

**ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE COMMITTEE
Department of Land Management**

**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 14th, 2015 9:00 AM
COUNTY BOARD ROOM**

Chairman Brandt called the meeting to order at 9:05 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 and Jon Schultz. Jeff Bawek and Rick Geske were absent.

Staff/Advisors present: Kevin Lien, Jake Budish and Virg Gamroth. DLM staff-Carla Doelle, Mark Carlson, Kirstie Heidenreich, DeWayne Snobl-USDA APHIS Wildlife Specialist, County Surveyor- Joe Nelsen and Ryan Swatek-NRCS District Conservationist were present for part of the meeting. Others present: Nancy Bergman-TCCTV volunteer, Heidi Graham, Donald L. Stellflue, Lloyd Stellflue, K. Don Pederson and Harley Yoder.

Adoption of Agenda - Nelson made a motion to approve the agenda as presented, Zeglin seconded. At this time Brandt mentioned that Britzius had requested an update from Lien on the budgeting process and suggested bringing that into the meeting under the "Project Initiation". Motion to approve the agenda carried with no opposition.

Adoption of Minutes

Zeglin made a motion to approve the September 9th, 2015 meeting minutes as presented, Nelson seconded. Motion to approve the minutes carried with no opposition.

Wildlife Damage & Claims Program – DeWayne Snobl

2014 WS WDACP Summary Report – Snobl went through the report with the Committee. (A copy which is on file in the DLM office. There is also a link to the report on the County website on the DLM page). Snobl noted that two additional county's, Polk and Marinette, have joined the program so now there are 70 counties participating in the Wildlife Damage & Claims Program of which 52 have contracted with Wildlife Services for administration. In 2014 they assisted over 1300 producers across the state. Of the 1300 that contacted Wildlife Services over 800 enrolled in some form of the program. In 2014 just over 180,000 acres were enrolled in the program which was an increase of about 6000 acres. As far as verified damage there were 56 different agricultural crops including livestock that they verified damage on. They appraised just under 38,000 acres statewide – 85% of that dealt with deer damage, 11% - bear, 3-4% - goose and under 1% for turkey. Of those acres, they appraised a total loss of just over \$800,000 which is a decrease as usually it is over a million dollars.

2015 Deer Donation Program – In 2014, in the County's that APHIS covers, there were 1183 donated deer, just under 48,000 lbs of venison donated and that was down by about 50%. Snobl stated again it is a function of less deer on the landscape, more conservative antlerless tags, etc. Discussion took place on processors in the County. Snobl referred to the report for numbers from each county in regard to types of crop damage and the animal causing the damage, etc. Lien asked Snobl to explain how DNR regulates the use of propane cannons as to when it is allowed and what Snobl has experienced as far as effectiveness and if DNR has any regulation over the use of propane cannons. Snobl responded they use it mainly with birds – geese, turkeys, etc. is what they are meant for, so it is mainly used in the southeast for goose related issues. If it is a small setting it may be used for deer, it may also be used for bear if they need to buy a little time because up in the north they are pretty busy with trapping bears and if they run

out of traps then they will set one right in the middle of an apiary to try to keep the bears out long enough until a trap can be put there. With regard to DNR, Snobl stated it is an approved thing through the damage program so there is nothing that Snobl is really aware of. The only law that Snobl is aware of is that there are noise ordinances by County's, townships, etc. Lien asked, because this is an approved practice, if a municipality did not have a noise ordinance, if an individual could put one up and run it unlimited. Snobl responded, no, because it is ran according to what one is trying to protect, so in the case of birds you run them from dawn until dusk. Snobl doesn't recommend them for deer because they habituate really quickly to them and one has to run them at night and it will probably only buy one a couple of days with deer. With birds, Snobl said they go roost at night so there is no reason to run a cannon at night. Brandt clarified that he thought Snobl was talking about people who are enrolled in the program or getting deer, bird or bear damage, etc. and what Lien is talking about is an individual who decides to do it and is trying to find out if the DNR regulates it. Snobl commented he thought he knew the individual that Lien was referring to and Snobl said he tried to address that last year with the township and the individual. Brandt thought the township has taken care of it and has done an excellent job and that they have a regulation related to that. Carlson commented he wasn't sure the town was enforcing it because October 1st was the date that they (the cannons) were no longer to be used and they are still being used right now. Snobl had been called in on this issue, it is outside the damage program but Snobl does assist with migratory bird problems. Snobl was contacted by US Fish and Wildlife Services to see if he could try and help the situation. That call came in and then Snobl said a day later the farmer called. Snobl spent two or three days down there trying to document if blackbirds were doing damage. Snobl explained that normally blackbirds do damage in the milk stage and the half stage and then they will back off, but they do damage corn into doe stage. We didn't do a whole farm appraisal because of the time it would take but Snobl did spend time documenting if in fact there was bird damage in the doe stage. Snobl did document damage in the doe stage. With that, Snobl then met with the town board and the farmers to try to work through if there is any kind of workable solution to the situation which has been going on for a very long time. Brandt clarified that Snobl was advising as opposed to doing a claim. Snobl stated that was correct. Because Snobl doesn't get funding for that, he did say when he is in the area he will stop down and try to help to see if he could verify it so they could use that information to make a more informed decision for both sides. Snobl did that and he did document in the fields that he surveyed, that in the samples that he took 17% of the corn cobs were damaged. They showed damage in the doe stage. (There was some inaudible text here) One of the issues is that they (the farmer) wants to start earlier (running the cannons) than the township would like them to and they want to go longer than the township would like them too. Lien commented he has been down there too and it seemed like at times the birds are used to the noise so the cannons have become ineffective. Lien asked, at what point, does that practice become ineffective and one should move on to something else. Lien stated that if Snobl is still documenting 17% damage and they are operating it, to Lien they would need to do something else, perhaps a different practice. Snobl responded that is where the catch comes in, in that the farmers would argue that if they didn't use them it would be worse – more than 17%. Snobl stated there are a couple of inherent problems; 1) the situation, it is only trying to be managed on the food side of the equation and not the cover side of the equation – birds going loose in the refuge. Snobl thought one needs to manage both and stated this isn't a species that is covered by the Wildlife Damage Claims Program. With what Snobl had found, he met with the town board. There were members of the public there and the farmers. Snobl presented his information and said it is not an appraisal to come up with a loss. Snobl had explained what it would take to do a complete farm appraisal. Snobl's goal was to assist in saying, "yes, there was" or "no, there wasn't damage in the later stage corn" and there was. That was last fall that Snobl had presented that stuff but according to Snobl it didn't really go anywhere. Snobl felt both sides were talking past each other they weren't listening to anything. With regard to what the farmers are doing, Snobl said with Wildlife Services they would recommend an integrative approach and cannons would be one of them. They are still effective to minimize damage. With what Snobl has seen he thought the frequency could be tested as to how fast

