BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221
E-Mail BrownCountyCountyBoard@co.brown.wi.us

WEEKLY MEETING SCHEDULE
June 8-12, 2009

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 2009

*	9:45 a.m.	Transportation Coordinating Committee	Metro Transportation Center 901 University Avenue
*	11:30 a.m.	Harbor Commission	Holiday Inn – City Centre Green Bay
*	6:00 p.m.	Executive Committee	Room 200, Northern Building 305 E. Walnut Street

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2009

*	11:00 a.m.	NFLS Board of Trustees, Personnel Committee	Nicolet Fed Library System Third Floor 515 Pine Street
*	12:00 noon	NFLS Board of Directors	
*	5:15 p.m.	Veterans' Recognition Subcommittee	Room 201, Northern Building 305 E. Walnut Street
*	5:30 p.m.	Board of Health	2nd Floor Conference Room 610 S. Broadway Street

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2009
(No Meetings)

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 2009
(No Meetings)

FRIDAY, JUNE 12, 2009
(No Meetings)

***Agendas Enclosed**
Any person wishing to attend who, because of a disability, requires special accommodation, should contact the Brown County Human Resources Office at 448-4065 by 4:30 p.m. on the day before the meeting so that arrangements can be made.

"PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING"

PURSUANT TO SECTION 19.84 WIS. STATS., NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN TO THE PUBLIC THAT THE FOLLOWING MEETINGS WILL BE HELD THE WEEK OF JUNE 8-12, 2009.

AGENDA
BROWN COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE

Monday, June 8, 2009

Green Bay Metro Transportation Center
901 University Avenue
Green Bay, Wisconsin
9:45 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Sunny Archambault	_____	Nick Mahlik	_____
Betty Bennett	_____	Byia Martin	_____
Linda Blohowiak	_____	Barbara Natelle	_____
Diana Brown	_____	Jennifer Nelson	_____
Brandon Cooper	_____	Sandy Popp	_____
Chris Culotta	_____	Cole Runge	_____
Pat Finder-Stone	_____	Jayme Sellen	_____
Chris Hasselbacher	_____	Julie Tetzlaff	_____
Kathy Hillary	_____	Mary Van Acker	_____
Kathy Johnson	_____	Vacant – BC Board	_____

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1. Approval of the March 9, 2009, Transportation Coordinating Committee meeting minutes.

2. Update on meetings with representatives of St. Mary's Hospital, Bellin Hospital, and Medi-Vans about post-appointment rides for disabled patients.

3. Discussion of developing a transportation coalition in Brown County.

4. Other matters.

5. Adjourn.

ANY PERSON WISHING TO ATTEND WHO, BECAUSE OF A DISABILITY, REQUIRES SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS SHOULD CONTACT THE BROWN COUNTY HUMAN RESOURCES OFFICE AT 448-4065 BY 4:30 P.M. ON FRIDAY, JUNE 5 SO THAT ARRANGEMENTS CAN BE MADE.

PORT AND SOLID WASTE DEPARTMENT

Brown County

2561 SOUTH BROADWAY
GREEN BAY, WI 54304

PHONE: (920) 492-4950 FAX: (920) 492-4957

CHARLES J. LARSCHEID
PORT AND SOLID WASTE DIRECTOR

-- PUBLIC NOTICE --

BROWN COUNTY HARBOR COMMISSION

Monday, JUNE 8, 2009 – 11:30 AM

Holiday Inn – City Centre, Green Bay, WI

AGENDA:

1. Roll Call
2. Approval/Modification – Meeting Agenda
3. Approval/Modification – May 11, 2009 Meeting Minutes
4. WI Department of Transportation Harbor Assistance Program Grant Application: Cat Island Chain Restoration Project – Request for Approval
5. Cat Island Chain Restoration Project Resolution – Request for Approval
6. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Cat Island Chain Restoration Project Letter of Clarification – Request For Approval
7. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Preliminary Renard Isle Causeway Design – Informational
8. 2010 Budget Preview
9. Director's Report
10. Audit of Bills – Request for Approval
11. Tonnage Report
12. Such Other Matters as are Authorized by Law
13. Adjourn

Charles J. Larscheid
Port & Solid Waste Director

Any person wishing to attend who, because of disability requires special accommodations should contact the Brown County Port and Solid Waste Department at 492-4961, at least two working days in advance of the meeting for special arrangements to be made.

Notice is hereby given that action by the Harbor Commission may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed on the agenda

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221
E-mail bc_county_board@co.brown.wi.us

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Mary Scray, Chair
Guy Zima Vice Chair
Tom Lund, Bernie Erickson
John Vander Leest, Andy Nicholson, Patrick Evans

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Monday, June 8, 2009
6:00 p.m.
Room 200, Northern Building
305 E. Walnut Street

I. Call meeting to order.
II. Approve/modify agenda.
III. Approve/modify minutes of May 11, 2009 and Special Executive May 20, 2009.

Comments from the Public/Such Other Matters as Authorized by Law

Communications

1. Communication from Supervisor Knier re: Implement a policy that would require every ordinance or policy amendments proposals to identify current law and the proposed changes in the same document; similar to procedure/amendments made to state law. (Held from May meeting.)
2. Communication from Supervisor Erickson re: Bid formats should include more personal information regarding taxes and loans and if any of these payments are in arrears or defaults. Bidder should be checking out by our Board Attorney before moving the award forward to any boards or committees. (Referred from May County Board.)
3. Communication from Supervisors Zima and Scray re: Respectfully request that the Executive Committee seven County Board consider reclassify the portion of Internal Auditor to a position of Internal Auditor/Board Research Analyst.

Legal Bills

4. Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.
5. Discussion and Possible Action re: Syble Hopp Legal Bills.

Reports

6. County Executive Report.
   a. Budget Status Financial Report for April 30, 2009.
   b. Voluntary Unpaid Leave Program.

7. Internal Auditor Report.
   a. Budget Status Financial Report for April 30, 2009.
   b. New Zoo Audit.
   c. Other.

8. Board Attorney Report.
   a. Pivonka update.
   b. Table vs. Postpone.

Resolution, Ordinances

9. Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Human Services. (Referred from Human Services Committee.)

10. Authority to Execute a 2009 Labor Agreement with the Brown County Library Clerk Employees Local 1901, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.

11. Authority to Execute a 2009 Labor Agreement with the Brown County Medical Examiner Investigators Local 1901, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.

12. **Closed Session:** For the purpose of deliberating whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session pursuant to 19.85 (1)(e). In the alternative, the Executive committee is meeting for the purpose of collective bargaining and is not subject to the Wisconsin open meetings law pursuant to 19.82 (1) of the Wisconsin State Statutes, and also for the purpose of conferring with legal counsel for Brown County as to legal advice concerning strategy as to litigation pending pursuant to sec. 19.85 (1) (g) of the Wisconsin State Statutes.

13. Such other matters as authorized by law.

Mary Scray, Chair

Notice is hereby given that action by the Committee may be taken on any of the items, which are described or listed in this agenda.
Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.

NICOLET FEDERATED LIBRARY SYSTEM

PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING

Pursuant to Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin Statutes, Notice is hereby given to the public that a meeting of the Board of Trustees, **Personnel Committee** of the Nicolet Federated Library System will be held **Tuesday June 9, 2009, at 11:00 a.m.**, at the Nicolet **Federated Library System,** 515 Pine Street, Third Floor, Green Bay, WI.

AGENDA

1. April 30, 2009 minutes.
2. New Hire Update.
3. Director's Evaluation.
4. New Business.
5. Adjourn.

Miriam Erickson, Chair
Personnel Committee

Attachments:
4/30/09 Minutes

Third Floor 515 Pine Street Green Bay, WI 54301-5194 Phone 920.448.4410 Fax 920.448.4420

NICOLET FEDERATED LIBRARY SYSTEM

PUBLIC NOTICE OF MEETING

Pursuant to Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin Statutes, Notice is hereby given to the public that a meeting of the NFLS Board of Directors will be held **Tuesday, June 9, 2009 at 12 Noon**, at the Nicolet Federated Library System, Third Floor, 515 Pine St., Green Bay, WI 54301.

AGENDA

1. Welcome & lunch.
2. Agenda Revisions.
3. Open Forum.

4. April 14, 2009 minutes.

5. Annual NFLS Audit Report – Conrad Schumitsch, Anderson, Tackman & Co.

6. Reports:

   6.1 President – Kay Krall
   6.2 Member Library Report – Becca Berger, Door County Library
   6.3 Director – Mark Merrifield
   6.4 Treasurer's Report – John Hickey
   6.5 Personnel Report – Miriam Erickson
   (a) Director's Annual Performance Review.

7. State Budget Update.

8. Shawano Crossover Borrowing.

9. New Business.

10. Adjourn.

Notice is hereby given that action by the board may be taken on any of the items that are described or listed in this agenda.
Please call 920 448-4410 if you cannot attend this meeting.

Any person wishing to attend who requires special accommodation because of disability should contact NFLS at 920 448-4410 at least two days prior to the meeting so that arrangements can be made.

Third Floor 515 Pine Street Green Bay, WI 54301-5194 Phone 920.448.4410 Fax 920.448.4420

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P. O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WISCONSIN 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4015 FAX (920) 448-6221

VETERANS SUBCOMMITTEE
Jack Krueger, Chair
Sherry Steenbock, Vice Chair
Donald Bettine, John Walschinski, James Haskins,
Kristen Verhaagh, Duane Pierce, John Maino.

**Running Total of Veterans' Certificates: 1114

VETERANS' RECOGNITION SUBCOMMITTEE
Tuesday, June 9, 2009
****5:15 p.m.****
Room 201, Northern Building
305 E. Walnut Street

1. Call meeting to order.
2. Invocation by Jim Haskins.
3. Approve/modify agenda.
4. Approve/modify minutes of May 12, 2009.
5. Report from Jim Haskins on Brown County Fair.
6. Action Item, Consider remaining preparations and expenses for the 2009 Brown County Fair.
7. Action Item, Approve final bill for Bumper Stickers, Coffee Cups, and T-Shirts to be sold to help with the increased needs of the Veteran Commissions emergency funding.
8. Report from Chair Jack Krueger.
9. Report from Committee Members.
10. Report from Jerry Polus (CVS, if available.)
11. Such other matters as authorized by law.
12. Adjourn.

Jack Krueger, Chair

Notice is hereby given that action by Committee may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda.
Please take notice that it is possible additional members of the Board of Supervisors may attend this meeting, resulting in a majority or quorum of the Board of Supervisors. This may constitute a meeting of the Board of Supervisors for purposes of discussion and information gathering relative to this agenda.
Word97agenda/humsvc/Veterans'Subcmte/June9_2009.doc

BROWN COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH
TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2009
5:30 PM

Brown County Health Department
610 So Broadway St, 2nd Floor Conference Room
Green Bay, WI 54305
Conference Room Phone #: 920-448-6444

AGENDA

1. Call to Order, Introductions & Board Status Update

2. Approval/ Modification of the Agenda

3. Approval of Minutes of March 10, 2009

4. Update Odor Ordinance / Complaints

5. Update Novel H1N1 Influenza A

6. Director's Report

7. Any Other Business Authorized by Law

8. Adjournment/ Next Meeting

Please RSVP attendance to Juli Gray at 448-6405 no later than 4:30 PM Friday, June 5, 2009. Thank-you!

Notice is hereby given that action by this board may be taken on any of the items which are described or listed in this agenda.

JUNE 2009

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
	1	2	Public Safety 5pm 3	Ed & Rec Approx 5:45pm (tour 5:15pm) 4	5	6
7	Executive Cmte 6pm 8	Vets' Recognition 5:15pm 9	10	11	12	13
Flag Day 14	15	Homeless 3:30pm 16	EMS 1:30pm **Board of Supervisors 7pm** 17	Facility Master Plan SubCmte 5:15pm 18	19	20
Father's Day 21	Land Con 7pm Plan Develop & Trans 7:30pm 22	Criminal Justice Coord Bd 3:30pm 23	Human Svc Cmte 6pm 24	Administration Cmte 5:30pm 25	26	27
28	29	30				

JULY 2009

SUNDAY	MONDAY	TUESDAY	WEDNESDAY	THURSDAY	FRIDAY	SATURDAY
			Public Safety 5pm 1	Ed & Rec 5:30pm 2	3	***4th of July*** 4
5	Executive Cmte 6pm 6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	Vets' Recognition 5:15pm 14	EMS 1:30pm **Board of Supervisors 7pm** 15	Facility Master Plan SubCmte 5:15pm 16	17	18
19	20	Homeless 3:30pm 21	Human Svc Cmte 6pm 22	Administration Cmte 5:30pm 23	24	25
26	Land Con 7pm Plan Develop & Trans 7:30pm 27	Criminal Justice Coord Bd 3:30pm 28	29	30	31	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMITTEE MINUTES

- **Facility Master Plan Subcommittee (May 21,2009)**
- **Homeless Issues & Affordable Housing Subcommittee (May 19, 2009)**
- **Chapter 21 Subdivision Ordinance Revision Subcommittee Board of Directors (April 30,2009)**
- **Chapter 21 Subdivisions Technical Advisory Committee (March 26, 2009)**

A copy of the minutes are located on the Brown County website under http://www.co.brown.wi.us/minutes_and_agendas/

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY FACILITY MASTER PLAN SUBCOMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a meeting of the **Facility Master Plan Subcommittee** was held on Thursday, May 21, 2009, at 5:15 p.m. in Room 201 of the Northern Building, 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Carole Andrews, Mike Fleck, Adam Warpinski.

