



**DRAFT – NOT APPROVED**

**MINUTES**  
**OZAUKEE COUNTY**  
**COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING**  
**CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE -**  
**LAND USE, TRANSPORTATION, AND UTILITIES & COMMUNITY FACILITIES (LUTU)**  
**WORK GROUP**  
**TUESDAY, MAY 22, 2007 @ 5:30 PM**  
**OZAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER – AUDITORIUM**  
**(121 W. MAIN STREET, PORT WASHINGTON)**

---

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Angela Curtes, Brian Borofka, Ed Beimborn, Pat Marchese, Phil Arnholdt, Rick Nelson and Roger Kirgues

**MEMBERS EXCUSED:**

David Murphy, Dave Verley, Don Korte, Joette Heckenbach, Kit Keller, Paul Westrick, Robert Dreblow and Roger Strohm

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Aileen Switzer, Al Neumann, Bill McGill, Daniel Wagner, James Froemming, John Stilp, Ken Lucht, Lance Leider, Krista Chapdelaine, Mark Lake, Sharon Gayan, Steven Lenz and Victor Pappas

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Andrew Struck - Ozaukee County - Planning, Resources and Land Management Department  
Paul Roback - UW-Extension, Ozaukee County  
Ben McKay - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)  
Joyce Gramz - Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)

**HANDOUTS:**

- Ozaukee County LESA Analysis

**1. CALL TO ORDER AND MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS**

Chairman Marchese called the meeting to order at 5:44 PM. There was not a quorum present according to the By-laws established for the Comprehensive Planning CAC. Each of the members of the LUTU Work Group gave self-introductions.

**2. ASSURANCE THAT THE MEETING WAS PROPERLY NOTICED / ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Andrew Struck assured that the meeting was properly noticed and posted. Andrew explained that the agenda was revised in order to reschedule the two presenters on regional water issues. A special meeting has been scheduled for July 17<sup>th</sup> for this Work Group and the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to hear these presentations.

Pat Marchese stressed that land use, water quality and drinking water were important issues for this Work Group to consider in moving forward with recommendations and encouraged Work Group members to attend this meeting on July 17, 2007 at the County Administration Center.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (TUESDAY, APRIL 3, 2007)**

No action was taken on the minutes from the Tuesday, April 3, 2007 LUTU Work Group meeting as there was not a quorum. This item was postponed to the next meeting of the LUTU Work Group.

**4. UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON THE LESA ANALYSIS FOR THE AGRICULTURAL PORTION OF THE PRELIMINARY INVENTORY AND ELEMENT CHAPTERS OF AGRICULTURAL, NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES (CHAPTER III AND VII) FOR THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035**

Andrew Struck commented that the document entitled “Ozaukee County LESA Analysis” has been reviewed and approved by the LESA Technical Advisory Work Group, Agricultural and Natural Resources Element Work Group, Comprehensive Planning Citizens Advisory Committee and the Comprehensive Planning Board. Andrew Struck noted that staff (specifically the Planning Intern) was still working on some supporting statistical analysis for LESA. He noted that more information on this analysis would follow in subsequent meetings.

**5. PRESENTATION, REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEM (GIS) DATA LAYERS FOR DETERMINING THE NATURAL LIMITATIONS AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE LANDS TO BE MAPPED AND SHOWN IN THE LAND USE ELEMENT FOR THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035**

Andrew Struck referenced two documents that were included in the Work Group mailing, namely: 1) “Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan Preparation of 2035 Land Use Plan Maps for County and Participating Local Governments” and 2) “Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan Categories for 2035 Land Use Map (Planned Land Use).

Andrew Struck started with the Planned Land Use map categories. Based on comments from the previous Work Group meeting, staff has added the additional planned land use categories, including floodplain (overlay), traditional neighborhood development (overlay) and conservation subdivision (overlay).

The Work Group discussed the following:

- These land use categories are meant to be broad and inclusive for the County land use plan map. Most local communities would split these categories into more detailed categories based on their local land use plan and zoning maps. These land use categories are also aligned with approved regional planning land use plan categories.
- Farmland preservation as a category implies that the land is in the farmland preservation program, which it may not be. Although this language is reflected in the state statute, it may need to be further refined. Staff should look into this land use category further for discussion. It was further suggested that this category could be split into two separate categories.
- Conducting a sensitivity analysis may help us measure the highest and best use for a parcel of land. This is being accomplished by identifying the prime agricultural land and natural resource areas and then using population and economic development projections to plan how much land we will need for development.
- Although we will have population growth, it will be a different population growth than we are used to, primarily 65+ years old. This type of population growth will require different land use development than we have historically seen.
- The category of Agricultural and Rural Residential was discussed. It was also discussed that this category may need to be broken down into two separate categories to more accurately reflect agricultural use from rural residential. The Work Group suggested that these were two very different land uses and perhaps should not be grouped.

Andrew Struck then presented with interactive GIS a list of possible natural resource features to be included in maps of natural limitations for building site development and/or other environmentally sensitive lands. As Andrew presented each feature, Joyce Gramz displayed the GIS data layers. The Work Group discussed the following:

- Land for groundwater recharge areas should be added (reference the Regional Water Supply Plan data and mapping)
- Other environmentally sensitive lands should be added
- Sand, gravel, bedrock and non-metallic mining should be treated separately
- Hydric soils should be a separate issue and mapping

- Endangered and threatened species habitats should be added such as the Butler's Garder Snake Habitat and the Hines Emerald Dragonfly Habitat Areas
- Cultural and historical resources were discussed

The Work Group requested that staff draft their recommendations and the maps for both the Natural Limitations for Building Site Development and Other Environmentally Sensitive Lands maps based on tonight's comments and present each of them at the next meeting for action.

**6. DISCUSSION ON THE TIMELINE AND NEXT STEPS**

Andrew Struck noted that the revised meeting schedule was provided in the Work Group packet.

**7. PLANNING NEWS/EDUCATIONAL AND OUTREACH RESOURCES**

Andrew Struck noted that a copy of the Comprehensive Planning legislation was included in the Work Group packet per comments at the last LUTU Work Group meeting and for future reference. Andrew Struck also noted the additional educational items regarding farmland and open space preservation tools.

**8. PUBLIC COMMENT AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no written communications and no public comment.

**9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS AS ALLOWED BY LAW**

There was nothing discussed.

**10. NEXT MEETING DATE(S)**

Tuesday, June 19, 2007. The Work Group agreed to meet at 5:00 PM for all upcoming meetings.

**11. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:37 PM.

*Respectfully recorded and submitted by Paul Roback, Andrew Struck, Ben McKay and Nancy Anderson, as reviewed and proofed by Pat Marchese, Chairperson.*