



# Washington County

## Planning and Parks Department

### Land and Water Conservation Division

#### CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

Public Agency Center - Room 3005

Minutes  
4/07/2010

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m. by Mr. Gonnering, Washington County Board Supervisor. It was noted that the news media was contacted and the affidavit was read and posted in the County Clerk's office. Those present included the following:

#### Citizen Advisory Committee Members (CAC)

Member	Affiliation
<i>Joseph Gonnering, Chair of Citizen Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Washington County Board Supervisor &amp; Town of Trenton Plan Commission</i>
<i>Ross Bishop, Vice-Chair of Citizen Advisory Committee</i>	<i>Washington County Farm Bureau &amp; Resident of the Town of Jackson &amp; Washington County Farmer</i>
<i>George Muth</i>	<i>Washington County Farm Bureau &amp; Washington County Farmer &amp; Resident of the Town of Farmington</i>
<i>Brian Russart</i>	<i>Milwaukee County Parks/UW-Extension, Resident of Village of Slinger</i>
<i>William Ripp, PE</i>	<i>City of Hartford Engineer</i>
<i>Shawn Graff</i>	<i>Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, Executive Director &amp; Resident of Village of Slinger</i>
<i>Roger Walsh</i>	<i>Big Cedar Lake Protection &amp; Rehabilitation District &amp; Town of West Bend Resident</i>
<i>Karl Glunz</i>	<i>Friess Lake Advancement Association &amp; Resident of the Village of Richfield</i>
<b>Other Agencies/County Staff</b>	
<i>Wendy Fiala, Soil Conservationist</i>	<i>USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service</i>
<i>Josh Odekirk, Soil Conservationist</i>	<i>UDDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service</i>
<i>Deb Sielski, Deputy Administrator</i>	<i>Washington County Planning &amp; Parks Department</i>
<i>Jill Hapner, PhD</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD*</i>
<i>Scott M. Schmidt, PE., R.L.S.,</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD</i>
<i>Paul Sebo, Senior Technician</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD</i>
<i>Stephanie Hofmann, CCA, Project Technician</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD</i>
<i>Paul Backhaus, CCA, Project Technician</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD</i>
<i>Fay Fitts, Administrative Secretary</i>	<i>Washington County LWCD</i>

\*Land & Water Conservation Division

Mr. Gary Korb, SEWRPC University of Wisconsin Extension staff members could not attend the meeting due to a conflict.

### **Approve Minutes 03/16/10**

The minutes had been previously mailed for the members to review.

**Mr. Ripp motioned to approve the minutes dated 03/16/10 as documented; seconded by Mr. Walsh. Motion carried.**

### **Review revisions to Chapters 2 and 3**

Ms. Sielski noted that the revisions to Chapters 2 and 3 were based on the comments received from the last meeting. She indicated that the information underlined was added to include Racial Composition and Hispanic Origin in Chapter 2. Regarding Chapter 3 - the first paragraph on Page 16 from Chapter 3 was deleted and moved into Chapter 4. The ownership information on *Table 17: Natural Areas in Washington County* now includes data up to 2007. Ms. Sielski further noted that information regarding Invasive Species has been added to that section on Page 31 and 32.

Mr. Ripp stated that the City of Hartford has acquired several wooded areas which are not listed in the Table 17, he questioned how parcels become identified and listed as being natural areas as referenced in Table 17. Ms. Sielski indicated that a representative from the Southeastern Area of Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) is responsible for identifying the ownership and depicting the natural areas by using specific criteria.

**Mr. Graff motioned to approve the changes as presented regarding Chapters 2 & 3; seconded by Mr. Russart. Motion carried.**

### **Review revisions to Chapter 4**

#### **Soil Resources -**

Mr. Sebo noted that information had been added to include the Transect Survey program data, which is a method to determine the average rate of cropland erosion (i.e., crops and tillage soil loss/slope and slope length/crop trends) throughout the County. Mr. Sebo noted that this program was developed by Purdue University and is statistically reliable. Mr. Sebo stated that an interesting finding is that even though 93% of all cropland was eroding at or below tolerable soil loss rates, soil movement has increased in the last 5 years, stating the need for buffer and filter strips.

He further noted that 2009 information was added from the Washington County Comprehensive Plan reflecting County Population statistics and that updated information regarding the Erosion Control & Stormwater Management Ordinance was also included.

Mr. Bishop questioned the statistics as indicated in *Table 19: Comparison of Soil Erosion and Tillage Practices – 1999, 2005 and 2009 Transect Surveys* regarding the total soil loss from croplands eroding at or below “T”. Mr. Bishop commented that more no-till practices are being installed and less land is being farmed, making it difficult to understand the higher values as indicated in the table. Mr. Sebo noted that in 2008, the Transect Survey program was updated to RUSLE2 (a new soil loss model) and that may attribute to the formula variations in the totals.

Discussion ensued on converting the 1999 and 2005 data values to the RUSLE2 formula. Mr. Sebo will calculate the soil loss from the previous years using the RUSLE2 formula and bring those figures back to the committee for their review and approval.