Excused: Jack Krueger, Pat Wetzel.

Also Present: Bill Dowell, Chuck Lamine, Peter Schleinz

---

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Adam Warpinski at 5:21 p.m.

2. APPROVE/MODIFY AGENDA

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SUPERVISOR CAROLE ANDREWS AND SECONDED BY SUPERVISOR MIKE FLECK TO APPROVE. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. APPROVE/MODIFY MINUTES OF APRIL 16, 2009

A MOTION WAS MADE BY SUPERVISOR ANDREWS AND SECONDED BY SUPERVISOR FLECK TO APPROVE. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT SPACE NEEDS ASSESSMENT INTERVIEW SUMMARIES

Chuck Lamine, Brown County Planning Director, referenced the department interview surveys (see attached). He indicated that instead of re-interviewing every department, he plans to mail these back to the departments to identify any circumstances that have changed. Lamine will present the updated information at the next meeting. Warpinski and Bill Dowell, Facility Management Director, agreed with Lamine that this approach would be the most beneficial.

Warpinski asked the status of the Public Safety portion of the Plan. Dowell responded that the 911 part is complete. Dowell further stated, "We have a good plan for everything except for the Sheriff," and that there are still some options for the Sheriff--S&L and MHC—to be discussed. Supervisor Fleck wanted to know what would occupy the space vacated by the Sheriff's Department. Dowell

indicated that the District Attorney and Drug Task Force could move into that space.

Warpinski asked the status of the interviews for those administrative functions in the Northern Building. Dowell said the interviews were completed; however, there were a couple of ongoing issues. He specified some issues with space for the Information Services Department and the County Clerk. Warpinski feels that the next focus should be the administrative services of the Northern Building.

Dowell stated that he preferred working all five plans simultaneously and wanted to finalize the Public Safety Plan with options. However, he was open to this suggestion.

Lamine stated that there is a "draft chapter" that he could provide at the next meeting for review. He felt that this may help clarify the order and the focus of the steps to follow.

The general consensus was that the updated interviews should be available for the next meeting.

5. REPORT ON THE EFFORTS AND PROGRESS OF THE ENERGY OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Dowell provided three handouts (copies attached) and stated that the 25X25 Plan should be completed by the end of June. Dowell indicated that at this point we are close to reaching the 10-year mark of the 25-year requirement.

When questioned, Lamine stated that there are a couple of sites being considered for wind farms. Lamine stated that at the location at the land fill, we are purchasing electricity and selling electricity; therefore, the purchase of a small turbine is being considered for a wind resource in order to generate all of the electricity needed. The highway garage in Howard is another possibility for a small turbine.

Dowell stated that part of the vehicle plan is to purchase replacement vehicles with alternative fuel vehicles. Brown County is awaiting approval from the Office of Energy Independence for grants in the amount of $2,000 per vehicle—or $10,000—to go toward the cost of these purchases. Warpinski asked if we had a estimate of the savings Brown County would realize with the purchase of alternative fuel vehicles. Dowell stated that a 6-year pay-back is estimated, and the savings would be reflected in the Budget through Fuel Expense. Dowell

stated that one of the suggestions of the Vehicle Committee is to develop a driving efficiency course.

6. DISCUSSION REGARDING OTHER PROJECTS FOR BROWN COUNTY RELATING TO FACILITY AND SPACE NEEDS

Andrews asked what the plans are for the Mental Health Center building. Dowell stated that there is no plan at this time, although the current options include moving the Sheriff Department into that facility, selling the property, and scheduling it for demolition. Dowell stated that if it is used by another occupant, there are some renovations that will need to be completed. Lamine stated that an RFI ("Request for Information") was sent to developers who do adaptive re-use of buildings; however, there was no response at that time. He further stated that it might be something to pursue now that the new facility is being built. Andrews stated that if we have departments now that have space issues, she would want to see Brown County utilize its own property whenever possible. Lamine stated that because it is not a good time to sell land, Brown County has slowed down this effort.

Warpinski stated that at the next meeting he would like to further discuss the Mental Health Center property. He also requested that detailed information be presented at that time concerning the property that is actually owned and occupied by Brown County and its departments.

Warpinski stated that his goal was to improve the efficiency of space, particularly in the Northern Building. He suggested the possibility of a central "one stop shopping" counter space in this building in order to better serve the customers. He also stated this type of facility would improve the safety in the building. Andrews thought this would be a good topic to pursue.

Warpinski asked that Staff finish the Public Safety Review and start with Administration and report at the next meeting. He stated that he also wants to know which departments are located in the Northern Building and how much space each department requires.

Lamine suggested that conference rooms be updated and made more functional for the many ways they are being used. He stated that he thinks this is a significant need because of the amount of time being spent in committee meetings. Warpinski agreed that the meeting and conference rooms should be evaluated for technology needs and functionality. Lamine stated that there could be some savings that could be realized with more efficient meetings; and

Warpinski suggested integrating technology that would allow the meetings to be video recorded. Lamine stated that the Village of Howard now gives its representatives a laptop when they come into office, and this would reduce the volume of paperwork produced for meetings. Warpinski stated that he will discuss this with Alicia Loehlein, Board Administrative Secretary.

7. SUCH OTHER MATTERS AS AUTHORIZED BY LAW:

None.

Next meeting to be Thursday, June 18, 2009, @ 5:15 p.m.

A MOTION WAS MADE BY ANDREWS AND SECONDED BY FLECK TO ADJOURN AT 6:16 P.M. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Alexander
Recording Secretary

Public Safety Departments
Interview Summary

1/24/08

Clerk of Courts
Meeting Date: 01/12/07
Locations: Clerk of Courts Office
Participants: Lisa Wilson, Neil Basten, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years
- The Clerk of Courts Office is staffed to meet present case loads
- Additional staff may be needed to meet future court case growth
- A major concern of the present facility is security:
  - Customer Service Area
  - Customer Records Area
- Another concern is the design/use of the south wall door as an employee entrance door.
- Other space improvement may be obtained by converting more fixed file storage bins to movable bins.
- An office rearrangement is recommended by Clerk of Courts to correct security concerns and to improve office efficiencies.

Actions:

- Sheriff Department review of security concerns.
- Brown County Staff:
  - Update office rearrangement plan with security recommendations and other office improvements

Public Safety Departments
Interview Summary

Court System

Meeting Date: 01/11/07
Locations: Judge McKay's chambers
Participants: Judge McKay, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years
- Court System presently consists of (8) judges and (4) commissioners.
- Present case load:
  - Shows the need for (2) additional judges, which is near the top in terms of state needs. (There may be two or three other counties ahead of Brown County).
  - Additional cases are handled by extended case loads for existing judges, visiting judges from neighboring counties, as well as retired judges. These cases are handled within existing courtrooms.
- County would need to request additional judges and the process is anticipated to take several years.
- State Legislators would need to OK budget for additional judges
- New court would need to include courtroom, judge chambers, judicial assistant office with public access, court reporter office, and jury room.
- Important to keep the judges involved in facility plans.
- Space for new courts could be made available by:
  - Rearrangement of existing space within the courthouse
  - Construction of new space over the Clerk of Courts area
  - Renovation of Sheriff Department space at the Law Enforcement Center

- Projected Schedule for new Court:
  - Ninth Court after five years (2113-2115)
  - Tenth Court after ten years (2118-2020)

Actions:

- Judge McKay to attend subcommittee meeting and provide additional information if needed.
- Brown County staff to develop cost estimates for new court alternatives.

Public Safety Departments
Interview Summary

District Attorney

Meeting Date: 01/11/07
Locations: District Attorney Conference Room
Participants: Sue Tilot, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years
- The District Attorney Office is properly staffed to meet present case loads
- Additional attorneys and staff may be needed to meet future growth
- Offices for (2) attorneys can be made available by reconfiguring existing offices
- Records are stored and retrieved from offsite storage location.
- Administrative Offices:
    - The office configuration is cumbersome and inefficient.
    - Improvements should be made with future renovations

Actions:

- Brown County Staff:
    - Develop plan for providing future offices
    - Develop plan for improved office configuration

Draft

Public Safety Departments
Interview Summary

Medical Examiner

Meeting Date: 01/12/07
Location: Medical Examiner Office
Participants: Al Klimek, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years.
- The Medical Examiners office operates with an office on the second floor of the Safety Building. Present staffing includes the Medical Examiner, a secretary, and eight part time Deputy Medical Examiners.
- Morgue space is rented from St. Vincent's Hospital.
- A central downtown location is preferred due to need for interaction with District Attorney, Sheriff, Courts, and Register of Deeds offices, as well as funeral homes.
- The Medical Examiners office provides services on a contract basis to several counties within the region. Contracted services are being promoted and the potential exists for additional contracts. These contracts provide revenue to offset the costs associated with the department. An additional Brown County staff person will be needed if contracted services expand.
- When the morgue facility needs to be updated Brown County should consider developing our own morgue. A new morgue facility would be in a downtown location and include office space, shower facilities, examination room, and a walk-in cooler for 5 to 6 bodies, storage space for body fluids and tissues, and a garage suitable for making body transfers away from public view.
- Presently the Deputy Medical Examiners share office and desk space. The majority of their work occurs in the field and with laptop computers. It would be good to have a limited work space available for each Deputy Medical Examiner.

Actions:

- Medical Examiner to develop projections of needs for staffing, morgue facility demands, as well as anticipated county contracts expectations for short term and long term.
- Brown County staff to develop a plan for future office and morgue facilities, cost estimates (operating costs and new facility costs) for comparison of alternatives.

Public Safety Departments
Interview Summary

Sheriff Department

Meeting Date: 01/03/07
Locations: Law Enforcement Center Conference Room
Participants: Dennis Kocken, John Gossage, Harold Kaye, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years
- Sheriff Department operates out of multiple downtown facilities including county owned and rented facilities.
- Considerable savings in rent and other costs may be obtained by consolidating operations (including the Communications Center) to one facility.
- Locating Sheriff Operations in proximity to the freeway /beltline could improve patrol vehicle access to primary patrol areas and increase patrol efficiency.
- New Jail, Huber Facility, and Courthouse Security should continue to operate as is.
- GPS Bracelet technology may result in a reduced demand for Huber facility in the future.
- The Courthouse will continue to need a limited number of holding cells.
- Potential locations for consolidation:
    - MHC
    - New Jail
    - S&L Chrysler Facility

Actions:

- Sheriff Department to develop staffing and inmate projections for short term and long term.
- Brown County staff to develop cost estimates (operating costs and new facility costs) for comparison of alternatives.

MINUTES OF MAY 9, 2007 MEETING
RE: LONG-TERM STRATEGIC PLAN FOR
SHERIFF'S DEPT., COURTS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY

Present: County Executive Tom Hinz, Facilities Director Bill Dowell, Sheriff Dennis Kocken, Chief Deputy John Gossage, District Attorney John Zakowski, Office Manager II Susan Tilot, Planning Director Chuck Lamine, Presiding Judge J.D. McKay

Bill Dowell indicated that he has been working on a strategic plan for the Sheriff's Department and the jail for about three months. He is looking to incorporate long-range plans for the courts and district attorney's office. The purpose of the meeting is to update attendees and to garner ideas and areas of concern to be considered in the long-range planning. Ultimately, the plan will go to the Facilities Master Plan Committee. The Facilities Master Plan Committee will firm up the plan and present it to the Public Safety Committee and finally to the County Board for approval.