they are going – the problem being if there is a bunch of damage that shows up nobody reimburses them. Snobl explained it is pretty easy to figure out; you basically have two fields, one you slow the cannons way down, the other one you keep going fast and then you look at what the difference is. It could be tested but Snobl didn't get a sense of wanting to do that. They (the farmers) were supposed to call Snobl back in the spring and say ok, see if it is valid to start as early as they want to start it. The farmer has 10 acres of sweet corn in one acre plots there as well which they run in stages so they have it all summer and then they have 270 acres of corn that the birds are a problem with. With regard to the State, Snobl stated there is no thing it is just simply a decibel ordinance. Lien commented only if the municipality has adopted it. Snobl agreed and added if there was something that would indicate that it is then you get into the "right to farm" stuff. Snobl's sense of the situation is that it isn't going to go away anytime soon. Brandt added, "And it has been around a long time". Brandt thanked Snobl for his assistance in this matter and commented that what Snobl is doing is adding scientific information to the discussion even if people are talking by each other. Snobl commented, that if he is called again, he would help them with regard to any appraisal (there would be a fee for service because of the time). At this time, Snobl continued with his report. Upon Brandt's inquiry, Snobl explained the landowner has to enroll fully in the program, to allow access, to get a claim. In most cases, there will be a deer shooting permit issued where they have to shoot "X" amount of deer and meet their quotas to qualify for the permit. In other situations there may be some other abatement method and that reduced it but it didn't stop it. In Trempealeau County, the other thing that they use a lot is Benner fence which is a plastic woven mesh but so far that has worked. They have to enroll fully and they are claim eligible but it works so well that Snobl said he has never had to appraise a claim inside one of these temporary woven structures. It is kind of pricey but it is meant for a small, high value crop, i.e. small orchards, vineyards, etc. Snobl added there is some form of abatement they must meet before they are claim eligible. In regard to the Donation Program, Snobl stated it is very popular, it is just a product of reduced deer on the land and conservative antlerless numbers. Snobl said the only processor available in the County, right now, is the Strum Locker Plant. This area has always donated a significant amount. Snobl explained that the final totals for this program were not in when Snobl last met with the Committee, so the numbers on the report are an update to 2014. Snobl explained when and how the numbers become available.

2015 WDACP Crop Prices (set) - Snobl explained he monitors crop prices from October 2014 through September 2015 and those are the numbers he uses to set the prices. Snobl suggested the following prices for crop damage claims.

<u>Crop</u>	<u>Price/Unit</u>
Corn	\$ 3.46 /bu.
Soybeans	\$ 9.25/bu.
Alfalfa	\$145.71/ton
Alfalfa-mix	\$ 94.59/ton

Nelson made a motion to approve the crop prices as presented, Skoyen seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition.

2015 90% Harvest Cut-Off Date (if applicable) – Snobl stated that those landowners enrolled in the program are qualified. There is going to be four claims. Snobl stated he thought he would be pretty much be done appraising crops in the first few days in November. Schultz made a motion to set the 90% Harvest Cut-Off Date as December 1st, 2015, Nelson seconded, motion to approve passed with no opposition. Upon Gamroth's inquiry, Snobl stated Wildlife Services will publish the 90% Harvest Cut-off date in the newspaper for the County and that will be done closer to that date and the County will get a copy of that.

2016 Trempealeau County WDACP Budget Proposal (review/approval) – Snobl stated this is hunter funded/DNR dollars. Brandt noted a typing error on the budget for the Total Proposed County WDACP Budget which should read “Trempealeau” county instead of “Clark” county. Snobl went through the budget with the Committee. Snobl explained the WS Cooperative Funds Allocated (\$6,037.49) as when a county signs an agreement with Wildlife Services there are federal funds that come in to support the administration abatement. Snobl stated there are no County funded dollars at all in the WDACP program. It is “pass through” money. Snobl added the Committee will vote on the Total WDNR Funding Requested (\$24,619.85) because we are requesting that money from DNR and Wildlife Services has already set aside the WS Cooperative Funds Allocated. In addressing the Deer Donation Administration and Processing, Snobl said for this year that is at \$120 for administration and the processing is \$3,380.00 and that money is only to be used for deer donation. If the County doesn’t spend that it goes back to the State. Brandt stated we are approving our share of Snobl’s budget related to his activities in Trempealeau County, yet it is a request to the DNR for their allocated funds. Snobl agreed and added that Wildlife Services for Trempealeau County is going to request from the DNR, \$24,619.85. Britzius made a motion to approve the budget and the request as presented, Skoyen seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition. Snobl noted that the budget represents a 3.7% decrease from the previous year as far as total budget goes. Some discussion took place about regulating the deer herd. Brandt expressed appreciation to Snobl for the work that he does.

Public Hearing – Land Use/Zoning Change-Transitional Agriculture (TA) to Residential-20 (R-20) – Lloyd C. Stellflue, Petitioner/Landowner, Ettrick, WI, Town of Ettrick

Chairman Brandt called the public hearing to order at 9:52 AM. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Brandt acknowledged Lloyd C. Stellflue who was present. Carlson stated Stellflue wishes to put some residential lots on the area (Carlson referred to the overhead aerial map) and to do so he would need to rezone the property to R-20. The zoning is currently Transitional Ag which allows 1 home per 35 acres. Stellflue has 20.62 acres so he would be looking at a maximum of 10 lots based on that size. Carlson stated one has to take into consideration that he would need to have some type of access so he will need a town road because each lot would be required to have 100 feet of road frontage. Carlson stated he did receive one phone call on the project and that person seemed to be more interested in the public hearing process but they didn’t object to the project. Carlson added he does have a letter from the Town of Ettrick. This is the first step in the whole process. He will have to come up with a little more in-depth information as to where the road is going to be and the location of the lots. Stellflue stated he has three different options for a road; one is that he has a road now that he has the right-of-way to that comes off Dopp Road. That is the road that is currently being used and is just an access. Stellflue referred to Crogan Lane as another access and also County Road D where there is 100 plus feet of footage there. According to Stellflue, his best option is the one that comes off of Dopp Road that is being used presently. Stellflue would purchase land for more right-of-way through there but that would be down the road, as he gets some lots sold otherwise it would remain the way it is. Stellflue has one lot right now by Crogan Lane which he has an Offer to Purchase on. That is the reason Stellflue is going through the rezone as he wants to sell that lot. No one else may ever come and want to buy any of the other lots. If someone does come and want to buy a lot, Stellflue intends to purchase the right-of-way from one of the landowners there and lay a road for future use. In regard to the present Offer to Purchase, Lien asked if they would be purchasing all of the frontage Stellflue has off of Crogan Lane. Stellflue responded “yes, he would be selling all the frontage down there because he has the other options on the other roads. Stellflue added there was possibly more area that he could buy near those other roads too. Upon Brandt asking if Stellflue would be creating a land locked parcel by selling that, Stellflue responded no as he still had the frontage on County Road D. Lien stated that Stellflue just built a home near Dopp Road and his frontage is on Crogan Lane and County Road D so if he sells the Crogan Lane site he still has frontage off of County Road D. One of the concerns that Lien has is in regard to 911 addressing. If there is a fire/emergency response call and one goes out to Dopp Road,

Lien thought there are about three 911 signs right there, so the addressing will get you to that point. Lien suggested if Stellflue would ever develop the remaining property and make the Dopp Road access a town road there should be some re-addressing done which would make those 911 addresses specific to the structures there. Unless you are someone from the Ettrick area or know someone living there personally, at this point, one really wouldn't know which house to go to in an emergency. Lien added that is a constant issue when frontage is in one spot and access is at another location; his access is coming off of Dopp Road and his frontage is off County Road D. Stellflue stated Lien has to talk about Crogan Lane as there is Steve Matiak who lives there as does Stellflue. Lien clarified that Stellflue is addressed off of Dopp Road. Lien added that in the future, if Stellflue would build a town road into the property, that would result in that road getting a new name and Stellflue getting a new address and it would resolve the 911 issues that are there now.

