



**Marathon County
Environmental Resources Committee Minutes
Tuesday, July 5, 2022
500 Forest Street, Wausau WI**

Attendance:	<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Not present</u>	
<i>Chair</i>	Jacob Langenhahn	X		} Via in person, Webex Or phone
<i>Vice-Chair</i>	Rick Seefeldt	X		
	Allen Drabek	X		
	Dave Oberbeck	X		
	Andrew Venzke	X		
	Tony Sherfinski		X	
	Kim Ungerer	X		
	Mike Ritter	X		
	Marilyn Bhend	X		
	Rodney Roskopf	X		

Also present via Webex, phone or in person: Laurie Miskimins, Nicole DeLonay, Shad Harvey, and Kirstie Heidenreich– Conservation, Planning, and Zoning (CPZ); Jamie Polley, Tom Lovlien – Parks Department; Lance Leonhard – County Administrator, Chris Holmen – Deputy Administrator, Kurt Gibbs, Craig McEwen, Matthew Leinbach, Nancy Stencil

1. **Call to order** – Called to order by Chair Langenhahn at 3:00 p.m.
2. **Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**
3. **Public Comment** –
Nancy Stencil - Discussed the importance of water quality as it related to the proposed mining in the County.
4. **Approval of May 31, 2022, Committee minutes**
Langenhahn requested modifications to the draft minutes under action item 5. A. 3 to specify that no motion was made, the agenda item was moved to the next month’s meeting.
Motion / second by Drabek/ Venzke to approve of the May 31, 2022, Environmental Resources Committee minutes with the modification mentioned above.
Motion **carried** by voice vote, no dissent.
5. **Operational Functions required by Statute, Ordinance, or Resolution:**

A. **Public Hearings, Review, Possible Actions, and Possible Recommendations to the County Board for its Consideration (County Zoning changes)**

1. Matthew Leinbach - from U-R Urban Residential and R-E Rural Estate, to R-R Rural Residential– Town of Spencer

Discussion: Harvey was sworn in and noted the staff report and decision sheet had been included in the packet. Harvey reviewed the rezone request. The rezone request is to correct a split zoning parcel. Harvey additionally reviewed the reasoning behind why Conservation Planning and Zoning (CPZ) staff are recommending approval of the rezone request, citing the rezone standards, requirements, and pertinent site characteristics. The Town of Spencer has reviewed the application and recommends approval without any concerns or additional comments. There was no additional testimony in favor or opposed to this rezone request virtually or in person. Testimony portion of the hearing was closed at 3:14 p.m. Committee deliberated.

Action: **Motion /** second by Seefeldt / Ritter to recommend approval to County Board, of the Matthew Leinbach rezone request. Noting the reasoning provided in the staff report and conclusions of law, the Committee determined the rezone is consistent with the Marathon County and Town comprehensive plans and is not located in the Farmland Preservation Zoning District. Adequate facilities are present or will be provided and providing any necessary public facilities will

May 31, 2022

not burden local government. Based on the proposed land division and existing land uses onsite the rezone should not result in any adverse effect on natural areas. The committee made their recommendation of approval based on the information, findings of fact, and conclusions of law as described in the CPZ staff report included in the ERC packet.

Motion **carried** by voice vote, no dissent.

Follow through: Forward to County Board for action at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

2. Kristy Wasinger - G-A General Agriculture to R-E Rural Estate - Town of Elderon

Discussion: Harvey noted the staff report and decision sheet had been included in the packet. Harvey reviewed the rezone request of Lot #1 shown on the Preliminary Certified Survey Map (CSM) that was submitted with the petition. Harvey additionally reviewed the reasoning behind why CPZ staff are recommending approval of the rezone request, citing the rezone standards, requirements, and pertinent site characteristics. Harvey noted, The Town of Elderon has reviewed the application and recommends approval without any concerns.

There was no additional testimony in favor or opposed to this rezone request virtually or in person. Testimony portion of the hearing was closed at 3:23 p.m. Committee deliberated and applied the standards for this request by reviewing and completing the decision sheet.

Action: **Motion** / second by Seefeldt / Oberbeck to recommend approval to County Board, of the Kristy Wasinger rezone request. Noting the reasoning provided in the staff report and conclusions of law, the Committee determined the rezone is consistent with the Marathon County and Town comprehensive plans and is not located in the Farmland Preservation Zoning District. Adequate facilities are present or will be provided and providing any necessary public facilities will not burden local government. Based on the proposed land division and existing land uses onsite the rezone should not result in any adverse effect on natural areas. The committee made their recommendation of approval based on the information, findings of fact, and conclusions of law as described in the CPZ staff report included in the ERC packet.

Motion **carried** by voice vote, no dissent.

Follow through: Forward to County Board for action at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

3. Randy Buchkowski - G-A General Agriculture to R-E Rural Estate – Town of Reid

Discussion: Harvey noted the staff report and decision sheet had been included in the packet. Harvey reviewed the rezone request of Lot #1 shown on the Preliminary Certified Survey Map (CSM) that was submitted with the petition. Harvey additionally reviewed the reasoning behind why CPZ staff are recommending approval of the rezone request, citing the rezone standards, requirements, and pertinent site characteristics. The Town of Reid has reviewed the application and recommends approval without any concerns.