Bill Dowell handed out copies of the New Jail/Huber Master Plan and proceeded to explain it. Judge McKay inquired about the juvenile facility and stressed that it needs to be separate from the overall facility. Juveniles must be kept away from the adult population. This is especially critical if federal dollars are used. In response to County Executive Hinz' question, Judge McKay indicated that the juvenile facility was addressed in the new jail; however, there has been a drastic cut in the number of juvenile beds. In fact, the juvenile section had been moved at one point. Sheriff Kocken indicated that the juvenile section was moved to a smaller pod because the original space was underutilized. The juvenile population increased again, and they were subsequently moved back to the original pod. County Executive Hinz indicated that it was his recollection that the original design allowed for a second floor to be added for juveniles if needed. A brief discussion followed on renting space to other counties for housing juveniles or renting space for our juveniles. Bill Dowell and Sheriff Kocken will break out the juvenile population numbers and create a separate column on the New Jail/Huber Master Plan for the juvenile facility.

Judge McKay inquired whether the present Huber facility could be used as a juvenile detention center if the Huber facility moved to the new jail. Sheriff Kocken thought this was a possibility. County Executive Hinz mentioned staffing issues. A savings in transportation costs was noted. Sheriff Kocken indicated they will still need holding cells at the jail. Bill Dowell will look at existing facilities for a separate juvenile facility.

Sheriff Kocken mentioned that they held off building a new Huber facility until 2020 because LaCrosse and Winnebago Counties have eliminated them, and they want to see where this trend is going.

Mr. Dowell distributed and explained the Sheriff Department Consolation – Construction Options handout. He is working with Information Services on costs for their services and also the costs involved in moving the 911 Center. This is a work in progress and will proceed to the Facilities Master Plan Committee and then to the Public Safety Committee.

In response to the Sheriff's inquiry as to the impact on the courts and district attorney if the Sheriff's Department moves out of downtown, this is seen as a positive for the district attorney because it allows for expansion. It also would result in extra parking space. Mr. Zakowski indicated that while he likes having the investigators working close by, the consolidation makes sense.

It was noted that the first floor of the Public Safety Building could be opened up for the medical examiner and possibly the register in probate. The district attorneys office could then expand to the second floor. The basement could be used for records storage. This building could also be used for growth space for the courts. Additional space will be available if the Huber facility moves. It was indicated that there is a real potential for it being reconstituted for one or two court rooms with access to the courthouse. A discussion followed about opening up a hallway where Jean Eckers' office and the holding cells are located and constructing a walkway over the sally port.

Judge McKay indicated that before the register in probate office is moved, consideration must be given to public access, i.e. elevator, ramp. He also noted that the probate judge will need access to the probate office.

It was mentioned that a rumor was circulating that Supervisors Harold Kaye and Jack Krueger want to move the clerk of courts office to the Sophie Beaumont Building. This would be a harmful move. A discussion followed and it was agreed that the clerk of courts office needs to stay in the courthouse with close proximity to the courts. Judge McKay agreed to discuss this with Supervisor Krueger.

Bill Dowell indicated that the clerk of courts office has no room for expansion. A discussion followed regarding building an addition on the deck. It was noted that it would destroy the south side of the courthouse. Too much money was spent renovating the courthouse to ruin its look. It was noted that the clerk of courts office could possibly expand to the first floor of the courthouse if space opens up.

Bill Dowell indicated that he will develop some layouts and estimates within the next four to six weeks on renovating the Public Safety Building to a court building with access to the courthouse on the second floor over the sally port.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Draft

Human Services Departments
Interview Summary

Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC)

Meeting Date: 08/30/07
Location: Aging and Disability Resource Center Office
Participants: Sunny Archambault, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years.
- The ADRC Office operates with an office located at 300 S. Adams Street on the east side of downtown Green Bay. Staff includes 27.03 full time equivalent positions.
- The Aging & Disability Resource Center of Brown County serves seniors 60 years and older and adults 18 years of age and older who have a disability. Major program areas include information assistance, benefits specialists, congregate meals, homebound meals, and recreation/health/wellness/educational activities.
- Congregate meals are served during the lunch hour Monday through Friday at 10 locations and one day a week at one location in Brown County. Rural sites are located in the senior/community centers in Denmark, Pulaski and De Pere. There is a nutrition site at the ADRC in Green Bay with the remaining sites located in elderly housing units or in adult day care settings.
- Learning and social programs are provided at the ADRC and at the Denmark, De Pere, and Pulaski sites. These programs are offered in collaboration with NWTC and other health and service organizations in our community.
- The ADRC Building on Adams Street is owned by the county. The ADRC rents room space and provide staff in De Pere, Denmark, and Pulaski to provide congregate, homebound meals, and senior center activities in those communities. The nutrition sites in housing units are either rented or the space is donated.
- The ADRC facility has been remodeled in the past two years to provide additional office space for new staff. There is no room for expansion at this site unless we use the space now dedicated for center programs/activities/nutrition site which would be problematic.
- The main Homebound Meal distribution site at Resurrection Church on Shawano Avenue is workable, but not ideal. In addition, the church has been talking about demolishing this building and then rebuilding. This would create an immediate problem. Food is delivered in bulk to this site and then packaged and delivered using volunteers. Four staff and 21 volunteers package and deliver around 270 meals from this site daily Monday – Friday. Because of space limitations, the program is at maximum capacity at this location. Meals are also delivered from the sites in Denmark, Pulaski, De Pere, and from the ADRC. It makes sense from the delivery aspect to also have an east side location. However, this would mean additional staff and the budget does not allow this.
- With the demographics of aging, it is clear that ADRC responsibilities will grow in the future. Because persons 80 years and older will be the fastest growing group of the senior population, we know that a large percentage of this age group will need support services such as our homebound meals to remain independent. With the growing public costs to support persons who have long term care needs, there is a question of how much government will continue to support senior centers. Demographics indicate centers

Draft

Human Services Departments
Interview Summary

Health Department

Meeting Date: 09/06/07
Location: Health Department Office
Participants: Judy Friederichs, Juli Gray, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years.
- The Health Department operates with an office located at the Fox River Professional Building located at 610 S. Broadway on Green Bay's near west side.
- Present staffing includes 43 full time equivalent positions. The Health Department has been experiencing some growth in staffing and they anticipate more growth. They are challenged to find space for additional staff within the existing office space.
- In some of the Health Department service areas the State has been promoting regionalization to serve an area of eight counties in northeast Wisconsin. This trend toward regionalization may be expanded to other service areas and may result in additional increases in staffing.
- In regards to the present office, what has kept the Health Department in their existing location is that it is a perfect location for their clients. It is a central location downtown and is convenient for walk-in traffic. Parking is plentiful and this is important as their clients often have small children with them.
- Access by clients is from automobile, transit, and walk-in.
- Immunization clinics occur on site because of the unstable nature of the medications. This adds to the importance of a central location with easy parking and access.
- Over 100 Tuberculosis medications are provided on a monthly basis at the site.
- The central location is also beneficial for business and restaurant sanitary inspections by the Health Department.
- The building is shared with other organizations and agencies that have cooperative services with the Health Department. Examples of these agencies are the WIC family food supplement program and the NEW Community Clinic. Tremendous relationships have been built through the shared location.
- The existing building has a garage space on the ground floor that enables the Health Department to have a child car seat program.
- Another downtown location would work but parking is a very important consideration for their clients.
- In regards to relationship of the Health Department to other county departments, there has been interest expressed by the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) staff to coordinate programs. The challenge has been to find funding resources to facilitate this interest. The Health Department does consider the ADRC to be one of many important partners.
- The Health Department has been located within their existing building since 1995. It is anticipated that the growth space may be used up within the existing building under its present layout. It may be possible to redesign the space within the existing structure to create additional office space.

Draft

Human Services Departments
Interview Summary

Health Department

Meeting Date: 09/06/07
Location: Health Department Office
Participants: Judy Friederichs, Juli Gray, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years.
- The Health Department operates with an office located at the Fox River Professional Building located at 610 S. Broadway on Green Bay's near west side.
- Present staffing includes 43 full time equivalent positions. The Health Department has been experiencing some growth in staffing and they anticipate more growth. They are challenged to find space for additional staff within the existing office space.
- In some of the Health Department service areas the State has been promoting regionalization to serve an area of eight counties in northeast Wisconsin. This trend toward regionalization may be expanded to other service areas and may result in additional increases in staffing.
- In regards to the present office, what has kept the Health Department in their existing location is that it is a perfect location for their clients. It is a central location downtown and is convenient for walk-in traffic. Parking is plentiful and this is important as their clients often have small children with them.
- Access by clients is from automobile, transit, and walk-in.
- Immunization clinics occur on site because of the unstable nature of the medications. This adds to the importance of a central location with easy parking and access.
- Over 100 Tuberculosis medications are provided on a monthly basis at the site.
- The central location is also beneficial for business and restaurant sanitary inspections by the Health Department.
- The building is shared with other organizations and agencies that have cooperative services with the Health Department. Examples of these agencies are the WIC family food supplement program and the NEW Community Clinic. Tremendous relationships have been built through the shared location.
- The existing building has a garage space on the ground floor that enables the Health Department to have a child car seat program.
- Another downtown location would work but parking is a very important consideration for their clients.
- In regards to relationship of the Health Department to other county departments, there has been interest expressed by the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) staff to coordinate programs. The challenge has been to find funding resources to facilitate this interest. The Health Department does consider the ADRC to be one of many important partners.
- The Health Department has been located within their existing building since 1995. It is anticipated that the growth space may be used up within the existing building under its present layout. It may be possible to redesign the space within the existing structure to create additional office space.

- In regards to the potential for satellite facilities or the limited use of other county facilities such as branch libraries, it was felt that the existing central location is better due to available parking, adequate space for programs, and the unstable nature of vaccinations.
- It was stated that it will be important to look at population trends and projections to get a handle on future program needs. The population is growing and aging as well as a larger minority and non-English speaking population with Health Department service needs.
- Presently four Health Department staff persons are located at the University Extension Building. At some point it would be good to get these employees closer to the rest of the staff to improve integration and coordination efforts.
- Future Health Department program priorities addressing chronic problems such as prevention programs to address obesity.
- Many different community groups use the existing Health Department offices for meeting space. This is a very important part of what the Health Department is involved in. Examples of these groups include: Adolescent Care, Tobacco Awareness, Communicable Disease Support, L.E.D.C., Safety Coalition and Lead Coalition.
- In regards to safety at the present location, it was mentioned that there is a need for improved lighting and security. It is important that the facility be accessible but security is important due to the potential for unstable clients. This is not a huge issue at this time but it is increasing as an issue.

Actions:

- Continue to evaluate the lease for occupancy of the building to address facility improvement issues.
- Brown County staff to develop a plan for future office layout to address the existing and future staffing needs.
- Evaluate the benefits of relocating the Health Department to another location that is County owned but meets the location and service needs of the Health Department. Evaluate the benefits of co-location with other service providers and county departments.

Draft

Human Services Departments
Interview Summary

Human Services

Meeting Date: 10/29/07
Location: Human Services Office
Participants: Mark Quam, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Second floor office space in the Sophie Beaumont Building is crowded. This is the location for all welfare services and food stamps.
- Second floor space is tight and employees can overhear conversations that are occurring within neighboring cubes. The cube environment is not conducive to privacy needs and confidentiality issues associated with the services in this office area.
- May be possible to move some of the Human Services staff into the office space formally used by the Information Services Office on the second floor of the Sophie Beaumont Building.
- In regards to potential loss of efficiencies by relocating the second floor offices to another location, it was felt that it was more important to provide adequate space in spite of any losses of coordination.
- May be possible to use some of the old Mental Health Center Building space for Human Services office purposes.
- There is a concern regarding relocating Human Services staff to the Mental Health Center in that it may be more difficult for low-income individuals to have access to that location, although the majority of the clients go to the Human Services office by car.
- There is a concern that exists regarding potential future funding of assistance programs. Presently 12,000 families are served by the Human Services Department compared to 5,000 families in 2000.
- It is possible that some of the services can be done by mail or by way of the internet which may reduce some of the need for the public to actually go to offices downtown.
- It is not crucial that the outpatient clinic staff be attached to the Mental Health Center. If it is necessary to save money for the new construction of the Mental Health Center, it is possible for that staff and clinic could be located in another building.
- In regards to the family care program, there are 30 employees that are presently working on family care. It is likely that due to increased needs, that staffing level will increase in the future.
- The purpose of the family care services is to enable the elderly and disabled to stay in their homes rather than be located in an institutional setting. However, this program does require the need for county staff to oversee the financial management and care associated with the program.
- The family services program could require a need for 20 new employees, primarily social workers and clerical to set up the program. The possibility also exists to have an independent board to administer this program. A third option would be that the county would not participate at all.
- If the county was to decide not to participate in the family services program, this would open up space for other offices and staffing.