Heidi Graham – Registered to testify in opposition. She also registered to appear and testify for information only. Graham stated she lives on Crogan Lane and her concern is that road. The blacktop on that road is 13 feet wide as Graham measured it. Graham said her vehicle is 7 feet wide. One cannot meet cars on that road. Graham's concern is that Stellflue would use Crogan Lane as an access. Graham stated she didn't measure from her house to the road but she has a very small front yard and if one extends Crogan Lane the road is going to five feet from her front door. Stellflue said that wasn't his plan and he isn't using Crogan Lane as he is coming off of Dopp Road. Graham asked if the road was going to go around his house. Stellflue responded the road will come in past Steve Matiak's house and go around the house Stellflue just built. Stellflue added that otherwise he could purchase the land up by the trailer house (the other property next to Schwager). Lien commented then it would come off of Crogan Lane. Stellflue agreed but said he would rather use Dopp Road and that he also has County Road D which he could come off of. Brandt clarified that basically this is all in the planning stages. Upon Brandt asking if Graham had any other concerns, Graham responded her main concern was over widening Crogan Lane because as she stated if they widen Crogan Lane the road will literally be 5-10 feet from her front door. Brandt commented that the town would have to be involved in this decision. Graham voiced that she didn't understand why Stellflue had a "right-of-way" to his house. Stellflue responded that he has a right-of-way right now to his house. Graham interjected saying, "which Steve Matiak owns". Stellflue corrected her saying it belongs to Schwager and that he purchased a right-of-way through Schwager's property and that is where Stellflue would plan to have the town road go through. Lien commented it would have to include some of Matiak's property too. Stellflue agreed and added that he also has the frontage on County Road D. Stellflue stated that is planned for the future in the event someone would come in and wants a place to build then Stellflue would purchase one of those properties or some off of Highway D to lay a road. Stellflue added that Crogan Lane is not the way he wants to go. Graham commented if Stellflue goes off of County Road D he will have to put a bridge across the creek. Stellflue responded he would go to the DNR and get approval to come off of County Highway D.

K. Don Pederson – Registered to appear and testify for information only. Pederson was curious how wide the access off of Dopp Road was. Lien stated he is sure Town of Ettrick adopted the same standards as the Trempealeau County Highway Department and that any development of a new town road has to be a minimum of a 66 foot wide easement area, 20 foot black top surface, 2 foot shoulders so one is looking at a 24 foot wide area. Pederson asked how wide Stellflue's easement was now. Stellflue answered that he wasn't sure but it is not that wide and he would have to purchase property so as he said he would purchase that right-of-way through there. Stellflue said he has the right-of-way now but he wants to purchase the whole road (the 66 feet or whatever it has to be) through there from him. Stellflue reiterated that he also has the frontage off of County Road D. Stellflue stated he has no plans of using Crogan Lane for anything. That parcel on the end (on Crogan Lane), if he sells that the frontage will be gone but there is room for a house down there. It appeared to Pederson that the

easement was very narrow. Pederson asked how involved the Village of Ettrick is in the process. Carlson commented the Village wouldn't have any involvement. Lien referred to the overhead aerial map and stated right now currently when one looks at the Zoning map for the town (Lien noted that for every one of the Towns' planning meetings the Village of Ettrick was invited) this area is zoned Transitional Ag and that is the zoning that is on the ground. When one looks at Ettrick they had an area that they planned to transition from the village out to the rural agriculture area. All of that area on the map that is gray is the transitional area to be used for perhaps another use. In viewing the land use layer, which is what was proposed, Lien noted how it changes from the zoning map. Lien stated the bright red colored area is a commercial use and the darker red area, which is what Stellflue's land is, has a zoning of Residential-20 (R-20) so it was determined with the village and the town that there would be urban expansion around the village at some point, in almost every direction, so it was planned to meet their (the village) requirements. Britzius asked at what point annexation comes into consideration and what happens if the village annexes that land from the township. Lien responded the village could do that but then the village, typically, would have to provide services, i.e. water, sewer, etc., and Lien didn't know if the Village of Ettrick was interested or had the capacity to do that. Lien noted there is a stream on the north side of this property separating this property from the village so it could be done but there would be some hurdles. Upon Britzius asking if Lien felt the Village would be compelled to annex, Lien responded that the last annexation that took place in the Village was in a northeasterly direction near the golf course. Pederson asked if the Village designated the land as R-20. Lien answered no the Village did not but the Village had discussions with the Town of Ettrick Planning Committee about how they wanted to be able to have that growth around the Village (not that they wanted to annex it) but that transition from the Village to perhaps a higher density of residences then out to the agriculture uses, so there was that buffer with the exception of along State Highway 53, there the Town did plan for a commercial corridor. Pederson assumed that the Village was involved because this building involved subdivisions and he asked if the Village of Ettrick has extra-territorial jurisdiction. Lien stated they could exercise that if they wished. They haven't in the past but every city/village has that right to enact that. Upon Lien asking if they were sent a letter as an adjoining landowner, Gamroth responded they were not as they are not an adjoining landowner.

Brandt called three times for any other testimony or persons who wished to speak in regard to the rezone. Carlson read a letter from the Town of Ettrick which stated they reviewed the proposal of Lloyd Stellflue for the rezoning of approximately 20 acres of land to Residential-20. The Town of Ettrick Board has no objections at this time to the requested changes provided all state and county requirements are met. Brandt closed the public hearing at 10:10 AM. Schultz asked if County Road D through the Village of Ettrick was the quickest avenue to the Highway 53. Brandt responded the quickest was to go through Ettrick but if one has time they can go Dopp Road as it takes awhile. Brandt thought the concerns that were expressed by Graham and Pederson have to do with the fact that there is no specific plan. Stellflue has an option of coming in off of Crogan Road but the preference is to come in off of Dopp Road, worse case scenario Stellflue could come off of County Road D. Brandt stated generally when someone comes for a rezone to R-20 there is something to look at in terms of where the lots would be and the number and size of each lot, but this is still very much "in the future", with lots of options. Brandt thought the neighbors especially reflect the concern over the lack of detail. Brandt noted he was summarizing but also expressing his own concern. Brandt expressed that this is a great idea and if one is going to build out from Ettrick that is the place to go but generally there is a plan involved. Schultz thought he was hearing Brandt say the concept of R-20 makes sense but commented that for us to approve that zoning change wouldn't we first need to know what the access would be because any other lot would need frontage from a town road. Schultz questioned if the Committee could actually make/approve a zoning change to R-20 if we don't know what those lot accesses will be. Lien addressed Schultz's question by saying if the Committee zoned it R-20 today that doesn't mean that additional houses can go in there because every lot still has to have 100 feet of public road frontage, a