There was no additional testimony in favor or opposed to this rezone request virtually or in person. Testimony portion of the hearing was closed at 3:30 p.m. Committee deliberated.

Action: **Motion** / second by Seefeldt / Drabek to recommend approval to County Board, of the Randy Buchkowski rezone request. Noting the provided in the staff report and conclusions of law, the Committee determined the rezone is consistent with the Marathon County and Town comprehensive plans and is not located in the Farmland Preservation Zoning District. Adequate facilities are present or will be provided and providing any necessary public facilities will not burden local government. Based on the proposed land division and existing land uses onsite the rezone should not result in any adverse effect on natural areas. The committee made their recommendation of approval based on the information, findings of fact, and conclusions of law as described in the CPZ staff report included in the ERC packet.

Follow through: Forward to County Board for action at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

4. Draeger's Dairy Farm - G-A General Agriculture to R-R Rural Residential - Town of Rib Falls

Discussion: Harvey was sworn in and noted the staff report and decision sheet had been included in the packet. Harvey reviewed the rezone request. The rezone request is related to the rezoning of Lot #1. Harvey additionally reviewed the reasoning behind why Conservation Planning and Zoning (CPZ) staff are recommending approval of the rezone request, citing the rezone standards, requirements, and pertinent site characteristics. The Town of Rib Falls has reviewed the application and recommends approval without any concerns.

There was no additional testimony in favor or opposed to this rezone request virtually or in person. Testimony portion of the hearing was closed at 3:38 p.m. Committee deliberated.

Action: **Motion** / second by Oberbeck / Ritter to recommend approval to County Board, of the Draeger Dairy Farm rezone request. Noting the reasoning provided in the staff report and conclusions of law, the Committee determined the rezone is consistent with the Marathon County and Town comprehensive plans and is not located in the Farmland Preservation Zoning District. Adequate facilities are present or will be provided and providing any necessary public facilities will not burden local government. Based on the proposed land division and existing land uses onsite the rezone should not result in any adverse effect on natural areas. The committee made their recommendation of approval based on the information, findings of fact, and conclusions of law as described in the CPZ staff report included in the ERC packet.

Follow through: Forward to County Board for action at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

5. Draeger's Dairy Farm - G-A General Agriculture to L-D-R Low Density Residential - Town of Rib Falls

Discussion: Harvey was sworn in and noted the staff report and decision sheet had been included in the packet. Harvey reviewed the rezone request. The rezone request is related to the rezoning of lot #2. Harvey additionally reviewed the reasoning behind why Conservation Planning and Zoning (CPZ) staff are recommending approval of the rezone request, citing the rezone standards, requirements, and pertinent site characteristics. The Town of Rib Falls has reviewed the application and recommends approval without any concerns.

There was no additional testimony in favor or opposed to this rezone request virtually or in person. Testimony portion of the hearing was closed at 3:45 p.m. Committee deliberated.

Action: **Motion** / second by Drabek / Venzke to recommend approval to County Board, of the Draeger Dairy Farm rezone request. Noting the reasoning provided in the staff report and conclusions of law, the Committee determined the rezone is consistent with the Marathon County and Town comprehensive plans and is not located in the Farmland Preservation Zoning District. Adequate facilities are present or will be provided and providing any necessary public facilities will not burden local government. Based on the proposed land division and existing land uses onsite the rezone should not result in any adverse effect on natural areas. The committee made their recommendation of approval based on the information, findings of fact, and conclusions of law as described in the CPZ staff report included in the ERC packet.

Follow through: Forward to County Board for action at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

- B. Review and Possible Recommendation to County Board for its Consideration (Town Zoning changes pursuant to §60.62(3) Wis. Stats.) – None.
- C. Review and Possible Recommendations to County Board for its Consideration – None.
- D. Review and Possible Action - None.

6. **Educational Presentations/Outcome Monitoring Reports and Committee Discussion**

A. Department Updates: Conservation, Planning and Zoning (CPZ)

1. Strategic Plan Objectives: Continue discussion from June ERC Meeting

Chair Langenhahn updated the committee on the Executive Committee's next steps for the Strategic Plan.

Discussion: Craig McEwen reviewed what ideas were discussed at the last ERC Meeting and the goal is to update the current Strategic Plan, that is due to expire at the end of the year. McEwen referenced Strategic Plan Objectives 5.2 & 6.3, as they are the Environmental Resources Committees objectives to focus on.

Administrator Leonhard referenced an email sent to all the County Board Supervisors that discussed the Strategic plan update for all committees.

Oberbeck questioned if the County has a list of historic building throughout the County, in reference to 5.2 B "Promote infrastructure development that protects natural resources".

Administrator Leonhard indicated that it is more in reference to "dilapidated" homes.

Oberbeck discussed the potential in saving some of these building throughout the County.

Bhend questioned if any of these standards would overrule another municipality.