- At this point we are not sure what will happen and what the county's position will be regarding the family services program.
- In regards to the juvenile courts and protective services, there will be a need for additional staff. Presently funding does not exist so unless there is a change in federal policy, we are not likely to see an increase in staffing.
- For the juvenile courts and protective services, the majority of the day is spent in the field so office space is less necessary for this area.
- Access to the County Courthouse is important for the juvenile court workers.
- At one point there was consideration given to filling space in the mezzanine space of the Sophie Beaumont Building in order to make it available for future offices. It is believed that plans exist for this remodeling and this should be investigated by the Facility Management Office.
- It is possible that sharing space or co-locating with the Health Department would be beneficial to some of the Human Services programs.
- In terms of priorities, the short term needs are to address confidentiality problems as well as the need for potential growth for the family care program.
- There have been concerns raised regarding lack of a security person being available in the office area, especially in the evening hours and after work.
- At one point there was safety glass located in the second floor reception area but it has since been removed. It may be possible that this safety glass is stored someplace and could be replaced.
- The county has a group home located on Adams Street next to the Green Bay Fire Department firehouse. There may be a need to replace that facility at some point due to deterioration of the building.
- It was suggested that, as a part of the facility master plan, the county should talk with the City of Green Bay and the State of Wisconsin to see if there is any possibility of additional vacant space being available for Brown County in those buildings.
- In regards to the Mental Health Center, the architect has designed additional space for expansion into each wing. This should provide adequate growth space for the future of these facilities.

Draft

Human Services Departments
Interview Summary

Veterans Services

Meeting Date: 08/20/07
Location: Veterans Services Office
Participants: Jerry Polus, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Discussed needs for next 5 years, 10 years, and 20 years.
- Veterans Services Office operates with an office on the first floor of the Northern Building. Present staffing includes the Veterans Services Officer, Senior Benefits Specialist, two Clerk Typists II positions, and one full time and one part time Clerk Typist I for a total of 5.65 employees.
- Primary issues associated with the existing office location is in regards to the need to maintain privacy for discussions with clients and space for file cabinets that are presently located in the basement of the Northern Building.
- It is not anticipated that staffing will increase for the Veterans Services Office.
- Discussion occurred on the feasibility of relocating the Veterans Services Office to the old Mental Health Center Building. This would be a very attractive option especially if it was possible to co-locate with a new expanded Veterans Administration Clinic that is being considered for the Green Bay area. It is possible that a new VA Clinic would be available by the summer of 2008.
- It is anticipated that a new VA Clinic would need between 24,000 and 25,000 square feet.
- From a regional and a local perspective, accessibility to the old MHC Building would be very good due to the proximity to the highway. Parking would also be adequate. The MHC Building is also located on a transit route.
- In regards to interrelationships to other county departments, it was stated that proximity to the Aging and Disability Resource Center is beneficial and that efforts are underway to continue to cooperate with programs.
- It was also discussed that a shared location in the MHC Building with the Sheriff's Department would not be a problem.
- Due to the potential of co-locating with the VA Clinic at the old MHC Building, consideration of moving the Veterans Services Office to the 3rd floor of the Northern Building have been put on hold. While this is still a viable alternative and an improvement to the present first floor location, the benefits of co-locating with the VA Clinic greatly improve on the ability to serve the veterans of Brown County and it would be worth delaying a move to explore this option further.

Actions:

- Continue to explore options for locating the Veterans Services Office at the old MHC Building and to work with staff of the Veterans Administration to locate an expanded VA Clinic at the old MHC Building.
- Brown County staff to develop a plan for future office and VA Clinic facilities cost estimates (new facility costs and potential revenue) for comparison of alternatives.

Draft

Education and Recreation Departments
Interview Summary

Golf Course

Meeting Date: 10/15/07
Location: Brown County Golf Course
Participants: Paul Delfosse, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- With the new clubhouse the facility is bringing in more events and more outings. The facility provides a great golf experience and now has a great clubhouse.
- Presently we are short on storage space and may need to look at a new storage space for the facility.
- May need an expansion on kitchen facilities in the clubhouse at some point.
- We have seen an increase in golf outings, many of which are charity golf outings. This increases business for the pro shop, the restaurant, and the golf course and this is a direct benefit of the new clubhouse.
- We have seen a lot of new golf courses in the area and this has created additional competition for the Brown County Golf Course.
- The new clubhouse building replaced a former 4,000 square foot clubhouse and at that point they simply served hamburgers, brats, hot dogs, beer, and soda. The new clubhouse provides a full service restaurant with bar and liquor license and they now have a great restaurant operator.
- The Golf Course owns and controls an 80 acre vacant property that was intended to be used for an expansion of an additional nine holes of golf for the golf course. This property is presently rented out to a farmer. It is Mr. Delfosses's opinion that the 80 acres will never be used for a golf course and the county should be looking into a plan for that vacant property.
- The Oneida Nation has expressed an interest in developing a bypass system around the pond on the signature hole for the golf course. His feeling is that this may be possible to do but it is important that the integrity of the golf course be preserved. The reason for this bypass would be to reduce the temperature of the water that is entering into Trout Creek.
- The 80 acre vacant parcel may at some time be incorporated into a recreational feature for the county, as well as the Village of Hobart.
- In regards to expansion of the number of golfers, it is believed that young people are spending more time with their family and less time on the golf course. This may have an impact long term in terms of the number of customers.
- It is hoped that the quality of the facility will maintain the level of users at the golf course.
- He anticipates that there may be some golf courses closing in the area due to a reduction in the number of customers as well as the expansion of the existing facilities in Brown County.
- The new clubhouse is generating approximately $150,000 of revenue per year and they expect that the bond for the new clubhouse will be paid off by the year 2013.

Draft

Education and Recreation Departments
Interview Summary

Neville Public Museum

Meeting Date: 10/15/07
Location: Neville Public Museum
Participants: Gene Umberger, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- It is recognized that any addition to the existing building will result in an increase in expenses.
- Improvements to the collection storage area will provide additional space.
- Compact storage units are being considered as a space saver. This would result in the ability to have rolling shelfs and wire racks for hanging stored art. This is a product that is provided by KI.
- In regards to prioritization of future needs, the first item would be there is a pressing need for storage space. The second area of consideration would be education space for orientation of school groups. The third priority would be the renovation of the permanent exhibit that was developed when the new Museum was created in 1983.
- There is a need for the permanent exhibit to be refurbished and there is a need to increase the amount of interactivity with Museum patrons.
- 2015 will mark the 100-year anniversary of the Museum.
- In 2009, the Museum anticipates applying for a planning grant through the National Endowment for the Humanities. These funds would be used to assist in refurbishing the collection and exhibits.
- The 100-year anniversary has been set as a target date for exhibit renovation.
- The permanent exhibit is the draw for school groups.
- The Museum has a 5-year strategic plan which they have adopted which is a requirement of their accreditation process.
- The strategic plan was developed with the assistance of Judy Knudsen and the University of Wisconsin Extension Office.
- The Neville Public Museum Foundation has a new president and there has been great recognition for the need for marketing dollars and there has been an increase in the commitment to marketing.
- The Museum has developed a new website and a new sign on the corner to make the public aware of events and exhibits.
- A new gift shop has been opened and is now being run with volunteers rather than paid staff.
- Office space for staffing is adequate.
- In regards to the Museum's location on the waterfront, it would be nice if docks could be placed on the river to provide access for boaters to the Museum, as well as a connection to the Broadway district.
- It would be helpful to have a safe, efficient means to get the public from Leicht Park to the Museum and to the Broadway district without having to cross a very busy street. It should be looked into the possibility for a pedestrian walkway underneath the river.

Draft

Education and Recreation Departments
Interview Summary

NEW Zoo

Meeting Date: 10/19/07
Location: NEW Zoo
Participants: Neil Anderson, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- A Zoo plan was adopted and developed in 2001.
- It is believed that the facility is the correct size for the community and the funding available.
- It was important for the NEW Zoo to address revenue generating components such as the new carousel and the gift shop. In these two areas revenue has outperformed the expectations. It is important to maximize revenue in these areas to move forward with the rest of the plan implementation.
- We are now looking at additional revenue generation possibilities.
- We are also looking at replacing aged exhibits such as the snow monkey exhibit which was built in 1986 and is now being replaced. Concerns were raised by USDA during their recent inspections and the penalties for noncompliance can be severe. Plans for the new facility will address these concerns.
- There is also a need for a new tortoise exhibit to replace the old one.
- A new education building is planned and it is anticipated to be a 1.1 million dollar project with one million dollars for the building structure and $100,000 as an endowment for ongoing maintenance.
- It is important to think of the Zoo as a medium sized facility.
- During the recent accreditation process it was determined that a new education building is critical for the future of the NEW Zoo. At this point preliminary plans have been done.
- The new tortoise exhibit is next in line after the new education building is completed.
- A future project would include relocating the Mayan food court to the center of the Zoo rather than at the entrance.
- It is anticipated that an outside ticket area will be created in order to expand the sales area.
- Moving the food court to the center of the Zoo will increase revenue and provide a warmer location in the center of the Zoo for patrons to warm up during the cold weather season.
- There is a need for a new and expanded animal hospital. The present hospital was built in 1994 and was okay for a small zoo but needs to be doubled in size to reflect the larger facility that exists today.
- There is a need for a food preparation area in the new building with a power generator.
- The next accreditation schedule would occur in 2012. The three priorities that were identified were: (1) replacing the education center, (2) the animal hospital, and (3) the food preparation area.
- Attendance and revenue determine the size of the Zoo and we have now expanded from a small Zoo into a medium sized Zoo. For a Zoo of our size, it is felt that we are in good shape.

- The accreditation process suggested that there should be an increase in county funding for the NEW Zoo.
- Fees have not increased at the Zoo for attendance since 2003 so it is likely to increase next year in 2008.
- We have maximized the revenue potential based on the existing facility. Last year's revenue was $275,000. It is projected that the ultimate growth would be $300,000 to $325,000. Presently the NEW Zoo budgets for $250,000 in attendance revenue.
- The NEW Zoo is at about 119 percent of expectations for revenue based on attendance compared to the national standards.
- The financial goal for the Zoo is to have a 25 percent reserve fund.
- In regards to who owns the animals, some of them are owned by the NEW Zoo, some of them are on loan, and some of them come from the federal government.
- The NEW Zoo has a collection management plan as a part of the overall comprehensive plan.
- For example, the NEW Zoo owns the giraffes and the potential exists for some minor revenue generation as a result of any offspring of the giraffes.
- In terms of acreage size, the Zoo is going to stay within the existing boundary but the intention would be to increase the density within the existing Zoo boundary.
- It is important to evaluate the operation costs of exhibits.
- Because there is a history of budgeting conservatively, the approach of considering the operation costs is consistent with our past budgeting practices.
- The key for the future of the NEW Zoo is to get beyond the existing debts. If donations are not in place, the Zoo will not be in a position to take on new debt if necessary in the future.
- Parking is adequate on most days at the Zoo. Special events such as the Zoo Boo exceed parking but it is not felt that this would warrant the creation of additional parking.
- The potential exists to charge for parking in the future as many other zoos do. Presently the NEW Zoo does not charge for parking.
- The NEW Zoo does offer free time during the last two hours on Wednesday for attendance at the Zoo.
- It should be considered if it would be possible to close County Highway IR as this would create an opportunity to add parking to the NEW Zoo.
- In regards to the master plan for the NEW Zoo, it projected a total of 14 million dollars from future investments. At this point we are about 4 million dollars into that plan.