one acre minimum lot size and the 4 to 1 width to depth ratio. Carlson had explained he has 20.62 acres so Lien stated at an R-20 rezone the maximum number of lots that could be there would be 10 lots and that isn't taking into account that one will lose acres for the road and there are some unbuildable acres there because of the flood plain. Lien stated the "knowns" are that 10 lots are possible, every lot has to have 100 feet of frontage and they all need to meet a minimum lot size of 1 acre so the reality, once you take out the road area, is that it will never be 10 lots, realistically 8 or 9. The "unknowns" are where that access point is and where the road is going to sit. The question would then be how it affects the neighbors. We've heard some concerns about Crogan Lane access and Stellflue has stated that access wouldn't be off of Crogan Lane it would be either Dopp Rd or County Road D. Lien noted that Stellflue's access option off of Dopp Road is really speculative because you only have an easement and no frontage, so Stellflue would have to purchase that. Lien added the only "known" access would be off of County Road D which has some hurdles because there is a ditch and a creek right there. Carlson commented he would have to purchase a 100 foot wide stretch off of Dopp Road to create a new lot for that. Lien agreed. Stellflue stated he owns 100 feet already off of County Road D. Lien said he thought Carlson meant Dopp Road and that access would have to be dedicated (Stellflue wouldn't necessarily have to purchase it but the two other landowners outside of Stellflue would have to be willing to dedicate enough to reach 66 feet for the town road). Lien elaborated on some other zoning issues that dedicating a road would clear up. Zeglin asked Stellflue if he has spoken to the Town Board about possibly making that a town road at some point in time. Stellflue's response was that he hasn't met any more with the town board other than what Lien had mentioned earlier. Stellflue has an easement through the property. Stellflue mentioned to the property owner about purchasing that right-of-way through there (and he has that) and about making the town road going through there and that is very much possible that it is going to happen. Zeglin stated something that Stellflue needs to consider and that this Committee should also consider is that most town boards will not take on a new road unless the owner, in this case you, creates the road. Stellflue commented he has already talked to them about that. Zeglin continued by saying that is a substantial investment. In order to get the road up to specifications (and a new road is substantial as far as width, depth, etc.) it can be pretty pricey. Zeglin stated Stellflue would have to get that road up to specs before the township will take it over, in most cases. With township funding the way it is for roads, Zeglin was pretty sure that is about the only way they will take it over. Britzius clarified that Crogan Lane is a town road. Stellflue commented it is only a one lane road (Graham said it is 13 feet wide) but Stellflue doesn't want to use Crogan Lane he wants to come off of Dopp Road. Stellflue stated he is looking at Crogan Lane for one lot. For clarification, in terms of the access easement to Stellflue, that easement doesn't necessarily extend to another potential lot that could be further back up. Stellflue said there would not be another lot made there until Stellflue owns that property. Stellflue's intention, since the guy that lives there is old, is waiting for the option to buy that property. Brandt asked what Stellflue's timeline was for development. Stellflue responded it could take forever as Ettrick just isn't growing that fast. Stellflue's idea is to get this one lot in on Crogan Lane and that will be the end of the lots down there. He wants to sell this one piece of property on Crogan Lane. Stellflue cannot sell that without getting rezoned. Stellflue said he has a buyer and he has a down payment for that one lot and he understood that he could sell this piece of property with the rezone being approved. Lien called County Surveyor, Joe Nelsen to the meeting as he made the determination on this rezone. Lien commented he thought Stellflue has sold all those lots along Crogan Lane and the zoning depends upon the time line of which they are sold. Lien stated Nelsen does a good job of tracking that time line because prior to the adoption of the new Ordinance there were no density requirements, so basically every half acre in the County, if it had 60 feet of road frontage could have a house on it, so on a 40 acre piece one could have 80 houses. In this case, Stellflue has 20.62 acres but without road frontage he can't develop any more houses on the property. Brandt stated that what is new right now, is that the motivation for the request for the rezone has shifted from developing 10 houses back there to being able to sell one lot because of the current density requirements. Stellflue agreed with what Brandt said and added that he just wants to sell this one lot. The other land might still be staying in agriculture

as far as Stellflue is concerned but he wants to sell the one lot off of Crogan Lane and then he will be done there. There will be no more houses there as there can't be any more because there is no frontage. Upon Zeglin asking what size the one lot will be, Stellflue responded he thought 1.38 acres. It is already surveyed. Brandt acknowledged County Surveyor Joe Nelsen who was present. Brandt stated there is a request for a rezone to R-20. Nelsen acknowledged that he was familiar with the situation. Brandt continued that the discussion has just shifted to developing this 20 acres for a subdivision and/or whether he needs a rezone in order to sell this one and a half acre lot. Nelson explained that, as he recalled, Stellflue would need a rezone to divide it at all so if he were to even convey an acre and a half or whatever in that area he would still need to rezone it. Nelsen added the density has been met on this piece and the only way to get another parcel (divide the remainder of that parcel) would be to rezone to probably a residential zoning that would accommodate the number of parcels left over on that piece. Brandt stated he is trying to get to the maximum which is R-20. Nelsen commented it is on the edge of town. Nelsen's added our concern on this initially was the frontage. There is 100 foot of frontage for this piece but as Nelsen recalled there is also frontage on County Road D. Skoyen verified that the frontage for Crogan Road was over 100 feet. Nelsen thought the County had a survey on file that actually shows that dimension across and it is in excess of 100 feet. Upon Skoyen asking if that lot qualifies, Nelsen responded it would meet the frontage requirements. Schultz asked if the Committee had enough clarification of the facts to make a motion. Schultz verified that we are looking at an R-20 zoning on 20.62 acres to make it possible for Stellflue to sell that lot and of course, any future development will require some kind of investment in a town road as any future lots will need frontage. Stellflue stated he understood to put in a road would be a substantial investment. Stellflue repeated that his main concern right now is to sell that one lot. Britzius asked if Stellflue had any other zoning option besides R-20 to sell the one lot or is that the only option. Lien stated under the current transitional zoning Stellflue has sold off enough lots therefore he cannot create another one. Nelsen added that was actually part of the issue with the lot count because Nelsen thought the current zoning is Transitional Ag which has a density of 1 house per 35 acres so in that parcel size if he sells one parcel without an existing dwelling on it then he (Stellflue) has met his density. It is fairly restrictive and nearly identical to Exclusive Ag zoning. The thing about Transitional Ag zoning is that it is designed to be rezoned because they are designed to be transitioned into a different type of use because it is so close to the village. Nelsen suspected that if we did some additional research we may be able to find possibly a different zoning classification but we would have to go back and analyze the different parcels that have been split off to get a good recommendation. The overall parcel size, even though the density is focused around the size of a forty, one has to pro-rate it versus the size of the parcel. Being that it is close to 20 acres it takes that density, for virtually any size when you're looking at per forty and cuts it in half, so when you are looking at R-20 that is an average lot size of about 2 acres per parcel if you're looking at the overall density size. In looking at it, Nelsen stated it is a 20 acre parcel, in R-20 that is potentially 10 lots, so if you take what has already been taken out of that parcel size that would reduce it even more. Nelsen believed there was a certified survey map (CSM) right north of the road that probably came out of the parcel, since the zoning requirements, and that is pretty much what kicked it into a rezone. To answer Britzius' question, Lien stated if an R-8 zoning was proposed, that would give Stellflue potentially 4 lots and because Stellflue has already built a house in one location, and he is proposing to sell the other lot that would be two of the four. With the remaining land he could have two additional structures/lots providing he met the 100 foot road frontage requirement and the width/depth ratio. Lien continued that R-8 zoning would give Stellflue the ability to sell off the lot and allow two additional structures. An R-20, realistically he isn't going to get 10 lots because he already has one on there, and if he sells off another that is two and if he puts a road in there that will reduce the overall acres so he would perhaps have 6 or 7 additional lots to sell. Nelsen commented that in R-20 you're never going to meet that full density without a road. Britzius clarified he can't sell the one lot unless it is rezoned to R-8 or R-20 so we can't leave it the way it is. Some discussion took place as to whether it should be rezoned to R-8 or R-20. Schultz made a motion to approve the land use/zoning change from

Transitional Ag to Residential -20 (R-20), seconded by Nelson. Brandt stated we understand that Stellflue understands what is required for building additional lots after this one. Motion to approve the rezone carried with no opposition. Brandt reminded Stellflue that the rezone will go to County Board on Monday and asked him to attend the meeting.

