

WASHINGTON COUNTY
MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT WORK GROUP
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 24, 2005

The meeting was called to order by McCune at 6:00 p.m. at the Washington County Public Agency Center in Rooms 1113A/1113B. Those present included:

Work Group Members Present:

Mark McCune, Chairperson	Washington County Board Supervisor
John Stern, Vice-Chairperson.....	Washington County Board Supervisor
Dan Wolf	Town of Addison
Mike Dricken.....	Town of Barton
Barb Kohler	Town of Erin
Art Seyfert	Town of Farmington
Paul Metz.....	Town of Germantown
Vicki Heideman.....	Town of Kewaskum
Mark Peters.....	Town of Polk
Ed Doerr	Town of Trenton
Mike Samann.....	Town of Wayne
Dan DeThorne	City of West Bend Citizen
Anthony Luciano.....	Town of Richfield Citizen
Mary Kennedy.....	Town of Richfield Citizen
Jeff Walters.....	Washington Board of Realtors
Margaret Burlingham	Rock River Coalition
Jerry Priesgen	West Bend Area Builders Association
Eric Gilbert.....	Non-metallic Mining Representative
Tom Nelson	West Bend Trail Blazers
Tom Calenberg	Applied Manufacturing Cluster Council

Excused:

Daniel Schmidt	Village of Kewaskum
----------------------	---------------------

Absent:

Michael Heili.....	Village of Newburg
Richard Boettcher.....	Town of Hartford

Staff:

Peter Wagner	Planner
Washington County Planning and Parks Department	

Kevin Stuck	Growth Management Educator
UW-Extension	

Kelly Hahm	Administrative Secretary
Washington County Planning and Parks Department	

Other Attendees:

Deborah Wilke	Multi-Jurisdictional Advisory Committee
---------------------	---

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS: Call Meeting to Order/Review Agenda

McCune called meeting to order.

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS: Approval of Minutes from September 26, 2005

Motion by Priesgen, seconded by Dricken to approve the minutes from September 26, 2005. Motion carried unanimously.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS: Discussion of Liability and Thics Code

Wagner stated the explanation from the County Attorney regarding liability for serving on a work group. Wagner explained that a copy of the ethics code was given to each work group member to inform them of the expected conduct regarding County business and that each work group member review the code on their own. (See Attached). Stern informed the workgroup that the County Board will be amending the Ethics Code at the October 25th meeting.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Update of Countywide Survey

Wagner explained that they received one proposal for the survey. Wagner stated that the RFP was reviewed on October 6th and it was decided to go with Option A for the countywide survey. Wagner added that the planning staff is currently in negotiations with the consultant and will update the committee at the next meeting. The work group will have the opportunity to review the draft survey at the November 30th joint meeting.

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Review Sample Questionnaires

Wagner briefly reviewed questionnaires. (See Attached). Dricken emphasized the need to ask questions for where the funding for various items will come from. McCune suggested to add sales tax to such a question.

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Brainstorming Session for Survey Questions and Issues

Struck briefly explained and began the brainstorming process. McCune requested ranking the questions and issues at the end of the meeting.

Ranked Transportation Issues/Questions

- 9 How important is public transportation?
- 9 Expand existing roads or build new to carry increases in traffic
- 7 We would like to know how residents feel about priorities for transportation investments in Ozaukee County in the future. For each of the following transportation options, please indicate if you think it should be a high priority, medium priority, low priority: (Ozaukee survey pg 3 Q7)
 - a. More buses between Ozaukee and Milwaukee Counties
 - b. Other types of public transportation (like shared taxis)
 - c. Maintaining existing streets and highways
 - d. Widening existing streets and highways
 - e. Minor street improvement such as adding turn lanes and signals
 - f. More bike paths and bike lanes
 - g. More sidewalks
 - h. More pedestrian trails providing access to public open space
- 7 Are current highways/county roads adequate to handle future traffic?
- 6 Access to industrial parks for large truck traffic
- 6 Public transportation for destinations beyond Washington County?
- 5 People interested in more bike/pedestrian trails
- 5 Should we try to designate certain roads for special or multiple uses?
- 4 Conflicts between urban and rural/ag traffic
- 4 Are you in favor of paying taxes or user fees?
- 4 Should a high priority be placed on local air travel? (West Bend Airport)
- 4 Which roadways in particular do you feel may be inadequate? (too much traffic, too narrow, etc.)