INCLUDE ATTACHMENT (LIST OF MAJOR PROJECTS PLANNED OVER THE NEXT FIVE YEAR PERIOD INCLUDING ANTICIPATED SOURCES OF FUNDING)

Draft

Education and Recreation Departments
Interview Summary

Resch Center and Brown County Veterans Memorial Arena

Meeting Date: 10/11/07
Location: PMI Offices at the Veterans Memorial Arena
Participants: Ken Wachter, Tom Hinz, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- A study titled the CH Johnson Report was completed in July 2005 and this study evaluated the economic impact of the Arena as an asset to Brown County and the local economy.
- Quality of life issues are very important for economic development and the Resch Center creates an additional venue for entertainment and sporting events in the area.
- The Arena area represents a good private/public partnership. It is a very unique relationship and a good testament to how to successfully run such a venue.
- With PMI's involvement in managing the Arena area, there is no risk to the county in regards to attracting acts to the area.
- The CH Johnson study evaluated the economic impact and evaluated alternative designs for improvements for the former Brown County Veterans Memorial Arena.
- The county should consider the potential for partnerships with the Green Bay Packers.
- The potential exists for expanded competition for the entertainment dollar as new facilities are created such as the Kress Event Center on the UWGB campus, the Atrium at Lambeau Field, as well as future facilities that the Oneida Nation may be creating at their casino.
- We have seen a loss of some attractions due to problems with timing such as the RV show.
- The Resch Center, as it exists now, is too small for some concerts yet too big for some of the sporting events that are held there.
- The Resch Center serves as a regional center for entertainment and their market area exptends from the Upper Penisula of Michigan to Sheboygan and contains a population of approximately 750,000 to 1,000,000 people.
- PMI is going to be doing another economic impact study in regards to their facilities in the near future. Things that will be looked at is the economic impact of persons attending and staying overnight in the area when they attend an event. Their findings are that the economic impact is much greater than they had anticipated.
- The Resch Center has been well received by the entertainment industry and we have created a very good reputation in that industry for entertainers and promoters.
- One of the challenges that is faced is how to keep the building in its great shape and maintain it as a state of the art facility. There is a need to plan for the future.
- Opportunities may exist after the Lambeau Field tax has expired. The possibility may exist to use some of that revenue to reinvest into the Resch Center complex.
- There is an opportunity for growth at these facilities but the question that remains is how do you do this wisely.

- Flexibility is a very important element of the existing complex. It enables a different mix of shows, events, and conference space and it is important to be competitive with existing facilities or facilities that could be designed in the future.
- There is a need to look at the total complex so that we are uniquely positioned to compete with other facilities in the area.
- What expansion plans may exist for the Oneidas is a very important wild card. At this point we do not know what direction they will be going and how they will compete. They certainly have the money to invest into entertainment facilities.
- An item for consideration with the Oneidas is going to be what kind of an impact expansion of their facilities may have on existing investments made by Brown County, as well as in downtown Green Bay, the Weidner Center, the KI Center, and the Meyer Theatre.
- It is important that PMI facilities not compete with the banquet market because that hurts the hotels in the area that help pay for the Resch Center.
- It is important, from an entertainment perspective, to consider beyond county facilities and buildings, things like the Kress Center and the Leicht Park area within downtown Green Bay.
- Presently there are three options under consideration for the Brown County Veterans Memorial Arena. The three options are: (1) tear down the existing facility, (2) build around it, or (3) leave the facility as it is.
- There is a need for three buildings as there are 40 days of the year where all three buildings are booked at the same time. This creates a great deal of flexibility in scheduling events.
- There are four shows per year that take two of the buildings and use them at the same time.
- In attracting shows and events, there are some that are great for the community and local economy but not necessarily great for PMI. These things have to be taken into consideration as events are booked.
- In terms of the Brown County Veterans Memorial Arena, a new 20-year roof has been installed.
- When asked if the present configuration would work for the next 20 years, it was stated by PMI that yes it could work.
- In regards to the Brown County Veterans Memorial Arena, we see a more active future. The facility is 50 years old and it still has the original seats and the original ice making equipment.
- We presently know what the capabilities are of our existing facilities. As we go out and try to recruit for bigger trade events, we recognize that any changes in the venue would be to a degree a mystery and would have to be taken into consideration as events are scheduled.
- It is possible that a new expo space may be cheaper than renovating the old Arena.
- The existing structures, with the Arena intact, give a great deal of flexibility but redesigning the old Arena to give the opportunity for greater floor expo space increases the flexibility further.
- Parking is a key issue that needs to be considered in the overall plans for the entertainment district associated with the Resch Center.

Draft

Planning, Development & Transportation Departments

Interview Summary

Airport

Meeting Date: 1/11/08
Location: Austin Straubel Airport
Participants: Tom Miller, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Austin Straubel International Airport is the third largest airport in the State of Wisconsin and is a 24-hour, 365 day a year operation.
- The airport is strictly a self supporting enterprise fund with a $10.6 operating budget that has no impact on the tax levy of Brown County.
- The airport is currently served by six major airlines with eight direct service cities.
- The airport is host to multitude of support businesses such as parking facility, car rental, restaurant/lounge, hotel, gift shops, and airfreight companies.
- The airport is also a regional base of operations for the Transportation Security Administration, and a US Customs office in the main terminal.
- The 20 year *Austin Straubel International Airport Landside Master Plan Update* was completed in December of 2007. The primary goals of this study are to provide adequate parking capacity, realign the circulation roadway with planned airside expansion, improve the safety and efficiency of pedestrian access to the terminal, and consideration of the relocation and upgrade of the service buildings away from the terminal area, provide adequate facilities for rental companies and modernize the terminal canopy.
- The FAA projects a 2.05 annual increase in enplanements while the Master Plan projects a 4.15 percent annual increase.
- In order to meet the long term need for parking it is anticipated that a multi-story parking structure will be required in close proximity to the terminal while limiting the impact on existing facilities and providing a second story pedestrian skywalk connection to the terminal building. A skywalk would require relocation of escalators.
- The circulation roadway will be realigned to the east to match long term terminal expansion to the east.
- The existing airfield maintenance building is comprised of two separate buildings. The existing buildings are currently undersized. It is anticipated that the buildings will be relocated away from the terminal area, combined into one building and moved to a more remote location with better access to the airfield with room for future expansion.
- The *Austin Straubel International Airport Landside Master Plan Update* includes a timeline for phased facility improvements including funding sources over the next 5 years.

Draft

Planning, Development & Transportation Departments
Interview Summary

Highway Department

Meeting Date: 1/04/08
Facility Tour: 1/18/08
Location: Highway Department Howard Compound
Participants: Brian Lamers, Ray Smith, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- The Highway Department carries out general and winter maintenance on County and State Highways in Brown County as well as local roads by contract with municipalities.
- In addition to the central Duck Creek Highway Department Compound in the Village of Howard three satellite locations exist in Greenleaf, Langes Corners, and New Franken.
- General maintenance work includes: patching, crack filling, and replacement of pavement; shoulder maintenance, roadside mowing, and brush control; bridge and culvert maintenance; litter and trash pickup; guard rail installation and repair; signing; pavement marking; traffic control; and traffic signal maintenance.
- Winter maintenance includes: installation of snow fence; ice control; salting and sanding; snowplowing and snow removal.
- Additionally the Highway department carries out road construction, pavement resurfacing (blacktopping), plus bridge and culvert repair and installation.
- The Highway Department presently employs 92.3 full time equivalent positions.
- The Highway Department efficiently manages the space and facilities that they have.
- The three satellite facilities provide for a more efficient services and fuel savings for the trucks and equipment by not needing to return to a central location. It is felt that the facilities are well located.
- The Duck Creek facility in the Village of Howard has emergency generators but the satellite locations do not. Emergency generators would enable the fuel pumps and garage doors to operate if the power is out.
- As new State and County Highways are built additional demands are placed on the Highway Department for equipment (trucks), storage, and staffing. There are significant additional lane miles that are planned for construction in Brown County over the next 10 years including additional lanes on US 41 and the Southern Bridge and bypass (CTH SB).
- **Greenleaf:** Of the satellite facilities the Greenleaf facility is in the best shape. It was redone about five years ago with a new building, new doors and windows in the old building, new energy efficient lighting and radiant heating. The site also is fenced in for security purposes. It is anticipated that a stormwater pond will be needed in the near future to address new EPA & DNR requirements for stormwater management. Recently the State of Wisconsin paid for and built a new salt storage facility. About 12 employees are located at this facility.
- **Langes Corner:** The Langes Corner Facility is older and similar in design and function to the New Franken Facility. Presently 6 or 7 employees are located at this facility. Future needs include pavement of the parking lot, security fencing, and a stormwater management pond. The salt shed at this facility is shared with the State. The facility has a holding tank for sanitary waste.
- **New Franken:** The New Franken facility is in the worst shape of the three satellite facilities. The building is short of space for the storage of equipment and is about half the size of the Greenleaf and Langes Corner facilities. The actual size of the property is

small and severely limits the room for expansion or new buildings. There is vacant agricultural property behind the building that should be considered for acquisition. This would enable the construction of a new heated building and the conversion of the old building to cold storage. The facility is on a sewer line but has a private well. There are two salt sheds on the site due to a recently built State salt shed. If additional land could be purchased the metal structure on the southeast corner of the lot should be removed to make room for a new building. Additionally the site could use pavement of the parking lot, a fence for security, and a stormwater pond.

- **Duck Creek:** This is a 40 acre facility. The main building is heated and could use a new ceiling, insulation and lighting. The heated storage facility is very cramped due to the amount of large equipment that is stored there. Consideration is being given to removing and replacing the large building nearest the quarry and replacing it with a new 21,000 sq. ft. heated building at a cost of $2 Million. The boiler for the facility is old (1955) but in good shape. The State Focus on Energy program has been used to evaluate building energy efficiencies and they have made several changes based on their suggestions that have had a quick payback due to increased efficiencies.
- State highway work is 100% reimbursed for salary and fringe, trucks & equipment, allocation for buildings and administration.
- County Highway Department workload for State work is approximately 50% of the maintenance budget and 50% of the snow plowing budget.
- New stormwater management requirements will require the acquisition of additional street sweeping equipment, and stormwater ponds.

Future Tasks:

- Highway Department staff will complete an evaluation of future lane miles as it may relate to the need for additional facilities.

Draft

Planning, Development & Transportation Departments
Interview Summary

University of Wisconsin Extension and Land Conservation

Meeting Date: 10/22/07
Location: Ag Extension Office
Participants: Judy Knudsen, Bill Hafs, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- Storage is a big problem for the existing facility.
- The stage area for the large meeting room is a storage area for both departments.
- Presently the building hosts 500 meetings per year and it is important to maintain the meeting room flexibility of the existing structure.
- In the large conference room it would be nice to have another dividing curtain. This would enable the ability to divide the room up into three areas. However, all three areas would have to have access to a hallway door to provide access.
- The tile floor is lifting in the large conference room.
- There are four acres of grounds for gardening that are associated with the existing facility. The potential exists for expanding into city property that is adjacent to the county owned lands.
- We have experienced HVAC problems. The air conditioning and heating system is designed for an old school and does not work well for the subdivided space that now is created for offices.
- The building presently works great for the programs that are offered by the two departments.
- The outdoor storage buildings have deteriorated and have had rust that should require them to be removed and be replaced by new outside storage structures.
- The potential may exist to reduce the width of the hall area and that may enable the possibility of expanding some of the office space.
- In regards to relationships to other departments, the co-location with the Health Department would make some sense as the Land Conservation Office does do a lot of work with the Health Department especially in the area of groundwater contamination.
- It is important that both the Extension Office and the Land Conservation Office continue to be co-located in that they work closely together.
- There is a need for additional map storage room space for the Land Conservation Office.
- It would be helpful to have a paved walkway between the parking lot and the building area. Presently there is a wood chip trail that is not shoveled.
- There is a significant advantage to having the Ag Extension services located in the same building in that it provides convenient access for the agricultural community.
- The carpeting in the meeting room where the Planning, Development & Transportation Committee meetings occur needs to be replaced as it is torn in the middle.
- The existing structure is a very busy office and has a lot of public attending meetings at it. Any plans for a new location should include recognition of the need of meeting room flexibility and adequate parking for the public.
- Because of the significant investment into garden areas for research and education purposes, moving to a new location would be a challenge.