Public Hearing – Land Use/Zoning Change – Rural Residential (RR) to Commercial (C) - Harley F. and Lydia A. Yoder, Petitioner/Landowner, Whitehall, WI – Town of Pigeon

Brandt called the public hearing to order at 10:32 AM. Nelson read the public hearing notice aloud. Carlson stated that Yoder wished to develop a retail store on his property therefore it requires the land to be rezoned commercial. Yoder would be required to have suitable parking spots for the store. Carlson thought he could meet that with no issues. Carlson has a letter from the town. Carlson did receive a telephone call from the public. Carlson said that Yoder could talk more about the size of the retail store. Brandt stated that he and Yoder had a little discussion in the hallway. According to Brandt, Yoder has lot of options there and the family is not of one mind as to which direction they want to go with the household economy but this is one of the options. Yoder explained that they decided not to have the store there, but then they didn't know if they wanted to rezone it, then they thought if it is rezoned they could perhaps have a bakery there. If they do have the bakery, Yoder said they would only have 40 feet so it is under the commercial size. They weren't sure though if that is going to happen. Brandt understood Yoder's option to be; originally the family would take over the Miller Store possibly, but that idea morphed into the idea of creating a bakery. Brandt asked Yoder if it would be a retail or wholesale bakery. Yoder responded they would be baking to sell, but he wasn't sure yet. Brandt thought the question for Yoder as well as the Committee is, by rezoning the half acre, Yoder would have an option down the line to create whatever business he wanted to as long as he met all the requirements, i.e. through the Health Department, etc. The Committee needs to know, as Yoder has just shared he is not sure, of the timeline nor of what business that might be. Brandt called for any testimony from the public. Carlson read a letter from the Town of Pigeon which stated Harley Yoder approached the Town of Pigeon for the purpose of a zoning change. It is their understanding that Yoder would like to have a dry goods store on property that is presently zoned agricultural. The Town of Pigeon feels that this is a good fit for the Amish community as well as the surrounding community and therefore wishes to grant the change in zoning. Carlson added that the call he received was from Tom Forrer and he said he wanted to register to speak but he was unable to be here and he wanted it on the record that he was in favor of it. Carlson received a call from a neighboring property owner, Pete Olson, who was notified of the hearing and Olson said he has no objection. Brandt called again for any other testimony. There being none, Brandt closed the public hearing at 10:40 AM. Nelson made a motion to approve the rezone, Skoyen seconded. Nelson clarified that Yoder doesn't know for sure if he is going to do this or not but he wants to have this rezoned just in case he would want to. Yoder responded, "Yes if we do go into the bakery we would still have to have it rezoned, but they are not for sure yet if or when that will happen. It may be two years down the road". Britzius stated he is all in favor of Yoder having a business out there, like the township said it is a good idea, but Britzius was wondering if the Committee wants to do a rezone on something that is as indefinite as we could wait until it is more definite and then he could come back. For clarification, Lien asked if Yoder was going to do the retail store, like Miller's have now, and just the bakery is a question or the whole thing is up for debate. Yoder responded they are not going to have the store now. They were going to but somebody else is trying to do it now plus they ran into other issues. Brandt commented that Britzius' question is germane and Yoder understands that if it becomes more firm in terms of what it is, that even if he would do his request now, or we decided not to approve this, he could always come back and ask for it again when the plans are more firm. To answer Britzius' question, Lien stated if the Committee approves a rezone to commercial, whether it was for this or any other commercial use, it would allow anyone to do any of the things listed in Table 2.05 under commercial listed in the Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance, so there is a whole host of things that would be allowable uses under there that we can't regulate. It isn't like a conditional use

where the Committee can put a condition that says you can have a retail store and possibly a bakery, it just rezones to commercial and if one can fit it on that half acre that he is rezoning, it can happen under the commercial uses. Lien suggested the Committee “table it” to give Yoder some time to verify his plans and then bring it back to the Committee or if the Committee chooses to make the decision to grant the rezone that would leave it open ended for any of the things in Table 2.05 under commercial which could take place there. Lien thought when the hearing was advertised and the notice sent out to neighbors it may have stated the use, so if that particular use didn’t happen and something else were to go there it might bring more neighbors in. Gamroth clarified the letter that was sent out stated “for a retail store”. Lien added that even though the Committee doesn’t have the ability to hold you to a retail store, Lien thought during the public hearing process there is some ownership of what the use is going to be and if you would change that use, neighbors could probably file a lawsuit, but if the Committee just blankly rezoned it to something commercial there would be no form of rebuttal because you basically gave a blank rezone. Carlson commented the bakery would be considered a retail store. Lien added that a bakery could be an accessory home occupation where one wouldn’t have to rezone. If they grow the stuff there that they are producing for retail sales and it is only a certain portion of the house or accessory building, it might fall under a home accessory occupation. Carlson commented that with a bakery you’re not raising the grain for the flour there. Zeglin commented that nowadays some people do as they take it from field to the table. Lien reiterated some of those types of uses one could do under a home accessory occupation. Zeglin’s concern was that the township was presented that it would be a retail/dry goods store and that is what they approved. Zeglin, personally, didn’t think they would have an objection to a bakery going in there but Yoder did present a dry goods store and now that is changing and the town letter was specific. Zeglin made a motion to table the issue indefinitely until Yoder comes back with a more detailed plan, Schultz seconded. Schultz questioned, if they are not selling the baked goods from that site, if that would be allowed without a rezone. Lien responded if they would be bringing them to town or wherever and selling them no rezone would be required for that. Brandt added if they were selling them onsite then they would need to rezone. Lien said it could fall under a home accessory occupation as those type of things allow people to, i.e. grow a product or perhaps you make baskets or bird houses, etc., and you can sell those without a rezone because it is something you are producing onsite, but if you start selling other retail items, i.e. hammers, nails, etc. then one is going into retail sales where one really should be zoned commercial. There is kind of a fine line and a home accessory occupation has different restrictions than an accessory home business. One is limited to the square footage of the home and one is limited to the square footage of an accessory building. Upon Britzius asking if the rezone goes with the land, Lien responded it does and would transfer to any new landowner. Lien informed Yoder that when he is ready, he should just notify the DLM and he will be put back on the agenda to appear before the Committee and he won’t have to pay another public hearing fee. Motion to approve the tabling of the issue indefinitely passed with no opposition. At this time the Committee took a five minutes break.

Brandt called the meeting back to order at 11:00 AM.

