committee’s ability today to make that decision, but that we would run this by Corporation Counsel and talk about the two issues specifically related to this which are identifying the desire to protect the well head itself and to define if the spreading of manure for fertilizing is appropriate within Zone A and Zone B. Those would be the two issues to deal with but it also give us the opportunity to engage other municipalities with municipal wells in this discussion and possibly folding them into an overall County ordinance and then the greater discussion of how is the aquifer protection beyond the well head protection which is something we as a Committee want to take up. Brandt asked Mayor

Kimmel to take back the Committees two concerns; spreading of manure and define the protection of the well head as the goal of this Ordinance back to his counsel. Mayor Kimmel thought everyone had his contact information and offered that if the Committee needs to meet with the City Council or the City Attorney feel free to contact them at any point as this is very near and dear to the City of Arcadia. Mayor Kimmel suggested keeping the well head protection and the aquifer protection separate because of the nature of the two and reiterated that if the Town of Arcadia ever wanted to visit with the City of Arcadia about the nature of the well head protection and how it would deal with the aquifer, the City would sit at the table and participate in that but Mayor Kimmel said they didn't have the audacity to tell the township and all those landowners what they can do.

Vehicle Purchase – Lien stated he budgets every year for vehicle replacement. There are two 2011 vehicles that are up for replacement. Lien has received written submitted bids from the new car dealerships in Trempealeau County. Lien went over the bids with the Committee. The new trucks are 2015 models. Some discussion took place on the trade-ins, the resale value of the vehicles and trucks in general, etc. Lien noted that the program works very well. The money is in the vehicle budget. Nelson made a motion to approve the vehicle purchases as presented, Zeglin seconded. Brandt called for a roll call vote; Zeglin – yes, Schultz – yes, Britzius – yes, Bawek – yes, Nelson – yes, Brandt – yes. Motion to approve passed 6-0.

Project Initiation – LTE (Limited Term Employee) – Lien state stated the Committee had discussed this item last month. Lien has been working with Kulig on this. Lien has handed out to the Committee a created job description which is attached to the filled out Projection Initiation form. Lien has discussed this with staff at a staff meeting. Lien thought this was something that he/the Department would probably do every year therefore it would be kept in the budget. According to Lien, the Department has had an LTE in the past and they are very beneficial to the Department with additional work loads. Lien gave the Committee a few minutes to look at the handout. This LTE position would never exceed \$7,000. Lien stated the money is in the budget because we hired the last two employees later in the year so there was some unused salary money. Even though the salary money is budgeted, because it is a new position it has to go through the Committee process of Personnel Bargaining, Executive/Finance and then full County Board. Upon Brandt's inquiry, Lien stated we already have a summer intern who has been helping the Department out. Lien's next request would be to approve a resolution in order to be able to back pay this position from her start date. Discussion took place on what her duties/experiences would be. Britzius asked how many hours a week the position would be. Lien responded it potentially could be forty but more than likely wouldn't be and again should never exceed \$7,000. Lien stated the County has a set policy that minimum wage is \$7.25 an hour plus \$2.00 so the set salary is \$9.25 per hour with no benefits. Brandt noted the position would be between May 1st and September 1st. Lien asked Kulig if those dates are flexible. Kulig stated it is nice to have a general idea and suggested putting in "approximately" but not "exceeding" these dates so that it leaves it open but we would not want to have a limited term employee work over six months. Kulig added that we want to be sure to stay within those parameters as we run into issues with the Affordable Care Act and offering health insurance if someone works over six months. Brandt commented the idea is to get someone in the office during the busy season but also to have that person gain some experience in the areas that we deal with. Upon Lien asking Kulig is she has any changes or if she is alright with the wording under project description as it just says "LTE from May 1st through September 1st of each year". Kulig suggested adding "approximate" in there and add "not to exceed four months or five months" so we make sure that we fall under that six month category. Brandt noted the last page of the LTE form has a history of people who have worked here in the past as limited term employees who have become full time. Lien noted that emphasis for the selection of an LTE would be on persons who are pursuing a degree in