#### **Water Resources -**

Mr. Sebo noted that a language reference to the watersheds (Menomonee, Milwaukee River & Rock River Watersheds) as being “regulated as a river for fish and aquatic life” has been deleted and replaced with: “is

designated as having to meet the standards for fish and aquatic life and recreational use as shown on *Map 15.*” The reason for deletion being that original language was used and referenced in the original DNR watershed plans which was carried over into the original Land & Water Resource Management Plan. It was noted that the information should be referenced and cited in the final plan. Mr. Sebo noted that *Map 14: Watershed Boundaries of Washington County* map was deleted moved to Chapter 3.

#### **Groundwater -**

Mr. Sebo stated that the first paragraph regarding groundwater was moved from Chapter 3 to Chapter 4.

**Mr. Walsh motioned to table the changes regarding Chapter 4, to be reviewed again at a future meeting; seconded by Mr. Bishop. Motion carried.**

#### **Review revisions to Chapter 5**

##### **Appendix A & Map–**

Mr. Sebo noted that Appendix A was added to reflect Soil and Water Conservation Achievement’s during the period (1985-2009) depicting implemented Best Management Practices (BMP’s) in Washington County. He reviewed the Appendix and map in detail with the committee. It was noted that the BMP symbols on the map will be improved for clarification purposes in the final draft plan.

##### **Implementation of the Agricultural Performance Standards –**

Mr. Sebo stated that in 2006, the County signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the DNR outlining roles and responsibilities for implementation and enforcement of the performance standards. Mr. Sebo explained that the MOU language was incorporated into this section and the Priority Farm Strategy section.

##### **NON-AGRICULTURAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS – Stormwater Management –Developed Urban Areas –**

Mr. Bishop questioned if the March date indicated on Page 9 for stage one implementation regarding permitted NR216 municipalities needed a day referenced in March. The staff will research NR216 regarding the date.

##### **NON-AGRICULTURAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS – Stormwater Management –Developed Redeveloped Areas –**

Mr. Bishop questioned the language at the top of page 9 regarding “...runoff rates for the two, 24-hour storm event.” It was noted that it should be corrected to read - “...runoff rates for the two-year, 24-hour storm event.”

##### **EXISTING PROGRAMS USED TO HELP IMPLEMENT THE PERFORMANCE STANDARDS – Farmland Preservation Program – FPP (State) –**

Mr. Sebo noted that new language was added to reflect that the Farmland Preservation Program now mirrors the soil and water conservation standards as indicated in the agricultural performance standards. New language was added to reflect that the Farmland Preservation program has been recently reformed as the Working Land Initiative which will require the County to develop and adopt a new Farmland Preservation Plan.

##### **LAND USE REGULATIONS – Construction Site Erosion Control -**

Discussion ensued on *Table 17: Land Use Regulations related to Natural Resource Issues* and how it relates to construction site erosion control standards in the townships regarding transportation facility sites which are not regulated through the county ordinance but are regulated through state and federal standards.

##### **STATE AND LOCAL REGULATIONS –**

##### **Animal Waste Storage Ordinance (Chapter 16)**

Mr. Sebo noted that in 2006 the County revised the ordinance to include required permits to properly abandon manure storage facilities – noting language was added to reflect the ordinance revision.

### **Erosion Control & Stormwater Management Ordinance (Chapter 17) -**

Language was added to include: Local municipalities will be requested to amend their ordinance to match the counties model for consistent code language throughout the county. Mr. Gonnering questioned if the local municipalities will have a sample model to reference. Mr. Sebo stated yes, that when the ordinance was revised a model was created for the municipalities.

### **NonMetallic Mining Ordinance (Chapter 18) -**

Mr. Sebo noted that language was included to reflect that the County amended the ordinance in 2007 to include changes to the annual reporting/fees collection and minor definitions/ additions/ modifications in the ordinance.

Mr. Ripp questioned the county's jurisdiction over mining activity. Mr. Schmidt stated that if they ceased mining before August 1, 2001 the County does not have any jurisdiction over the mining activity. If they were mining before and after that date the County does have jurisdiction; contingent upon an ordinance at the Township level, which would then have jurisdiction. Mr. Schmidt noted that if a mining operation goes over an acre than it becomes regulated, noting that there are exemptions.

**Mr. Ripp motioned to approve the revisions regarding Chapter 5 as presented; seconded by Mr. Graff. Motion carried.**

### **Review revisions to Chapter 7**

Dr. Hapner reviewed the Chapter with the committee members in its entirety. Noting that on the table on page 1 listing Action Plan Keys which could be deleted and incorporated into the Acronyms & Glossary or into the table.

### **Fertilizers and Pesticides -**

Minor text changes and additions. New Legislature language regarding phosphorus ban was added. Mr. Bishop noted that "runoff containing agriculture and agricultural" was referred to twice on page 4. Dr. Hapner will delete agriculture in the final draft. Mr. Walsh recommended that "the dates" of the Legislature acts be added in the text.