Draft

Planning Development and Transportation Departments

Interview Summary

Brown County Register of Deeds

Meeting Date: 11/19/07
Location: County Register of Deeds Office
Participants: Cathy Williquette, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- The County Register of Deeds (ROD) Office activities include, document reception and real estate, UCC lien searches, electronic records storage, and vital statistics.
- The ROD office maintains a tract index which provides an accurate listing by location of all recorded documents that affect land interest and ownership.
- The ROD office uses optical imaging technology to scan real estate documents and vital records including births, deaths, marriages, and military discharges to create an electronic format for permanent storage and retrieval.
- The ROD office presently employs 14.25 full time equivalent positions.
- The location of the ROD office is good especially in regards to interaction with other County Departments such as Planning and Land Services.
- Parking is a real concern for customers.
- Handicapped access is very limited due to a shortage of parking. A few handicapped parking spaces exist at the Sophie Beaumont Building but it is a bit of distance from the Northern Building.
- There is a concern that too many metered street parking spots are occupied daily by County employees with handicapped parking permits. The County should evaluate if some handicapped parking could be developed closer to the Northern Building possibly in conjunction with the City Parking Utility.
- It was commented that directional signage for county Buildings is much improved but would like to see a "you are here" label on the maps.
- Kewaunee County has successfully moved there ROD office into one building with other land related departments on the edge of town with adequate parking.
- The present physical setting of the ROD office is at capacity. Due to change to a more electronic record keeping system significant space has been saved.
- The front counter area of the office is crowded and it would help if space could be added to provide standing room for customers.
- Reduction in real estate market has enabled a downsizing of staff.
- The vital records services of the ROD office has picked up in recent years.
- Electronic filing has become acceptable and this will enable a reduction of staffing int eh future.
- The exception to the electronic filing capabilities is in the area of plat maps and certified survey maps which need to be available in a hard copy. We are at capacity for flat file storage and additional space will need to be available through office reconfiguration to add more files.
- The ROD office does use the second floor conference room and converting that spacxe to an office would create problems for their operations.

Draft

Administration Departments

Interview Summary

Brown County Treasurer

Meeting Date: 1/07/08
Location: County Treasurer's Office
Participants: Kerry Blaney, Mary Reinhard, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- The County Treasurer's Office keeps records of all monies appropriated and disbursed regarding: general property taxes and all other monies received by the County, is charged with the safe keeping of all County funds and invests such funds consistent with state statute, and the office maintains assessment rolls, property tax records and is responsible for the collection of property taxes.
- There presently are five full time equivalent positions in the office. During tax collection periods up to six temporary help positions are available.
- The office calculates and prepares tax bills for 24 municipalities.
- The County Treasurer feels that it is good that their office is located on the first floor of the Northern Building.
- The biggest drawback to this location is the lack of parking.
- In recent years the public has had the option to pay their tax bills at banks within brown County. The option also exists to mail in tax payments. Those who make payments through their mortgage provider have a massive electronic payment made on December 31st.
- During tax collection periods the office maintains nine open drawers for tax collection with December, January and July being the busiest months.
- The availability of Land Record Information on the County website has significantly helped to reduce the amount of walk in traffic.
- The Treasurer's office responsibilities are 20% receipting and 80% collections.
- The New World Accounting Software will provide some additional efficiencies for receipting.
- The County Treasurer feels that the office has adequate space for the department. He did point out that his personal office space is two feet shorter then the rest of the offices of Department heads in the Northern Building. This makes it difficult for him to fit a conference table in his office.
- Staffing levels for the office have been consistent and he does not anticipate change.
- The counter space in the department is adequate.
- Significant interaction exists between the Treasurers Office and the Department of Administration, Register of Deeds and the Planning and Land Services Department which are also located in the Northern Building.

Draft

Administration Departments

Interview Summary

Brown County Clerk

Meeting Date: 1/14/08
Location: County Clerks Office
Participants: Darlene Marcelle, Sandy Van Straten-Juno, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- The County Clerk's Office issues Marriage Licenses, Passports, Work Permits, Golf Passes, Boat Launch Permits, Conducts every phase of the election process, Compiles and produces the Brown County Directory, Records and publishes minutes for the Brown County Board of Supervisors, Is an agent for the State in issuing Dog Licenses, Issues Emergency Alarms and accepts hundreds of incoming information calls on the County's Information Line.
- In 2004 we began accepting Passport Applications. With that additional work load and traffic flow, the counter does not provide adequate space to accommodate the public.
- With the anticipated move of the Veterans Office to either the third floor of the Northern Building or the old Mental Health Center additional space would be available for expansion of the Clerks Office.
- It would be helpful to move the elections room to the western end of the building to provide more convenient access from Adams St. on elections days.
- Marriage License activity has decreased in recent years.
- Passport activity has increased in recent years and is anticipated to increase again due to new requirements for travel to Canada and Mexico.
- Neither staff reductions nor increases are anticipated in the near future.
- For years such as 2008 when there are four elections it is anticipated that this will account for approximately 50% of the Clerks Office activities for the year. In more typical years with two elections it accounts for approximately 25% of the workload.
- Six work stations are needed with workspace to accommodate a computer and 2+ people each. Basically, space to easily accommodate 12 customers at a time. The greatest numbers of applicants are for marriages and passports all of which generally involve working with 2 or more people at a time.
- Crowded workspace makes it difficult to hear and talk with applicants. There is also a shortage of countertop space to do necessary paperwork and review legal forms. In addition, overcrowding violates the customer's privacy and compromises their confidential information.
- There is not enough customer space and chairs for people waiting to be served. It is necessary that customer service reception space is increased. In addition, a table for applicants to complete legal forms prior to being served at the counter is needed. A table should be large enough to accommodate 4-6 people; and should have reception chairs available for 6-10 people.
- Photography Area –need to have space set aside where passport and golf photos can be taken and the appropriate lighting should be provided to prevent shadowing.
- Brochures Display and Bulleting Board – Should have ample space for informational brochures and a bulletin board for public legal notices.
- Children's Area –need a dedicated space for children to keep busy while the adults conduct business in our office since children are required to be present at the time passports are applied.

New Design Requests

- Service Counter – The service counter should be at an ergonomically correct height for working with computers. Storage drawers should not be located beneath because we constantly have to ask people to move to get at the required paperwork and documents. Instead, storage drawers should be located behind staff and the counter.
- County Records Room – Currently we have filing cabinets located throughout the office wherever we can find space. We have file cabinets for County Board minutes and agendas, bids, contracts, agreements, abstracts, claims, maps and miscellaneous other documents. We need a desk and chair for researching and filing records. In addition we need shelving for binders and books.
- Elections Room – we need space to use and store 3 Eagle voting machines and cabinets and Automark machine with a table. In addition, we need space for poll books, election supplies, election records and filing cabinets, voter registrations, a canvassers/work table and chairs, and prom pack storage. In addition, we need an easily accessible holding space near the Adams St. loading zone for a large volume of outgoing and incoming election ballots and supplies.
- Shared Equipment –2 computer printers, 1 fax machine, and 1 copy machine centrally located.
- Staff workspace - Staff is currently crowded into the space we have available. Basically, everyone is crowded to the point where we are bumping into each other. This is especially true when staff is working at the counter. In many cases, staff can't access file cabinets or storage space because it collides with staff working. Also, low walled cubical workspace with counter visibility would be nice to prevent computers and paperwork from becoming damaged.

Draft

Administration Departments
Interview Summary

Brown County Board

Meeting Date: 10/8/07
Location: County Board Office
Participants: Tom Lund, Chuck Lamine, Bill Dowell

Discussion Points:

- The Sheriff's Department should be located on the highway with a branch location in Howard on the west side for a substation.
- Would like to see us evaluate auto repair and maintenance in-house at one location.
- Would prefer to see the county avoid outsourcing for services, where possible.
- Should evaluate the possibility of using the Highway Commissioner's Office as a place for servicing Sheriff's Department vehicles.
- He feels that the 911 Communication Center should be located at the Jail in that it would provide adequate space for future growth as well.
- Likes the idea of a veterans clinic being located in the old Mental Health Center building as it would provide good relationship of services to the Veterans Office as well as a revenue source for the county.
- Feels that there is a need for remodeling of the County Board office space with the inclusion of possibly creating a conference room. Also would like to see the front counter moved to allow more entry space and would like to see the Auditor's office moved to another location, possibly relocated to the existing conference room on the 2nd floor of the Northern Building.
- Likes the idea of one-stop shopping for veterans services and feels that it is tough for a disabled veteran to find parking and access to the Northern Building. He feels that the old Mental Health Center building would be a better location.
- In regards to aging issues and services for the aging population, he feels that this is going to be a growth area for county services and that our population is getting older.
- Regarding the development of a model Traditional Neighborhood Development on the vacant County Farm property, he feels this would be a good use of the site for the property. It would generate revenue and provide a model development and the development could be controlled with restrictive covenants.
- Regarding the Human Services Department, he would like to see their office stay in the Sophie Building and feels there is a need to address growth.
- Feels that there may be some benefits of co-locating the Veterans Office and the ADRC Office to the old Mental Health Center.
- Feels that the Health Department should also be considered for a move to the old Mental Health Center building although he recognizes that the department staff likes the downtown location.

Brown County Sustainability Plan
Dec 2009

Outline

- Introduction
  - What is Sustainability
  - What is Sustainable County Government
  - Brown County History
  - Brown County Resolution
  - State of Wisconsin 25x25 Plan
  - Brown County Goals
  - 25x25 Goals

- Brown County Sustainability Plan
  - Administration Plan
    - Administration and Sustainability
    - Administration Goals
    - Policy and Procedures
      - Purchasing Procedure
      - Purchase Green Energy Policy
      - Lighting Policy
      - Heating/Cooling Policy
      - Appliance/Office Equipment Policy
      - Green Cleaning Policy
      - Recycling Policy
  - Sustainable Building Plan
    - What are Sustainable Buildings
    - Brown County Building Goals
      - 25x25 Goals
      - Other Sustainability Goals
    - Building Data
      - Building Inventory/Types
      - Energy Usage
    - Existing Building Plan
      - Energy Audits
      - Energy Efficiency Improvements
      - Energy Star
    - New/Renovated Building Plan
      - LEED/Green
      - 25% Alternative Energy
    - Alternative Energy Projects
    - Other Sustainability Actions
  - Community and Education Plan
  - Energy Plan
  - Sustainable Vehicle Plan
  - Sustainable Communities
    - Sustainable Airport
    - Sustainable Libraries
    - Sustainable Parks
    - Sustainable Zoo

- Implementation Plan

- Reporting Plan
  - Energy Metrics
  - Fuel Metrics
  - Sustainability Practice Metrics

Brown County 25X25 Plan - Top Five Priorities

05/21/20095:05 PM

	Priorities	SubCom
1	Develop Plan for obtaining Alternative Energy and Energy Efficiency Improvement Goals for Buildings	Bldg
2	Develop Plan for generating alternative energy using landfill gas and wind turbines to meeting alternative energy goals.	Energy
3	Develop plan to education employees and citizens using Website, Brochure, and other Educational Tools	Com
4	Develop Plan for obtaining Alternative Fuel Goals for Diesel and Gasoline Vehicles	Vehicle
5	Develop Plan for establishing Sustainable Processes	Admin

5

Attachment C - Area of Interest #4:

Vehicles Cost Information for Alternative Fuel and Advanced Technology Vehicles Pilot Program Information Table

*** Please reveiew Instructions and Guide before filling out this for

Clean Cities FY08 Petroleum Reduction Technologies Projects for the Transportation Sector

Alternative Fuel Vehicles

Indicate adding new vehicle to fleet "N" or replacing vehicle in fleet "R"	Vehicle Type and Model Year	select one - light-duty, medium-duty, heavy-duty	Quantity	Type of Alternative Fuel(s) or Advance Vehicle Technology	Total Cost of Comparable Conventional Model	Total Cost of Vehicle, Including Conversion, or Retrofit	Incremental Cost Per Vehicle	Requested Federal Share ($)*	Annual Mileage (per vehicle per year)	Estimated Petroleum Displacement (per vehicle per year)	Near Alternative Fuel Station?	Additional Information
R	Pontiac Grand AM, 2001	Light Duty	1	Hybrid	20870	27995	7125	2000	13000	380		
R	Pontiac Grand AM, 2001	Light Duty	1	Hybrid	20870	27995	7125	2000	17000	497		
R	Ford Crown Victoria, 1997	Light Duty	1	Hybrid	20870	27995	7125	2000	11000	496		
R	Cheverolet Tahoe, 2000	Light Duty	1	Hybrid	24660	32510	7850	2000	7500	301		
R	Taurus, 2001	Light Duty	1	Hybrid	20870	27995	7125	2000	17000	402		

5

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
HOMELESS ISSUES & AFFORDABLE HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Homeless Issues & Affordable Housing Subcommittee** was held on Tuesday, May 19, 2009, at NeighborWorks - 437 South Jackson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Noel Halvorsen-Chairman, Rosemary Jonas, Michael Paprocki, Cathy Putman.

Excused: Tammy Frea, Inky Meng.

Absent: Lawrence Loberger, Mary Marks, Kathy McMurray.

As there was not a quorum present, no formal action was taken.

However, there was a brain-storming session concerning ways to improve efficiency and effectiveness of this Subcommittee.

1. **Call Meeting to Order:**
   No Action Taken.

2. **Approve/Modify Agenda:**
   No Action Taken.