- 4 Would you be in favor of using more roundabouts at intersections of arterials rather than conventional signals, etc?
- 3 Improve existing roads
- 2 What is your perception of the traffic volume on state roads? County roads? Local roads? (Heavy, moderate, low)
- 1 Visibility on roads
- 1 Adequate street lighting at intersections?
- 1 With limited money, where should we focus? shared taxi within County? or regional with commuter express?
- 0 Appropriate level of enforcement for traffic laws
- 0 Adequate safeguards at railroad crossings?
- 0 What else do you use roadways for besides driving a vehicle?
- 0 What is the biggest safety issue on our roadways?
- 0 Are you in favor of cooperative efforts between jurisdictions to help solve safety issues?
- 0 Are current snow removal practices adequate?
- 0 Road width (including shoulders) – How wide should they be?

(Paul Metz left at 6:52 p.m.)

(Ed Doerr arrived at 6:55 p.m.)

Ranked Land Use Issues/Questions

- 9 Should new development be scattered throughout the County or concentrated in areas with existing infrastructure?
- 9 Are you in favor of expansion of hydro, wind, solar – renewables? And where?
- 8 What should be the minimum lot size for land not annexed to city/village?
 - 1 acre 2 acre 5 acre 10 acre 35 acres
- 7 Is there a point where Washington County has enough growth?
- 7 Would you be in favor of purchasing development rights on agricultural land – and how should it be funded? (Property tax, County sales tax?)
- 6 Rank areas for preservation: wetlands, woodlands, agricultural land, stream corridors, etc.
- 5 How important is it to maintain agricultural land uses in Washington County?
- 5 Are you in favor of compensating landowners for their development rights – and how? (PDR, TDR, etc.)
- 4 Cluster subdivisions vs. conventional subdivisions
- 4 Conflicts between neighboring uses
- 3 Should developers share costs for infrastructure in remote areas? – to get there
- 3 High density housing appropriate in areas without sewer/water?
- 3 Do you prefer land use decisions to be made at the local level, County level, or some other level?
- 1 If you believe Walworth County should continue to grow, what kind(s) of growth would you like to see? Circle all that apply: (Walworth survey pg102 Q4 – Where should we put each type of growth?)

a. Single family residential	f. Family farms
b. Multi-family residential	g. Large corporate farms
c. Rural residential	h. Tourist-related businesses
d. Condominiums	i. Office-type businesses
e. Hobby farms	j. Convenience stores and services
- 1 Development along waterways – threatening?
- 1 How are nature conservancies, easements, open space preservations viewed?
- 1 Given the current growth rates in Washington County, should the isolated areas we currently have agriculture preservation maintained?

- 1 New parks – or modify existing parks – for ATV use?
- 1 Land use can be managed through numerous techniques. Which of the following land use management tools do you favor? Strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree (Wayne survey pg 5 Q6)
 - a. Prepare a strong land use plan
 - b. No management tools
 - c. Use of impact fees
 - d. Purchase of development rights
 - e. Strong zoning controls
 - f. Preserve prime agricultural land
 - g. Wetland/marsh protections
 - h. Preserve all steep slopes
 - i. Preserve a portion of all woodlands
 - j. Preserve 100% of all woodlands
 - k. Create and/or require minimum buffers between new buildings and floodplains/wetlands
 - l. Limits on building permits per year
 - m. Limits on land divisions per year
 - n. Only allow residential growth having property values that offsets or exceeds the cost of providing town services to the development
 - o. Only allow commercial growth having a property value that offsets or exceeds the cost of providing town services to the development
 - p. Only allow industrial growth having a property value that offsets or exceeds the cost of providing town services to the development
 - q. Include issues such as sand & gravel, solar power, wind power, and cultural services
- 0 Do residents believe it important to identify and preserve historic buildings?
- 0 How much park land should County have? How far to go to get to a park? What do you consider to be a park? How often do you use parks?
(Seyfert left at 7:20 p.m.)

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Public Comment

Wilke commented that there seems to be a lot of overlapping questions, with some of the other workgroup questions. Wilke added that she liked the idea on ranking the top 5 questions.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Discussion Regarding Upcoming Meetings

Wagner stated at the November 28th meeting there will be discussions on the public kickoff meetings for municipalities and SWOT analysis. Wagner added that the public kickoff meetings will be held December through March.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Adjournment

Motion by Peters, seconded by Wolf to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 8:01 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debora Sielski
Assistant Administrator for Planning

Approved by _____
Mark McCune, Chairperson

Date _____