McEwen stated he did not see/know if it was meant to be a part of the original intent of 5.2.B, but the committee could decide if this is a topic worth discussing.

Miskimins further explained Objective 5.2 D "Develop a land capability index" and the understanding/history seems to be the objective was to look at economic development within commercial and industrial areas to see that the County is developing in the correct way.

Langenhahn reiterated 5.2 E "Develop a comprehensive approach to redevelopment and revitalization of older housing stock and older buildings".

Leonhard explained how County Departments develop their budgets and work plans based on the Strategic Plan objectives, so it is important the County Board give direction to what they believe the County should be focusing on for work. It doesn't have to be what is in the strategies now, but if there is something economic developed focused, they want the County to work on, they need to provide that direction.

Additional questions were brought forth on the Groundwater Plan strategy and the acquiring of park and forest land strategy.

Miskimins and CPZ and Parks staff reviewed progress and some initial recommendation on various strategies in 5.2 & 6.3 that are being worked on now. The County does not have an updated Groundwater Protection Plan, but does have a Land and Water Resource Plan, referring to Objective 6.3A "Groundwater Protection Plan." In 2023 CPZ will begin the update to this plan.

Lovlien explained the County has been acquiring about 200 acres yearly and according to the Forest Comprehensive Plan this remains the target; this is in reference to outcome #3 in objective 5.2 F.

Ritter questioned if Objective 6.3 has taken into consideration PFAS and the effects of city waste on area farm fields and its effect on water quality.

McEwen stated PFAS was not a concern when the Comprehensive Plan was created in 2016, that is why it is not stated in the Strategic Plan.

Langenhahn questioned what the County's impact would be with the PFAS levels and this would be a great discussion to continue having.

Oberbeck stated the County procedures such as salt application, need to be looked at when it comes to ground water containments.

McEwen reiterated the objective 6.3A is to "Update the 2001 Groundwater Protection Plan" and Miskimins stated it is in the budget to start in 2023.

McEwen stated they would like to adopt an update by the end of the year.

Leonhard reiterated the importance of what the committee wants to see and whether they like the Strategies the County is working towards, or not.

Bhend stated she would like committee to prioritize the PFAS concern.

McEwen stated that the objectives 5.2 and 6.3 will not be changing but as far as the strategies and

the outcomes, those can be adjusted accordingly.

Ungerer questioned how Objective 5.2 Outcome #3 decided on the 320 acres of land (park and forest) be acquired per year and how the County acquires the land.

Lovlien explained in recent updates to park and forestry land use plans the public was surveyed, and it was indicated that the public would like more county land available for public use.

Marathon County only acquires land from willing sellers. Forestry also utilizes the Knowles Nelson Stewardship Program that provides 50% match for acquisitions, and they use segregated land purchase account.

Drabek questioned if Objective 6.3 A and the POWTS loan program when it comes to failing POWTS.

Miskimins stated CPZ is trying to update the loan program.

Follow through: Future ERC Meeting will continue discussion on what Objectives and Strategies to move forward for the next few years.

2. WI Land 7 Water Educational Video : The committee watched a nine minute video that comes from a series of Land Conservation Committee training videos, produced by WI Land + Water Association (it can be viewed at <https://wisconsinlandwater.org/members-hub/lcc-resources>). The video focused on describing Chapter 92, devoted to the powers of Land Conservation Committees under Wisconsin conservation law.

Discussion: County Conservationist Kirstie Heidenreich mentioned that she will aim to get through the short series of training videos with the committee over the coming months, as they prove to be very beneficial to describe the duties of the committee and the Land Conservation Department. She also reminded them that there is a wealth of resources located under "Member Resources" at the WI Land + Water website, such as a Land Conservation Committee handbook ([found here](#)).

Follow through: None at this time.

7. Policy Issues Discussion and Committee Determination to the County Board for its Consideration

A. Recommendation to Executive Committee for updated to the strategies, objectives, and expected outcomes found in 2018- 2022 Strategic Plan

1. New strategies to be added to the existing objections in the plan
2. Strategies to be prioritized within existing objectives.
3. Strategies or objectives from the 2016 Comprehensive Plan to add to the Strategic Plan

8. Next meeting date, time & location, and future agenda items:

Tuesday, July 5, 2022, 2022 3:00 p.m. Marathon County Courthouse, Assembly Room 500 Forest Street Wausau WI

A. Committee members are asked to bring ideas for future discussion

1. PFAS

B. Announcements/Requests/Correspondence

1. Langenhahn announced that Green Light Inc has interest in meeting with the ERC and Metallic Mining Committee. The date and time are still to be determined.
2. Roskopf stated many in the western part of the county have been contacted by an energy company with interest in creating a wind farm that could encompass up to 15 thousand acres.

9. **Adjourn** – **Motion** Venzke/ second by Seefeldt to **adjourn** at 5:08 p.m. Motion **carried** by voice vote, no dissent.

Laurie Miskimins, CPZ Director

For Jacob Langenhahn, Chair

cc: (via email/web site) ERC members; County Administrator; Corporation Counsel; County Clerk

LM/nd

Environmental Resources Committee Minutes
May 31, 2022