natural resources or other related environmental fields, so we are trying to educate youth from the County or area that are interested in pursuing a career in this field. Britzius made a motion to approve the Project Initiation form and the job description, Schultz seconded. Zeglin questioned if the Department wants to limit the months from May through September or do they prefer eliminating that language and just specifying “not to exceed 6 months during any calendar year”, should a project come up that needs to be started before May 1st or extend after September 1st. Historically, Lien stated the summer months are really busy and that coincides with when college students may be free. Zeglin clarified that this particular form would only apply to this year and then anything put in the budget would be a separate description. Lien thought as long as it is in the budget this wouldn't have to be done again. Kulig stated that was correct as long as it is itemized in the budget for the specific purpose, this wouldn't have to be done again. Some discussion took place about the wording on the application. Kulig thought that stating “five months” would be ok. Lien clarified that was in a calendar year. Lien suggested eliminating the dates and adding “not to exceed five months. Kulig thought that would be ok but added that she will research that just to make sure that is correct. Zeglin commented she didn't want the Department to be locked in time wise if you needed to extend it after September first for some reason and the LTE is available. Zeglin stated Lien had indicated a set amount of time per week and asked if that was more in tune with the LTE's schedule or the Department's schedule as far as work needing to be done or is it a combination. Lien responded it is a combination as we don't exceed 40 hours typically unless there are meetings or other things in which one doesn't get overtime, but comp time. We try to limit all employees to forty hours and typically college students may have classes or some other obligations so it might be less. We are flexible with that so it would be up to the forty hours. Zeglin asked if the current job description was for future interns also. Lien responded yes and that the job description is just general as to what we would be looking for in a person. Zeglin added we may need to change the dates on that also and as far as salary Zeglin thought one may want to indicate that the salary is the minimum wage plus \$2.00 instead of the \$9.25 per hour. Lien and Kulig were going to work on that language. As far as work hours, Lien stated he would eliminate “up to 17 weeks May through September 1st and just put “up to forty hours per week with a flexible schedule not to exceed five months in the calendar year”. Britzius suggested including UW- Extension in the list of other departments in which there is formalized cooperation because of things like the water study, etc. Lien explained it would be whatever department is beneficial to the position as far as education and or need. Motion to approve the slightly amended Project Initiation Form and job description passed with no opposition. Brandt stated that Lien is also requesting that the Committee approve the request to back pay the current LTE at the current County salary. Britzius made a motion to approve the back pay request, Schultz seconded. Zeglin thought it beneficial for the LTE to get some type of compensation for their time if at all possible and the money is there now. Motion to approve the back paying of the currently unpaid LTE carried with no opposition. Brandt asked Kulig to work with Lien on clarifying that language and move the paperwork on to Personnel/Bargaining.

Trempealeau County Farmland Preservation Plan Public Participation Process – Lien stated he and Meghan Wessel are continuing to work with Peter Fletcher from Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission (MRRPC). They haven't scheduled any town meetings yet but they are scheduling meetings with the individual town chairmen because they are going through and cleaning up parts of the current zoning layer and the land use layer where they have found some conflict. They are relying on the expertise of the town chairmen to assist DLM in that process before they hold a meeting at the town level. At the same time they will be updating the Farmland Preservation Plan. They are going to be asking town chairmen whether or not they are interesting in a mining overlay district and if they are know where those areas are that make sense. Lien elaborated on mining district issues. Brandt stated this Committee made the decision at the last special meeting to use this planning process as a way

to deal with the location of mines in the County and the issue of knowing where to build and where to mine.

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

No one from the public was forthcoming with any comments.

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

Requests and Payment Approval – Lien presented the following contract and payment requests for approval.

Land & Water Resource Management (LWRM)

Name	Type	Amount	New CSA Total	Reason for change	Town
Allen & Kenneth Husmoen	Contract	\$5,512.50	\$5,512.50		Preston
Allen & Kenneth Husmoen	Pay Req.	\$5,512.50		Certify Stream bank Riprap	

Targeted Runoff Management (TRM)

Name	Type	Amount	New CSA Total	Reason for change	Town
Dennis Waletzko	Contract	\$15,038.10	\$15,038.10	Riprap	Arcadia
	Pay Req.	\$15,038.10		Certify Riprap	

Nelson made a motion a motion to approve the payments as presented, Bawek seconded, motion to approve passed with no opposition.

Brandt stated he has talked to DLM staff member Keith VerKuilen and next month he is going to have a map and list of projects that he has been working on this year.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval – No surveying update was presented this month.

Confirm Next Special Meeting Date and Regular Meeting Date

Since there were no public hearings scheduled for next month to date, Brandt and Lien had talked about hearing from other members of DLM staff as to what they are doing. Zeglin suggested having Pat Malone from UW-Extension give an overview/update on the Cost-share Water Program. Lien stated he has that information and there have been 38 kits distributed and results are slowly coming in. They set up a remote site in the Town of Arcadia for people who live farther south. Lien suggested having Malone come in with the other Well Head Protection ordinances and other protection areas that we are aware of and have that discussion so that if we're going to do a County ordinance it reflects the other well and protection areas as well. The Committee agreed. Since Lien would not be present for the next meeting, he elaborated on some concerns he had with enforcement of the Well Head Protection Ordinance and some of the proposals within. If the County is going to enforce it there will need to be some clarification on issues that the County is responsible for. Britzius suggested having Malone give information only at the next meeting and then reserve any action on it for the August meeting. Bawek asked about a special meeting date. Brandt was thinking the next regular meeting may be an opportunity to spend some time on the Health Impact Study issues as well. Bawek stated at the special meeting the Committee was going to talk about some property value guarantee templates and Radtke was going to look into it. After much discussion, the Committee agreed to have the next meeting on Thursday, July 9th, 2015 at 9:00 AM.

At 11:56 AM, Nelson made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Brandt seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Michael Nelson, Secretary