NRCS (Natural Resource Conservation Service) Update - Carla Doelle introduced Ryan Swatek, the new District Conservation at the local NRCS office. Swatek stated he is originally from Crawford County. He grew up in the Eastman/Prairie Du Chien area. Swatek went to college in Platteville and received a degree in crop science there. After college he started in his conservation journey with the Richland County LCD and then he moved to Madison to work in the NRCS office there. He wanted to be out in an actual field office so he transferred to Vernon County/Viroqua, he then got moved to the LaCrosse County office, then to Monroe County/Sparta. He was there for three years as a Soil Conservationist. An opportunity in Jackson County came up which Swatek applied for and became the District Conservationist (D.C) there in 2007. He has been the D.C. in Jackson County since 2007. After Mark Kunz retired here in Trempealeau County, Swatek was hired. Swatek has been with the NRCS

agency for 14 years and stated he looks forward to learning all about Trempealeau County and working with the Committee and DLM staff and all the producers in the County. Swatek is very familiar with the landscape and the Driftless Area as he has grown up in it his whole life and it is just a beautiful part of the State and Country. He looks forward to working and building our relationship. Brandt stated when Kunz did his final report to the Committee he highlighted a number of accomplishments of NRCS's programs over the years – CRP, etc. Brandt asked if there was anything that Swatek saw, in the time that he has been here or in the time he has been in Jackson County, that were areas of concern or areas that have improved significantly over the last i.e. 20 years. One thing Swatek thought is really starting to catch on agriculturally is the cover crop/soil health type movement. Swatek is a really big proponent of that and anytime we can get a living cover on that ground throughout the year, Swatek thought that was a huge thing. He would like to see that promoted more and kind of continue to grow. Swatek stated there are so many benefits with that. The high commodity prices really took a lot of land out of production that probably shouldn't have been in production and maybe we can get that back under control a little bit. Swatek thought perhaps people will with the tighter margins. Upon Brandt asking Swatek to talk about any new programs or existing programs that are going to continue, Swatek said a lot of the programs are probably the same as Kunz talked about. Swatek mentioned the EQIP (Environmental Quality Incentive Program) Program which is their main cost-sharing program. With their new State Conservationist, Jim Bramblett, who came on board a couple of years ago, he is starting to change the way they do their contracting and planning so we want to get a lot of our planning done ahead of contracting so we don't go into bad contracts. Swatek explained they work with people almost a year ahead of time to sign them up. Some discussion took place on how that program worked and the time lines. Lien asked Swatek how he would promote a cover crop program in Trempealeau County. Swatek stated they have cost sharing available and the last two years have actually had a cover crop sign-up through NRCS. According to Swatek the only downfall with cover crops in our area is timing. Depending on the crop, the latest that NRCS standards say to plant the cover crop is October 15th and that would just be some straight rye. Anything after those dates we start to lose the effectiveness of that crop and questioned if we are really getting any benefit off of it. We will get some but not the same benefit as if we got it planted September 1st, obviously. Swatek added that timing becomes an issue but Mother Nature is a big factor in all these things and by NRCS offering cost-sharing assistance to these guys we are talking \$40-\$50 an acre to plant a cover crop. As a financial incentive it is a no brainer, it isn't going to cost them a dime and it is going to benefit their soils and so many things down the road that Swatek thought it is an easy sell. Swatek said they are starting to host cover crop field days/soil health field days to get people out there. Swatek had attended the one held earlier this year in April in Trempealeau County and we dug up plants that were seeded around September 15th and they had nine inches of root depth in it already and this was in April. Swatek thought it was an easy sell. Swatek added there are a lot of people doing it so it is very competitive so he doesn't want to say you're automatically going to get paid for it because they give NRCS a certain amount of money. Swatek gave some of the parameters of the program. In referencing the Soil Health Field Day that Swatek had referred to, Doelle said there were some "nonbelievers" of the benefits and why they should do it and you see them out there now planting cover crops. Doelle believed that a lot of it has to do with education and making people aware of what is going on. Doelle elaborated on some of the happenings at the Soil Health Field Day. Schultz stated that Swatek had mentioned competitiveness. Schultz was wondering if there are any kinds of slope standards or seed preference in use of cover crop on slope grounds. Swatek responded it would probably benefit one more by putting it on there but one wouldn't get, i.e. "ranked higher" because it is on steeper ground. Swatek added there are so many different factors you can't just base it on one. Schultz thought if in our County NRCS could do that and move landowners towards that it would be great. Swatek hoped that was something he could promote more. More discussion took place on the crops, the sign-ups, funding, etc. In regard to funding, Swatek thought it was probably going to go down from years prior and budgets will be tighter. They aren't hiring as much staff as they've had in the past and counties are combining. Swatek stated EQIP is the

biggest cost sharing program and there is the Conservation Stewardship Program which is the five year program and landowners can enroll their land and then they have enhancements (things above what they are currently doing which they can receive a payment for).

NRCS Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) – Lien stated we had a one year MOU with NRCS. Lien and Swatek have talked and e-mailed about this MOU and the existing language. Lien stated we (Lien and Swatek) would be ok with extending that another year. Lien thought he and staff are very confident that Swatek will be great to work with. Lien welcomed Swatek to Trempealeau County. Lien looks forward to promoting some of the cover crop issues. Lien commented on some of the gullies he has seen in the County and hoped that the cover crops could alleviate some of those. Brandt noted that all the Committee members were here a year ago. To summarize, Lien said Mark Kunz was sitting in Swatek’s chair a year ago. According to Lien an MOU was suggested, (because there hadn’t been one in Trempealeau County for a long time), as more of a formality because we will continue to work together as we have some of the same clientele. Lien stated we have a good working relationship with NRCS and that is going to continue whether there is an MOU or not. For Lien, personally, it doesn’t affect what is done day to day. Lien thought it is a “good faith effort” to have it but reiterated we’re going to continue to work together whether we have it or not. Nelson made a motion to approve the one year extension to the existing MOU that we have, Skoyen seconded. Motion to approve carried with no opposition. Lien noted he would get a clean version of the MOU signed and would get it to Swatek.

RCCP (Regional Conservation Partnership Program) Proposal Discussion – Upon Brandt questioning as to whether or not we were already into this, Doelle explained that they do a pre-proposal and then a formal proposal so the pre-proposals were approved for a full proposal, so that is where we are at and we currently have two different proposals that we are currently working on. One is a Bluff/Goat (used interchangeably) Prairie Restoration and the other one is the Driftless Restoration Effort which is habitat for the wild and rare. At this time, several short videos were shown on Bluff Prairie Restoration. Doelle explained the RCCP proposal is a three county (Buffalo, Pepin and Trempealeau) proposal with multiple partners (UW-Extension, DLM, NRCS, DNR, Fish & Wildlife) and what we are hoping to do is that each county will have a small group of landowners. Each County was hoping to target perhaps 10 landowners on a small number of acres. Schultz continued that his family property is kind of unique as they have 7 or 8 of these bluff prairies but there is no boundary or wall as they emerge into the woods and as one goes down the slope that is where the historical prairies are mentioned. Arman Bartz was the person who sort of mentioned that historical aspect where the prairie soils gave us the fields that we have and built society on. Schultz wasn’t sure if people understand that Trempealeau County, pre-settlement, had on average 2-3 trees per acre and so the absence of fire on the Ag fields is actually how hills are became more wooded than they once were. What Schultz found growing up (he noticed this from being a young child to maybe 10 years ago as a young adult) is that the bluff prairies were becoming much smaller. Schultz appreciates the ecological diversity aspect those people in the video spoke to but he also found, as he started working with the bluff prairies, that they expanded into woodlands. Just this weekend Schultz was walking along the perimeters of one of his restored bluff prairies and the oak seedlings are almost a carpet. When Schultz walks through woodlands in the County now he doesn’t see a lot of oaks his own age and now from doing the bluff prairie restoration (it is a great tool to start that kind of land management) he burns 80-150 acres of woodlands also on a rotating basis and Schultz has young oaks. Schultz wasn’t sure that landowners in the county, 40 years down the road are going to have a stand of oak trees that the Schultz family has. To Schultz this is a great project to initiate an understanding of the efficiency of fire as a landscape tool because to Schultz a quality landscape promotes diversity – it is respecting the intelligence of creation that we’ve been given but a quality landscape is diverse in itself and productive. That was Schultz’s addition to what the people in the videos spoke to, so to answer Doelle’s question, Schultz stated typically you’re going to see a bluff prairie project of one to two acres in size. The point

