



Walter arrived at 9:08 a.m.

No other suggested changes or additions.

Goal #2

Pesch suggested that in the first objective, change the first "and" to "or" in order for it to read better.

Goal #3

Walter had a question about the term "infill" in Objective 2. Sielski will provide an explanation of that term for clarification.

Goal #4

No comments

Goal #5

In regard to Objective 5, Pesch suggested providing an explanation of the term "universal design". Mention affordability for the elderly in the objectives for consistency. Explain the term "across the lifespan" in Objective 6.

Goal #6

In the last objective, delete "Washington County" at the end, as that would be assumed.

Goal #7

In all objectives, take out "Washington County" where it would be redundant.

For objectives 1, 4 & 5 – use the same terminology or explain why we are not using the same terminology. Sielski suggested the word "promote" for objectives 4 & 5. Pesch expressed a concern with the word "promote". Discussion ensued.

Goal #8

Objective #1 – Change to alternate rather than alternative.

Goal #9

Objective #2 – "Shared Services." Walter provided the suggestion to stop it right after the word Government, and get rid of all "Washington County" references in objectives that are redundant.

Goal #10

In regard to the last objective, Pesch expressed concern about the term "disseminate". Don't mention "develop methods", just say "disseminate" That is a trend that runs through these objectives, and Pesch suggested looking at this.

Sielski asked if there were any other changes or suggestions. None stated.

**FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Recommendations**

Sielski handed out the recommendations from the other committees (see attached). Due to the fact that she had not mailed these out, she gave the Committee a few minutes to read them.

Pesch inquired about how the recommendations fit into the Plan. At this time, Sielski handed out copies of the nine Comprehensive Planning Elements (see attachment) and explained how these recommendations will fit into the element chapters of the Comprehensive Plan.

Sielski stated that she wants to focus on three elements: Housing, Utilities and Community Facilities, and Intergovernmental Cooperation.

#### Housing Element:

Olson suggested the possibility of an umbrella agency to deal with countywide housing issues such as a "County Housing Council". We need an authoritative resource that would provide a centralized place to deal with various housing issues. Walter would like a forum for multi-jurisdictional communication and code enforcement for such issues as:

- Having a place to go for landlord issues
- Health hazards
- Fire hazards
- Issues with older homes

Need standardization. Walter asked if we know what other communities have done in regard to housing standards and regulations. Sielski will check into this. Hoffman stated that this is a very important issue and should be looked into. Walter stated that perhaps the recommendation on this element would be to study the possibility of a County Housing Council.

No other recommendations for housing elements.

#### Utilities and Community Facilities Element:

Sielski provided an overview of this element. Need to sort out which of these items the County actually has authority over, and determine the County's role in these items.

Walter stated that this is the area to show that Washington County doesn't have a place to do well water testing. Need to address this concern. Also stated that we should have a wish list in recommendations: One item is the issue of licensed facilities and restaurant inspection for cleanliness in public facilities. This is not just for food. It should relate to tattoo parlors, hair salons, etc. The State is getting out of the business of inspecting these facilities for cleanliness and the County needs to be involved in this to protect citizens. This issue falls under the Health Department Authority.

#### Intergovernmental Cooperation Element:

Hoffman asked if there was any discussion with Counties regarding school districts. Walter stated that we do work with school districts on certain projects, but there is no interaction regarding management of the school districts themselves.

Discussion ensued regarding "First Friday" meetings in Ozaukee County where various entities come together to discuss issues. Sielski stated she thinks that is a good idea. Stated that she is hearing from some of the local municipalities that they are seeing a benefit to the interaction between various entities in the townships with the multi-jurisdictional meetings. Suggested a meeting at the County level for municipalities to bring forth concerns or issues and someone at the County level would follow up and provide a forum for discussion. This council of multi-jurisdictional governments would work to remove barriers within local and state regulations to encourage intergovernmental cooperation.

Schwartz suggested that perhaps a master list of all public works equipment owned by various towns and cities could be kept at the County level so that if someone needed additional equipment, they could ask the County where that equipment is stored and borrow from a different municipality if necessary. All villages and cities have a mutual aid agreement in place which could be expanded on. Walter again mentioned the First Friday idea, and thought that was a good idea to pursue.

Olson stated that in regard to intergovernmental cooperation, look at the City of West Bend, City of Hartford, and Washington County regarding public transit services.

Olson suggested a change in the last bullet in Recommendations by the Transit Committee. Stated it should say "commuter rail". Pesch stated agreement with that suggested change, or suggested just saying "rail" rather than an adjective. Decision was reached to say future "passenger" rail rather than "light" rail service.

Schwartz questioned the last recommendation of the Highway Committee. Has concerns about recommending opening an ATV trail. Discussion ensued. Sielski explained how these recommendations are developed and how the identifiers are determined as to who is bringing forth the recommendations.

In regard to Intergovernmental Recommendations, Walter suggested some sort of intergovernmental discussion to attempt to discuss this and educate people about intergovernmental interaction.

**FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:**                      Public Comment

No one present from the public.

Future meeting dates: Per Sielski, Feb. 23<sup>rd</sup> as originally planned will not work. She has to be at SEWRPC that day. Stated she was thinking of the first or second week of March as ideal. After discussion consensus was reached to meet next on March 1<sup>st</sup> at 9:30 a.m.

**SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS:**                      Adjournment

**Motion by Schwartz, seconded by Olson to adjourn. Motion carried.** Meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deb Sielski  
Assistant Administrator for Planning

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David N. Radermacher, Chairperson

Date \_\_\_\_\_