### **Animal Waste –**

New statistics were added. Mr. Gonnering noted that the word "as" in the second paragraph should be deleted.

### **Development – Stormwater - Groundwater – Soil Sustainability and Sedimentation – NonMetallic Mining & Waste Management –**

All text changes, additions and deletions were noted. Dr. Hapner stated under the Waste Management section, the first paragraph should read – "Improper disposal of these wastes into landfills is a concern of our generation, as well as, future generations."

Discussion ensued on whether to rank each of the objectives in order or add another column indicating the ranking established by the committee members.

**It was agreed by consensus that another column be included in the table to indicate the ranking as High, Medium or Low.**

Mr. Bishop questioned whether the ranking that was performed by the committee needed to be reviewed again. He stated that when reviewing the ranking after the last meeting, he felt that he may have ranked the objectives in error, (in some cases too high of a priority for the staff's workload). Discussion ensued on grant opportunities and ranking objectives, the pros and cons. It was noted that the responsibilities of the Citizen Advisory Committee was to develop a Land & Water Resource Management Plan for the citizens of the County not for the Land & Water Conservation Division staff. It was noted that this gives the staff some direction on what they should be spending their time and resources on.

**The committee agreed by consensus that the ranking of the objectives stand as motioned in the previous meeting, without change.**

The eight goals in the tables were reviewed in detail. Dr. Hapner noted that measurable outcomes showing progress in quantitative measures will be incorporated into each of the planned actions and outcomes. Suggested recommendations and additions to the Tables included the following:

### **DEVELOPMENT**

1. Preserve and restore stream corridor, lake shoreland, wetland and floodplain areas. – Promote BMP programs and conservation easements through semi-annual newsletter articles, LWCD website, and at a minimum of one public event (e.g. County Fair).
2. Protect and maintain woodlands, environmental corridors, exceptional water resources, unique geological areas resulting in the protection of threatened and endangered species. - Encourage municipalities and landowners to follow the Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan and future updates to the Plan.
9. Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation with urban, rural, and county. - Promote intergovernmental discussion, cooperation, and agreement regarding development issues. – Status: Ongoing - Agencies: PD, LWCD, UWEX

### **FERTILIZER & PESTICIDES**

1. Assist farmers and private consultants with the development and implementation of nutrient management plans on cropland and sod farms.

As previously noted, Ms. Gayan will be looking into this language addition and will be reporting back to the committee at a future meeting.

2. Increase awareness of the proper use of fertilizer, pesticide and de-icers and promote natural landscaping (non-agricultural). Status is Ongoing – Agencies: LWCD, LUD, UWEX & LO
3. Monitor quantities and locations of sludge and septic applications. - Obtain annual reports regarding location, content and amount applied. Maintain working relationship with WDNR to be kept informed of materials being applied in Washington County.

If funds become available conduct limited soil testing for heavy metal build-up – Agencies: LWCD, WDNR

### **GROUNDWATER**

1. Ensure a safe drinking water supply. – Assist with the location of sensitive (e.g. high bedrock, sandy soils) recharge areas using existing maps and groundwater hydrology models.

**Mr. Ripp motioned to approve the revisions as noted and presented regarding Chapter 7; seconded by Mr. Walsh. Motion carried.**

### **Review revisions to Chapter 8**

#### **Budget Implementation -**

Dr. Hapner noted that Chapter 18 was reviewed by Ms. Sielski and the Department Accountant. Dr. Hapner also noted that in Table 19 there were significant changes in the values. Mr. Sebo reviewed the table indicating *Table 19: Cost Share Needs by Practice Type* with the committee, noting that the old plan had a cost of

\$2,500.00 for Development and Groundwater needs, also Animal Waste Management had \$75,000.00 in the old plan, both categories have been raised significantly.

Mr. Walsh stated that the totals columns are incorrect. Dr. Hapner noted that the totals column will be corrected in the final draft.

**Motioned by Mr. Muth to approve the changes as noted and presented regarding Chapter 8; seconded by Mr. Graff. Motion carried.**

**Review revisions to Chapter 9**

Dr. Hapner reviewed the chapter revisions with the committee noting that, she along with Mr. Schmidt had revised the Chapter edits. Dr. Hapner noted that the Monitoring Water Resource section includes information on the new programs currently implemented in addition to a report being obtained from UWEX on well water testing.

**Mr. Graff motioned to approve the revisions as noted regarding Chapter 9; seconded by Mr. Walsh. Motion Carried.**

**Public Comment**

None.

**Adjournment**

It was noted that the public hearing meetings are tentatively pending new County Board Supervisors oath of office and committee assignments. It was noted that if any CAC members can not physically attend the public hearings, written comments will be accepted as part of the record for the public hearing.

Mr. Gonnering noted that he would like to see at least 2 or 3 CAC members present at the public hearings, if not all members can attend.

**There being no further business, Mr. Graff motioned to adjourn; seconded by Mr. Bishop. Motion carried.**

Meeting adjourned at 6:29 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fay Fitts  
Recording Secretary