of this program is to create that initiation for people to start doing some work on the land. Brandt heard all the partners but he didn't hear where the money is coming from. Doelle responded that is what part of the grant is for and then as a County we would hope to contribute the "in-kind" portion through plan writing and contract development and oversee that the project gets evolved. Doelle explained they are also asking for monetary contribution which we could use from our already established county-wide conservation program with the small pot of money because they are high impact-low cost types of practices and we are hoping to have an investment of a minimum of \$2000 per year for the five year contract, so what they are asking for is very small. Brandt recalled that this issue was raised and put on the agenda as adding bluff land prairie restoration to the list that already exists for high-impact, low-cost practices that would be available through our cost-share program. Doelle said that was correct. Upon Brandt asking if that money was available every year or if it was a dwindling pot, Lien responded he was hoping that, as the year ends, this Committee would decide to put more money into that fund. Lien has been talking to Pat Malone from UW-Extension about the well water testing program and the hope to keep that program alive. Brandt recapped that we are looking for a couple of things; 1) designate bluff land prairies as a high-impact, low-cost practice that would be eligible for our cost sharing through our Department as well as participation in the bluff land prairie restoration that is going on with the regional conservation partnership. Britzius asked who the application is being made to. Doelle believed it was NRCS's program. Swatek explained there are projects submitted all across the Country to this RCCP program that NRCS has and it is a national program. People, groups, etc. submit their proposals and then they (NRCS) will select from the "first pot" the ones they like out of there and put it into the next pot (this is the stage we're at right now). Now they will take an in-depth look at the project and say, "Give us the nuts and bolts of this thing and how it is going to shake out, who are you going to sign up and how much money is going to be needed, etc." and then they will take that and say which proposals they will fund. Doelle stated Carl Duley, UW Extension Agent, Buffalo County is taking the lead on it along with others from the State. Schultz and Doelle agreed that there was a pretty good chance we are going to get this grant. Some discussion took place on prescribed burns and the type of terrain involved and what type of landowners would be interested in this grant. Schultz asked if the county program would be in addition to realizing this potential grant program. Lien commented he wouldn't want to necessarily "piggy back" on that but it would be in addition for if the proposal didn't go through that it would still be a practice that would be added to the County cost share list. Britzius made a motion to make bluff prairie restoration eligible for the County high-impact, low cost, cost share program, Zeglin seconded. Motion to approve carried with no opposition. Brandt stated the next request is to pursue the second stage of the RCCP program. The pre-proposal has been done and now we are into the full proposal stage. Zeglin made a motion to continue our participation in the RCCP program, Schultz seconded. Motion carried with no opposition. Doelle stated that in regard to the second RCCP grant proposal that went in, the pre-proposal was written by Jeff Hastings from Trout Unlimited and that was for the co-water stream restoration and that has also been selected for a full proposal and basically it is going to be a continuation and potentially countywide stream restoration that we're already doing. We do have different grant monies already established in the Elk Creek/North Creek/Newcomb Valley areas. Stream bank riprap is an identified practice, (high-impact, low-cost) that we can use our county funds for so this grant would tie in with what we are already currently doing. It is a multi-county (Buffalo and Trempealeau) grant with multiple partners (DNR, UW-Extension, Fish & Wildlife and Trout Unlimited, NRCS, etc.) This is also a five year project, the fiscal year is from 2016 to 2020. Doelle added we are going to see what we can do to get approved for this as well. Doelle wasn't sure if the Committee wanted to take action to have Doelle continue on or if the Committee just wanted information. Doelle clarified for Brandt that we are in the full proposal stage and that we already designated riprap and stream restoration as a practice under our high-impact, low cost County program. Upon Zeglin asking if there were any other practices in this program that we don't have listed, Doelle suggested adding stream buffers (5 foot to 20 foot buffers) as she wasn't sure they were included. Lien didn't think staff or the Committee would be doing their job if we didn't support moving forward with

these kind of proposals as that is our job for the benefit of Trempealeau County and the environment as a whole. The bigger issue was that if we continue to get these grants and continue to move forward we are not going to have enough staff to implement these things. To Lien this was a bigger picture of where we are headed in this County and what we want our goals to be. Lien thought it was a “no brainer” and we should be moving forward on every opportunity like this but right now we’re working with one technician and at one time our County had, at least, six, so we are continually doing more with less. Brandt asked if the grant money includes staff. Doelle, Lien nor Schultz believed that it did. Schultz said that Doelle raised that concern in discussion at the Buffalo County meeting. Some discussion took place on this and Doelle voiced that she felt this was a doable practice for us if we focus mostly on stream restoration because it isn’t as complex to design as a manure storage structure, barnyard, etc. It ties in well with what we are currently doing. Schultz made a motion to move forward with the whole proposal related to stream restoration, Britzius seconded. Motion to approve carried with no opposition.

Western Area Poster and Speaking Contest – Donation for Awards - Doelle informed the Committee that she got packets out to all the schools/teachers for the 2016 Poster and Speaking Contest. Our local Poster and Speaking contest will be held on January 13th, 2016, there will be an area contest to follow on February 2nd, 2016 in Viroqua and the State contest is March 2nd, 2016. This year’s theme is “We All Need Trees”. The posters all have to be identified with that somewhere on the poster. The speeches can be written about anything conservation related, they do not have to be tied to the “We All Need Trees” theme. Ironically, Doelle had some conservation posters turned in yesterday which aren’t due until January 11th, 2016, so there is interest out there already and Doelle was very excited. Doelle had received a request from the person who runs the Western Area Poster and Speaking Contest asking if each County would be interested in putting money (\$50.00) towards awards for the Western Area Contest winners. At this point, they don’t receive a ribbon or anything for it other than a “Congratulations”. Lien elaborated on last year’s contest which included Trempealeau County having a State Speaking Contest winner as well as a State Poster Contest winner (which is going on to the National contest). Upon Britzius suggesting that we have participants do PSA’s (Public Service Announcements) within the contest, Doelle stated she would take it to the Youth Education Committee, because this is established on a statewide level so it is above and beyond our control as to the rules that are set. Britzius suggested just doing the PSA’s (other media) on the local level. Schultz made a motion to approve sending \$50.00 to the Western Area Poster and Speaking Contest, Britzius seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition. Zeglin added that she had the honor of being one of the Poster Contest judges last year and has been asked again this year. She had a lot of fun last year but it was extremely challenging to narrow each group down to three winners.