3. **Approve/Modify Minutes of March 17, 2009:**
   No Action Taken.

4. **Broadsheet preparation and approval:**
   No Action Taken.

5. **Such other matters as authorized by law:**
   None.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa M. Alexander
Recording Secretary

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD OF DIRECTORS
CHAPTER 21 SUBDIVISIONS ORDINANCE REVISION SUBCOMMITTEE
Thursday, April 30, 2009
Brown County Planning and Land Services Office
305 E. Walnut St, Room 391
Green Bay, WI
3:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Michael Soletski	X	Dennis Reim	X
Bill Bosiacki	X	Graham Callis	X
David Chrouser	Abs.	Norb Dantinne	Abs.
Pat Ford	X	Pat Kaster	Exc.
Chuck Lamine	X	Jon Motquin	X
Michael Vande Hei	X	Andrew Vissers	X
Jim Wallen	X		

1. Verification of public meeting notice.

   J. Motquin indicated that all agendas are being sent out with the County Board weekly meeting notifications. All future meetings will be noticed by the County Board office staff.

2. Approval of the minutes of the March 26, 2009, meeting.

   A motion was made by J. Wallen, seconded by D. Reim, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Review Scope and Services for Chapter 21 Ad Hoc Committee.

   C. Lamine indicated that the committee was formed by action of the Brown County Planning Commission Board of Directors.

   C. Lamine also indicated that the original agenda for this meeting seemed to be rather ambitious for the time allotted. All concerns will be reviewed by the committee in a timely fashion. Consistent with the Scope of Services prepared for the Subdivision Code update, the committee will review existing Wisconsin Statutes, Administrative Code, and Brown County ordinances to determine the appropriateness of the regulations set forth in Chapter 21.

   M. Soletski indicated that he had prepared the draft agenda so that ideas that were generated at the previous meeting would be carried forward as agenda items for future meetings. The original agenda was prepared to discuss all issues related to the Subdivision Ordinance. He also reminded everyone that the Brown County Homebuilders Association (BCHBA) had spent a considerable amount of time assisting Brown County staff to identify the issues which needed to be addressed. He also cautioned that the ad hoc committee is only advisory in nature. All proposed changes must be presented to the Brown County Board and all appropriate subcommittees.

   C. Lamine indicated that everyone appeared to be in agreement with the original scope of services.

M. Soletski welcomed all of the members and thanked them for their participation. Due to the large public turnout, everyone introduced themselves. All present signed an attendance sheet. He was appreciative that so many community members were interested in the procedures of this committee.

4. Review and action regarding draft proposed changes to the Brown County Subdivision Ordinance (Chapter 21 of the Brown County Code).

   a. Review and action regarding the threshold size of a land division (40 acre parcel) under Section 21.04 Applicability.

      J. Motquin distributed meeting materials to all attendees. He indicated that the committee had create a pros-cons list to analyze both requiring a Certified Survey Map (CSM) or a subdivision plat for all land divisions 40 acres or less in size. A second pros-cons list was established for reviewing a proposal to require a CSM or plat for all lot line adjustments. In order to receive public feedback, M. Soletski asked for a motion to open the meeting to public discussion.

      A motion was made by C. Lamine, seconded by J. Motquin, to open the meeting to allow public comment. Motion carried unanimously.

      Bob Gerbers, Zoning Administrator for the towns of Ledgeview and Rockland, asked for a clarification of the proposal.

      M. Soletski stated that the current ordinance requires all land divisions 10 acres or less in size in the non-sewered areas of the county.

      J. Wallen indicated that changing the application of a parcel size of 40 acres or less would create a uniform size requirement county-wide. Currently the trigger sizes are 40 acres in all Sewer Services Areas (SSAs) and 10 acres in all other areas. The change to a 40 acre trigger would result in a minimum of a two lot CSM.

      B. Gerbers expressed concerns that changing the overall size requirement to 40 acres may result in increased costs to landowners due to extra surveying costs and environmental reviews. He also stated that a larger parcel review would allow for increased zoning reviews by local municipal staff.

      B. Bosiacki discussed the sanitary permit process at B. Gerbers request. A sanitary permit can be issued as soon as a site's soils are proven to be capable of supporting a private onsite wastewater treatment system. The sanitary sewer approval process occurs independently of local zoning. In addition, soils test are no longer required on all lots per Wisconsin Statutes. He also indicated that soil testing requirements can be temporarily delayed with the usage of restrictive covenants on the plat.

      J. Motquin indicated that the Brown County CSM review process already utilizes similar strategies to identify approximate Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) for larger parcels.

      C. Lamine, B. Bosiacki, and J. Motquin indicated that Brown County staff would be willing to continue to utilize a limited environmental identification review process by utilizing the above discussed restrictive covenants and/or approximation methods.

      Sarah Burdette, Town of Ledgeview Clerk, indicated she was attending for informational purposes.

      Joy Koomen, Town of Morrison Zoning Administrator, indicated she was attending for informational purposes. She indicated she supported increasing the requirements to 40 acres as it would provide additional opportunities for local review for land divisions.

Currently, Town of Morrison ordinances allow for only one buildable lot split per parent parcel. Secondary splits would result in additional non-buildable lots within Morrison.

D. Reim indicated he would support the change if language was added to Chapter 21 to allow for increased flexibility in the environmental review process. He indicated there are additional landowner expenses due to wetland delineations, increased surveyor time commitments. He indicated a cutoff should be established for the parcel size before an ESA review should be completed.

B. Bosiacki concurred that D. Reim had a good idea by establishing a threshold parcel size to streamline environmental reviews.

M. Soletski indicated that increasing the threshold for requiring a CSM or plat for land divisions would substantially increase landowner/developer costs. The costs for monumentation, environmental review, erosion control, stormwater management, and all other related costs associated with land division would be cost prohibit for the average citizen for splitting his land. He suggested that local municipalities are already requiring Area Development Plans (ADPs). Local communities could amend their ordinances to allow for zoning review authority of all land reviews.

J. Wallen indicated that this may not be happening. All divisions between 10 and 40 acres are currently being completed through a warranty deed. In an ideal situation, the landowner hires a surveyor. The surveyor then creates a metes and bounds description. A title company and/or attorney utilize the metes and bounds to create a legal description to place on the deed. The deed is then recorded. Local zoning administrators review the division only after the deed is recorded and posted by Brown County.

J. Wallen and J. Motquin indicated that Brown County staff receives several calls a month for parcels which are nonconforming with the local zoning ordinance with respect to issues such as inadequate street frontage, insufficient acreage, spite strips, and landlocking.

J. Koomen indicated that parcels between 10 and 40 acres created by warranty deeds did not undergo a local review for rezoning. Most local ordinances do not have a provision to allow for this.

B. Gerbers indicated that there had been land divisions (both CSM and warranty deeds) that had attempted to create landlocked parcels in Ledgeview.

J. Wallen suggested that Brown County staff could formulate a plan to allow for a more flexible review.

M. Soletski indicated that the 40 acre requirement may encumber most landowners. There may be another amount which could serve as a compromise.

J. Motquin indicated that he had spoken with town board members, clerks, and zoning administrators throughout Brown County. A majority of the communities with significant portions of their territories outside of the SSA provided either written or oral support in requiring CSMs for all land divisions 40 acres or less.

J. Wallen and C. Lamine stated that Brown County does not have county zoning. Thus, all rezoning must occur at the local level. There has been an increased desire by the towns to have additional review authority.

J. Motquin stated he feared that there will be perpetual problems if the threshold remains at 10 acres. He provided a case example from the Town of Holland in which a landowner was unable to rezone his property to build a retirement home. The land is now for sale. He fears the buyer will face the same dilemma.

Jim Van Den Heuvel, Village of Hobart Zoning Administrator, indicated that the Village of Hobart requires that a CSM must be recorded prior to issuing a building permit.

C. Lamine indicated that the committee must make a decision. Brown County staff wishes to codify all procedures for CSM plat review. The Planning staff is preparing to do this during the Chapter 21 update process.

A motion was made by C. Lamine, seconded by J. Motquin, to close the floor to public discussion. Motion passed unanimously.

M. Soletski indicated he was uncomfortable making a final decision with three committee members absent. He entertained a motion to table the decision until the May 28, 2009, meeting.

J. Motquin questioned if tabling this issue violated the agreement to resolve all issues which required pro-con analysis lists at the next committee meeting.

General consensus was reached by the committee to have Brown County staff develop a list of restrictive covenants or notes to create a more flexible CSM review if the 40 acre threshold was adopted. The committee will review the 40 acre issue at the next meeting.

D. Reim indicated the motion should be to "postpone" the decision.

A motion to postpone the decision to review proposed restrictive covenants and notes to address ESA, soil testing, and other related issues to be utilized in conjunction with 40 acre parcels was made by B. Bosiacki, seconded by M. Vande Hei. Motion passed unanimously.

b. Review and action regarding requiring CSMs for all lot line adjustments under Section 21.04 Applicability, clarification of ordinance language for combination CSMs under s. 21.50, and lot and outlot definition discussion under s. 21.63 and proposed s. 21.67.

M. Soletski stated that due to time constraints, it was best to table discussions on these three agenda items until the May 28, 2009, meeting. He requested a motion to do so.

A motion was made by B. Bosiacki, seconded by G. Callis, to table agenda items 4b, 4c, and 4d until May 28, 2009. Motion passed unanimously.

e. Distribution of recorded plat copies (proposed s.21.44 (5)) and
f. Distribution of recorded CSM copies (proposed s.21.46 (7))

J. Motquin indicated that Brown County has been receiving preliminary CSMs via email for about six months. The process has worked well. Brown County Planning staff would like to expand this to allow for electronic distribution of recorded subdivision plats and CSMs.

C. Lamine requested an explanation of the CSM review process so all attendees would be familiar with the action item.

J. Motquin discussed the electronic submittal process. Surveyors can submit PDFs of preliminary CSMs via a link on the Brown County Planning web site. All pages of the preliminary CSM must be prominently labeled "Preliminary." The PDF is then

forwarded to all objecting and reviewing agencies such as utilities, extraterritorial communities, and the local municipality. All review and objecting agencies, for the most part, have then provided electronic responses. Once received, all comments are forwarded to the surveyor in a review letter. The electronic submittal process has allowed for faster review times for CSMs. He also indicated that there are still some technical issues with submitting plats, but these can be resolved.

M. Soletski indicated that surveyors should be included on the electronic distribution process to confirm that the CSM has been appropriately distributed.

C. Lamine and J. Motquin indicated that electronic submittal and distribution have been rather successful. The process has saved postage and eliminated paper usage.

J. Motquin indicated that surveyors must still submit paper copies of the recorded CSMs and plats to distribute to all objecting and reviewing agencies.

D. Reim indicated that Brown County staff should explore the option of receiving a PDF of the recorded plats and CSMs directly from the Brown County Register of Deeds. This will increase efficiencies in the distribution of the recorded copies and result in lower costs to surveyors and landowners.

J. Wallen indicated that electronic submission should be completed in a "format acceptable to Brown County." This will allow for changing computer technologies.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by B. Bosiacki, to amend s. 21.44 and s. 21.46 to allow for electronic distribution of electronic subdivision plats and CSMs, respectively. Motion passed unanimously.

5. Other Matters.

None.

6. Establish next meeting date.

J. Motquin indicated the next Chapter 21 Subdivisions Ordinance Revisions Subcommittee meeting will be Thursday, May 28, 2009. Brown County staff will explore alternative meeting rooms due to the anticipated public interest in the upcoming topics.

J. Motquin indicated that Brown County Planning and Land Services staff has an open door policy. If anyone from the public has questions regarding the Chapter 21 update process, they can contact us by phone, in person, or via email at any time. Additional written comments regarding the issues discussed are highly encouraged.

M. Soletski indicated that all members on the committee could be contacted regarding these issues.

J. Wallen indicated that Brown County Planning and Land Services staff had a conference call with both Outagamie and Oconto County staff. Brown County staff received invaluable input from our neighboring counties with respect to the issues the Chapter 21 update committee is discussing.

7. Adjourn.

A motion was made by B. Bosiacki, seconded by D. Reim, to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

MINUTES

Brown County Code of Ordinances Chapter 21 Subdivisions Update
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting

Thursday, March 26, 2009
Brown County Planning and Land Services Office
305 E. Walnut St., Room 391
Green Bay, WI
3:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Michael Soletski	X	Dennis Reim	X	
Bill Bosiacki	Exc	Graham Callis	X	Steve Dunks as proxy
David Chrouser	X	Norb Dantinne	X	
Pat Ford	Exc	Pat Kaster	X	
Chuck Lamine	Exc	Jon Motquin	X	
Michael Vande Hei	Exc	Andrew Vissers	X	
Jim Wallen	X			

1. Introductions.

J. Motquin welcomed all of the members and thanked them for their participation. He asked Andrew Vissers to introduce himself since he was unable to attend the last meeting.

