

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY  
LAND CONSERVATION SUBCOMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the Brown County Land Conservation Subcommittee was held on Monday, November 26, 2018 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut St., Green Bay, WI

---

**Present:** Supervisors Norbert Dantinne, Dave Kaster, Bernie Erickson, Steve Deslauriers, Supervisor Tran, Citizen Rep Stan Kaczmarek

**Also Present:** County Conservationist Mike Mushinski, Assistant County Conservationist Jon Bechle, and other interested parties

---

I. **Call Meeting to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dantinne at 6:00 p.m.

II. **Approve/Modify Agenda.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Stan Kaczmarek to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

III. **Approve/Modify Minutes of October, 2018.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Comments from the Public** None.

**Land and Water Conservation**

1. **Open Position Report.**

County Conservationist Mushinski informed they had the Agronomist position open.

2. **Directors Report.**

a. **DATCP Transfer.**

Assistant County Conservationist Jon Bechle informed the state allocated cost share dollars to every county on an annual basis, where farmers or landowners put in practices, these ones were used to offset typically up to 70% of the cost of those practices. Brown County had more requests for funding this year than they actually got originally in their allocation from the state so the state allowed counties to transfer money amongst each other to go towards projects and they received cost share funds from Manitowoc and Oconto County.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Stan Kaczmarek to approve \$12,000 transfer from Manitowoc and \$4,648 transfer from Oconto County. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

b. **Livestock Facility Siting Review Board Determination.**

Mushinski referred to the handout in the packet and informed the Ledgeview farm issue went to the Siting Board. Two things happen; the town could take into consideration the past compliance of the permittee and could still deny the permit because of past issues of non-compliance. The Livestock Facility Siting struck down the town's more stringent manure setback standard.

In talking with a committee member Stan Kaczmarek noted the reason distance got setback was they didn't want to start having towns setting precedence of setbacks, the state had a setback. Their final recommendation will be in print form at their next meeting. There were too many things that Ledgeview had not complied with.

Kaster understood it was up to the towns to enforce setbacks. Mushinski responded, the town tried to go to 1,320' so the siting board informed the most they could go was 350'.

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**c. Shallow Soils Landowner Notification.**

Mushinski informed they were at the point where they had done some location of shallow soils, 0-5'. They had plans to get the letter, in the packet, out this winter to 262 affected landowners. This was the first shot at the real shallow soil. NR151 went from 0-20' for manure spreading restrictions. Their maps were only good 0-5' so as they got more data on the 5-20', the list of landowners will grow drastically and so will the notifications to consultants and manure haulers.

Erickson questioned the rules of commercial waste. Bechle informed they had their own set of rules; animal waste was handled under a separate chapter than industrial municipal waste. They did allow industrial waste to be stored in animal waste storage facilities, which could potentially compromise the capacity for animal waste. They had some overflows occur. When they started looking into it they were finding industrial waste in some cases going into these storage facilities and also being land applied. The whole concept of nutrient management was what they started looking at and trying to gather all that information on various nutrient sources being stored and land applied. They continued to request those from the state. Those were required to be tracked on the nutrient management plans that the farmers prepared; to follow the nutrient management guidelines if they used both of those resources of the nutrients. As a farmer, Kaczmarek stated some things were thought of as ag waste when it was industrial waste.

Dantinne questioned if they had jurisdiction over this one? Mushinski responded that it was in the works right now and that's why they needed to amend their ordinance to add this in. DNR promulgated the rules but DATCP had to act on the process, the funding, and enforcement part. Very quickly the county would be responsible to enforce this ordinance. It was an addition to NR151 in the shallow soils area so the counties generally took the lead role in doing it.

**Motion made by Supervisor Kaster, seconded by Stan Kaczmarek to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Other**

**3. Such Other Matters as Authorized by Law.**

Kaczmarek informed that every year the Brown County Farm Bureau gave a conservation award out and the last few years the UW-Extension office had done a video. Van De Hey: New Horizon's Dairy, LLC got the award and he wanted to share the video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FMQT40T0xvg>

**4. Adjourn.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Kaster to adjourn at 6:30 pm. Vote Taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia Loehlein  
Recording Secretary

1-Nov-18

**Departmental Openings Summary**  
**To: Land Conservation Committee**  
**From: Land & Water Conservation Department**

Position	Vacancy Date	Reason for Leaving	Fill or Hold	Unfilled Reason
Agronomist	Current	N/A	open	

Ex: Transfer, Wage, Working Conditions

**Brown County Land & Water Conservation  
Budget Status Report (unaudited)  
October 31, 2018**

	<u>2018 Amended Budget</u>	<u>2018 YTD Transactions</u>		<u>2017 Amended Budget</u>	<u>2017 YTD Transactions</u>
Personnel Costs	\$750,559.00	\$548,228.23	Personnel Costs	\$716,633.00	\$522,990.21
Operating Expenses	\$446,278.00	\$248,986.69	Operating Expenses	\$550,427.00	\$377,475.29
OUT- Outlay	\$25,894.00	-\$5,075.01	OUT- Outlay	\$0.00	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$1,222,731.00</b>	<b>\$792,137.91</b>	<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$1,267,060.00</b>	<b>\$900,465.50</b>
Property Tax Revenue	\$457,179.00	\$380,982.50	Property Tax Revenue	\$437,922.00	\$364,935.00
Intergov't Revenue	\$631,106.00	\$402,095.63	Intergov't Revenue	\$695,318.00	\$504,393.87
Public Charges	\$124,421.00	\$114,427.07	Public Charges	\$131,806.00	\$129,300.41
Misc Rev.	\$0.00	\$348.12	Misc Rev.	\$0.00	\$500.62
Other Financing Sources	\$10,025.00	\$0.00	Other Financing Sources	\$2,014.00	\$0.00
<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$1,222,731.00</b>	<b>\$897,851.32</b>	<b>TOTAL REVENUES</b>	<b>\$1,267,060.00</b>	<b>\$999,129.90</b>