Project Initiation – Land Records Position – Lien introduced new DLM staff member, Kirstie Heidenreich stating she started with the County a couple of weeks prior. Heidenreich lives in the County and she replaced Meghan Wessel. Lien added that Heidenreich has met with three towns this week and they have officially met with all 15 towns now regarding the Land Use planning update and Farmland Preservation update. Lien explained Heidenreich is working on the Farmland Preservation goals and to update that plan by year end. Heidenreich said she is very excited to be working in Trempealeau County. She is actually from central Wisconsin. The Wausau area is where she grew up, and she went to school in Stevens Point. She worked in Eau Claire in continuing education for a couple of years and then they moved to Strum earlier this summer and she has completely fallen in love with Trempealeau County. It has been enjoyable for her to get to learn more about the County in this position and she is very passionate about youth education and communicating with our landowners. To Heidenreich it is exciting to hear that we do want to be progressive in a lot of our conservation practices. Heidenreich has been reaching out to a few counties around us in terms of what they do for their Farmland Preservation Programs. It is encouraging to her that we have so many participants (150-170) in Trempealeau County. Heidenreich did have the opportunity to go to Sauk County and learn how they

do cover crops. Sauk County has approximately 400 participants in the Farmland Preservation Program so we aren't one of the leaders in the State but are definitely doing really good as some county's have only 6 or 7 contracts. Heidenreich added it will be good to get our plan updated and we are almost at the stage where we can finalize our County map for the Farmland Preservation Program. We can then work with our farmers to possibly form Ag Enterprise areas. Brandt asked Heidenreich about her GIS experience. Heidenreich responded her degree is in Land Use Planning so GIS was part of her learning. She is hoping to learn more from Ann Hempel in Land Records. Heidenreich mentioned that she had the opportunity to work with UW-Extension on a Youth Education Day which was held in Independence. County 4-H agent, Adam Trunzo, had let her know that WIS-COR (volunteer based program) had reached out to him and WIS-COR really has the desire to break into Trempealeau County to do a little more volunteer/education efforts so Heidenreich thought that was definitely a group the County could target in getting the "sweat equity" and/or labor to do the prairie restoration projects. They haven't done much work in Trempealeau County but they have a really good base of volunteers. Heidenreich also mentioned that when she went to school in Stevens Point they had the UW-SP Wild land Fire Fighting Crew and a lot of those were volunteers, so if the County is looking at doing small scale prairie/bluff burns a group like that might be able to help. Brandt thanked her for the awesome suggestion.

To continue on, Lien stated the Committee is aware that Land Records merged into the Department of Land Management. Lien attended the first Land Information Council meeting after the merger. The Council listened to what Hempel is working on presently, her work load in general and everything that needs to be done and it was a unanimous vote that they move forward to hire a Land Records GIS Technician. Brandt commented that Hempel has been doing the work of two or three people (there used to be 3 or 4 people in that office) for as long as she has been the Director. She has been expanding the awareness of GIS in the Courthouse and the County as to what is available in the Land Records Office. According to Brandt, her "open door policy" is working to the point where she has, obviously, more work than she can do, i.e. parcel mapping, zoning maps, helping landowners and real estate agents, other agencies within the Courthouse, etc. Recently the State, through Act 20, is requiring a considerable more amount of work in regard to the creation of her Land Records Plan. It has basically become a full time job. In order to get the money from the State to do what it is her Department does she has to do this incredibly detailed, goal and objective, plan and if the goals aren't accomplished and she can't explain why, the money dries up. If she doesn't submit a plan the money dries up, so she needs not only Nick Gamroth's position, she needs another person. According to Brandt, the Exec. /Finance Committee seemed to be willing to listen but they didn't take a stand. Brandt felt this isn't going to be a Department or an effective one unless we get more people in there. Lien stated Brandt pretty much covered everything under the Project Initiation Form – Act 20 requirements, etc. Lien continued that it was just assumed previously that Hempel had no deadline for doing parcel mapping, data entry, etc. With Act 20, there is now a timeline and a goal and the mapping has to be done to certain standards. Lien said the County wanted this done anyway that is why we pursued the remonumentation (which is completed) because it is the foundation to this whole mapping process. Lien presented a Project Initiation Form to the Committee, signed by Lien and Hempel. This Committee, Exec./Finance Committee (Lien had brought this up at budget time to them) and the Personnel/Bargaining Committee will all have to approve this, so this is basically the first step in the process. This position request came out of the Land Information Council, but Lien and Hempel have known of this need all along and that is why the merger of that Department with DLM was implemented. This Project Initiation Form includes the pre-existing GIS Technician job description. Hempel and Cindy Currier, Information Systems, filled out the Project Initiation form and they have an estimation of \$56,421.26 for the position. Because of the two vacancies in Lien's department for a good part of the year, Lien felt there would be excess money in the budget which the Committee would have to make a recommendation to County Board as to what to do with it, so it could fund part of this position for this year but in years to come it would probably require levy

dollars. Lien elaborated on the need for this position and some of the funding for it. Brandt talked about the Wipfli wage study and how it relates to this position. Lien noted this would be adding money to the budget. Zeglin asked, in regard to the current budget that went before the Exec. /Finance Committee, if we didn't have a half-time position in that budget. Lien responded no, Hempel presented her regular budget. Lien added that we are utilizing part of Nick Gamroth's time so that is included because that was in the DLM budget but this new position was not in there nor a half time position. Upon Zeglin asking if this was for a technician or a specialist, Lien responded a GIS Technician. Lien explained that when N. Gamroth leaves, that new job description, that Lien and Hempel have been working on, will be a GIS Specialist. A brief discussion followed on additional revenue that may be able to offset the cost of this position. Britzius made a motion to approve the job description, Schultz seconded, and motion to approve carried with no opposition. Brandt announced we are looking for support of the Project Initiation Form which would basically do the same thing and that is to create the position that the job description describes. Britzius made a motion to approve the creation of this position using the Project Initiation Form, Zeglin seconded, motion to approve carried with no opposition. Some discussion followed on the County budgets. Lien noted that DLM came in at zero on the budgets with the exception of wages and benefits which are out of our control and there would also be an increase on the Land Records side if this budget amendment to allow for additional staff would go through.

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

No one from the public was forthcoming with any comments. Heidenreich stated that, as was mentioned earlier, they (Lien and Heidenreich and Peter Fletcher, Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission) just finished meeting with the last three towns in terms of connecting with all the towns. Each parcel in the town was discussed to clear up any inconsistencies and to get on the same page as far as what portions of their particular town will be in Farmland Preservation. Heidenreich added they will be meeting with each town again in early 2016 to tie up any loose ends and update their Comprehensive Plans. Heidenreich is seeing the "light at the end of the tunnel" in getting the County's Farmland Preservation map completed.

LWRM (Land & Water Resource Management) and TRM (Target Runoff Management) Requests and Payment Approval. No payments were presented for approval.

Surveying Update and Payment Approval – Lien presented a report and bill, prepared by County Surveyor Joe Nelsen, for the maintenance of the re-monumented corners and extensive office work. Nelson made a motion to approve the report and payment, Skoyen seconded, motion carried with no opposition.

Confirm Next Special Meeting Date and Regular Meeting Date

The next Special meeting date was set for Wednesday, October 28th, 2015 at 6:00 PM.

The next regular Committee meeting date was set for November 11th, 2015 at 9:00 AM.

At 12:34 PM, Zeglin made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Nelson seconded, motion carried unopposed.

Respectfully submitted,
Virginette Gamroth, Recording Secretary

Michael Nelson, Secretary