2. Election of a Committee Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson.

Nominations for a chairperson and vice-chairperson were conducted at the March 5, 2009, meeting. M. Soletski was nominated for chairperson and D. Reim for vice-chairperson. The floor was re-opened for any additional nominations. Hearing none, a motion was made by N. Dantinne and seconded by D. Chrouser to close nominations. Motion carried unanimously. A motion was made by N. Dantinne, seconded by P. Kaster to nominate M. Soletski for chairperson and D. Reim for vice-chairperson. Motion carried unanimously.

3. Approval of the minutes of the March 5, 2009 meeting.

A motion was made by N. Dantinne, seconded by D. Reim, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

4. Introduction of Brown County Home Builders suggested revision list.

M. Soletski stated the Brown County Home Builders Association (BCHBA) had submitted a detailed list of suggested changes to Chapter 21. The committee agreed to use this list as a framework for upcoming committee discussion. For this meeting, it was agreed that the agenda be amended to include both the agenda and BCHBA list.

5. Discussion of Brown County Home Builders suggested revision list.

M. Soletski stated that a committee of the BCHBA discussed the ordinance revision in detail. The committee agreed that s. 21.01 should be left as is. There are currently concerns with s. 21.02 Jurisdictions regarding condominium review fees. However, the BCHBA felt this section should be left unchanged at this time.

D. Reim indicated the concern had arisen due to discussion at the state level.

J. Wallen indicated he is continuing to work with state and local representatives to assure that taxes are collected properly at the county level.

N. Dantinne stated that local communities should have increased concern over the regulation of condominiums.

J. Wallen, S. Dunks, and others stated that the best resolution was to revise local ordinances to allow municipalities to oversee zoning, conditional use, and other regulation of condomiums.

6. **Review and action regarding the threshold size of a land division under Section 21.04 Applicability.**

J. Motquin stated that several Brown County communities have local subdivision ordinances which require that all land divisions 40 acres or less are platted by Certified Survey Map (CSM). Currently Brown County reviews land divisions which are 10 acres or less. He stated that some local municipal staffs have expressed an interest in Brown County adopting similar regulations.

S. Dunks stated that a larger minimum would allow local communities to review land divisions for consistency with local zoning ordinances. Currently, the Village of Suamico has a high percentage of non-conforming parcels which are zoned Exclusive Agriculture. This change would allow local communities to more adequately review land splits between 10 and 40 acres and to inform land owners of potential.

J. Wallen indicated that Brown County reviews all land divisions for consistency with only county ordinances. This may result in the creation of non-conforming parcels with respect to local zoning codes. To avoid this, it would be helpful and appreciated to create a matrix which details local subdivision and zoning requirements so that Brown County staff can perform a cursory review to ensure local requirements are met.

N. Dantinne and M. Soletski questioned if this would trigger the identification of Environmentally Sensitive Areas on CSMs.

J. Motquin stated that Brown County staff has allowed landowners to identify the approximate location of ESAs on larger CSMs when it is known that the proposed development will not adversely affect the existing ESAs. A restrictive covenant is then placed on the face of the CSM to require an ESA delineation if land within 50 feet of the indicated ESA will be disturbed or undergo development. This practice has allowed development to occur without placing undue hardship on landowners to have wetlands and other ESAs delineated. This practice would most likely continue.

The committee reached a consensus to develop a pro – cons list to analyze this issue in greater detail at the April 30, 2009, meeting.

7. **Review and action regarding the applicability of requiring Certified Survey Maps (CSMs) for lot line adjustments under Section 21.04 Applicability.**

J. Motquin proposed the idea of requiring CSMs for all sales and exchanges of land between adjoining property owners. All lands affected by the land transfer would need to be mapped in their entirety. This idea will move "lot line adjustments" from an exempt status to a required status. It was further stated that both Outagamie and Oconto Counties are requiring CSMs to be completed for lot line adjustments.

The principle gain from this requirement is to give notice to the local municipalities. This in turn accomplishes several things related to reconfiguring land. It insures that someone is looking at zoning, minimum lot sizes, minimum frontage, building setbacks and any other issues that are under local control. Currently notification of land swaps and divisions over 10 acres are provided through the assessment system.

D. Chrouser stated that he was concerned how requiring CSMs for lot line adjustments would affect cases of adverse possession. There are numerous places in Brown County where the lot line and the occupation lines are not concurrent.

N. Dantinne expressed that requiring a CSM for lot line adjustment may result in an economic hardship for some landowners.

N. Dantinne and M. Soletski questioned if this CSM would trigger the identification of ESAs and others. J. Motquin responded that it would be depend on the type of CSM required.

The committee reached a consensus to develop a pro – cons list to analyze this issue in greater detail at the April 30, 2009, meeting.

8. Review and action regarding definition of a "convenient scale."

J. Motquin stated that the definition forwarded would allow surveyors to utilize a useable multiple of the engineering scale. Allowing for a multiple of 10 or 2 will provide the most understandable and usable measurement standard for the end user and general citizens.

D. Chrouser expressed that a simple multiple of a convenient scale would be useable for most skilled craftsmen and professionals utilizing a certified survey map.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by D. Chrouser, to define a convenient scale as "a multiple of any of the six scales on an engineering scale." Motion carried unanimously.

9. Review and action regarding definition of a "County Plat."

J. Motquin proposed that a plat and subdivision in general, should be modified to allow only four divisions of land from an original parent parcel existing on the date of adoption of this ordinance. Several towns in Outagamie County currently have enacted this policy. The overall number of four divisions would hold regardless of change of ownership. Concern was also expressed that transferring ownership of land between limited liability corporations (LLCs) has made it difficult to track if land was being sold to circumvent existing ordinance requirements to allow for the creation of five or more lots within five years by changing ownership.

D. Chrouser indicated that most communities now require area development plans (ADPs) to indicated future land division intent. This ensures proper subsequent land divisions.

N. Dantinne agreed that ADPs have been a useful tool for local municipalities to ensure future street connectivity and appropriate land divisions.

J. Wallen stated this practice may have been common in the past, but it is now an exception rather than the standard. In addition, the Brown County Corporation Counsel has deliberated an opinion which states that the current policies and standards reflected in the existing ordinance are acceptable.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by P. Kaster, to maintain existing definition of a county plat. Motion carried with two dissentions (J. Motquin, A. Vissers).

10. Discussion regarding definition of an "Original Parent Parcel."

Per discussion regarding the definition of a county plat (Item 9), a consensus was reached that it is not appropriate to add a definition for original parent parcel at this time.

11. Review and action regarding definition of a "State Plat."

In lieu of discussion regarding, Item 9, a consensus was reached to retain the existing definition for a state plat.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by P. Kaster, to maintain existing definition of a state plat. Motion carried unanimously.

12. Review and action regarding definition of a "Subdivision."

In lieu of discussion regarding, Item 9, a consensus was reached to retain the existing definition for a state plat.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by P. Kaster, to maintain existing definition of a subdivision. Motion carried unanimously.

13. Discussion regarding definition of an "Outlot."

Considerable discussion was held regarding the definition of an "Outlot." D. Chrouser stated that different municipalities had varying opinions on what affects the definition of an outlot and its overall buildability.

J. Motquin, J. Wallen, and others agreed it would be best to draft proposed text and definitions for this matter and discuss the issue at a future meeting.

14. Review and action regarding the review period for CSMs and Subdivision plats.

M. Soletski indicated the Brown County Home Builders Association has proposed that the review time for land divisions be reduced to 30 days.

J. Motquin stated that Brown County review times for land divisions have averaged 21 – 30 days. Only in extenuating circumstances do review times approach 40 days. If development would return to levels in the early 2000s, it would be nearly impossible to adequately review land divisions in 30 days.

D. Chrouser and D. Reim stated that Brown County staff has been willing to review land divisions on a "rush" basis. Both were satisfied with Brown County staff's willingness to accommodate special situations.

S. Dunks (Village of Suamico) and A. Vissers (Village of Bellevue) indicated that current review times for both communities are 60 days. Since all land divisions must be approved by the plan commission and village board, it is unlikely that the municipal review time could be shortened.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by J. Wallen, to retain the existing 40 day review period for land divisions. Motion carried unanimously.

15. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language for preliminary plat requirements in Section 21.43.

J. Motquin indicated that several items could be included with the submission of a preliminary plat to provide additional information to allow the review process to go smoother. This included any proposed alterations to non-navigable waterways, the existing parcel numbers and the contact information for the surveyor.

J. Wallen stated that this information was appropriate for the preliminary plat, but not the final plat as parcel numbers change upon recordation of a plat.

D. Chrouser stated that since surveyors already place their contact information on the CSM, this may be unnecessary.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by J. Wallen, to add s.21.43 (16) through s. 21.43 (18) as written in the meeting agenda packet. Motion carried unanimously.

16. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language to include reference for electronic submittal in Section 21.46.

J. Motquin explained that Brown County now accepts CSMs to be submitted via email in a PDF format.

D. Chrouser indicated this method has worked well for CSM submittals.

There was discussion on the language "appropriate format." A consensus was reached that computer technology changes too rapidly to designate only one form of electronic media. Appropriate formats would mean a technology which can be easily read or converted at the time of submission.

A motion was made by D. Reim, seconded by D. Chrouser, to add the language referencing electronic CSM submission as written in the agenda packet. Motion carried unanimously.

17. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language for CSM requirements in Section 21.47.

J. Motquin explained the need as a part of item 15.

A motion was made by J. Wallen, seconded by D. Reim, to add s.21.47 (2)(m) as written in the meeting agenda packet. Motion carried unanimously.

18. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language for Combination CSM requirements in Section 21.49.

Since the committee had reached a consensus to table all language regarding lot line adjustments, a consensus was reached to address language at the next meeting.

19. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language for surveying requirements in Section 21.50.

J. Wallen stated that there is a need to clarify when an affidavit of corrections is appropriate to use as a correction instrument. Most importantly, affidavits of correction are not to be used to correct land division documents which require that the lot corners be reset. Instead, they must be re-mapped on a new map instrument.

D. Chrouser suggested that the affidavit does not necessarily incorporate the change to the map instrument; it just makes the end users aware of the correction that must be made.

A motion was made by D. Chrouser, seconded by M. Soletski, to add s.21.50 (2)(a) as written in the meeting agenda packet. Motion carried unanimously.

The committee discussed the text for proposed s. 21.50 (2)(b). J. Wallen stated land only condominiums are in effect a division of land within the outermost condominium boundary. The document is used to subdivide cubes of land in fashion similar to subdivisions under Wisconsin Statutes 236 and Brown County Ordinances Chapter 21 with a private road system providing access to each unit. As such new language was proposed to require monumentation of corners.

Consensus was reached to review the proposed s. 21.50 (2)(b) at the next meeting to determine if this is the most appropriate location for this language.

20. Review and action regarding the revision of ordinance language for street naming in Section 21.61.

J. Motquin stated that Planning and Land Services would like to better define and codify staff policies on how streets are named in Brown County. Streets shall bear names of less than 13 characters (including spaces), be non-offensive, and not be copy-righted. In additions, new street names should not duplicate or be phonetically similar to existing streets.

Motion by P. Kaster, seconded by D. Chrouser, to recommend adoption of language for 21.61 Street Names as written. Motion carried unanimously.

21. Other matters.

Since A. Vissers was not present at the initial meeting, he stated that he would like to address language to assure the land division of larger parcels would not create non-conforming parcels per local ordinances.

Several concerns were expressed on how ESAs would relate to the above discussed action items. J. Motquin indicated that Brown County staff is currently researching the origins of the existing ESA requirements including staff notes and Wisconsin Statutes. Brown County staff will invite representatives from the appropriate state agencies to discuss their interpretations of Wisconsin Statutes to allow for a more informed discussion. All issues related to ESAs and

"lands unsuitable for building" setbacks would be discussed at a single meeting near the end of the update process.

Committee consensus was established that some issues/topics may require several meetings to resolve. If the committee feels that an issue/topic is too complex to address with one meeting, a pros – cons list will be created for distribution. The committee will resolve all issues with pros – cons list at the next meeting as an agenda item.

22. Adjourn.

A motion was made by N. Danntine, seconded by P. Kaster, to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.