ICC Meeting Minutes
June 20, 2016
UW-Extension, Jefferson County Office, Jefferson, WI

Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Russell Kottke, Chairman, at 9:30 a.m.

Certification of Open Meeting Notices
The Secretary confirmed that the requirements of the WI Open Meeting Law were met.

Adoption of the Agenda
Approved by Chair after consent by members.

Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes
Motion by Jefferson County, seconded by Columbia County to approve the minutes from the May 16, 2016 meeting.

Reports from Visiting Legislative Officials -- None

Update on County Issues-Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA)
Wisconsin Counties Association, Jon Hochkammer reported on several WCA legislative topics:
  o Kitty Rhoades passed away (DHFS Director)
  o Legislative priorities looked at via steering committees convened by WCA. Steering Committee makes recommendations to WCA Board.
  o Shoreland Zoning Task Force formed by WCA is starting its work, and is looking into:
    ▪ Prior legislation
    ▪ Changes made by legislature
    ▪ Recommendations
  o A special ICC meeting on UW Extension reorganization (nEXT Generation Reorganization) will be held on July 27, 2016 in Dodge County; an Agenda for this meeting was handed out by Chair Kottke; there was discussion about this special meeting:
    ▪ Invite faculty from each County Extension Office, Extension Committee chairs and members
    ▪ Important to hear about “values” around County Extension
    ▪ John Hochkammer-very important to hear about implications to budgets for County Extension offices
    ▪ Marty Krueger-wants this to be productive
    ▪ Russ Kottke: concerned that not enough county officials on the planning work groups
    ▪ Concerned about not hearing from the County perspective on these work groups
    ▪ John Hochkammer- All work groups/committees have been appointed, but the process is about a month behind; there is an opportunity to make some significant changes by County leaders
    ▪ Follow-up by each County: Email Jeff Hoffman on the number of County officials who will be attending from your county
  o Implications for regularly scheduled July ICC meeting: The topic of transportation that had been scheduled for the July ICC meeting will be bumped to August and will be held in Green Lake.
Getting ready to update comprehensive plans
- Many folks are new to planning
- Smart Growth Law (Comprehensive Planning Act of 1999) adopted in 1999
- Prior to law, less than 1/3 of local government had a “land use plan” (Map from 1999 illustrated this)
- Land use had become big issue
- Needed a definition of a comprehensive plan
- Prior: citizen participation not required

Many organizations were involved in establishing the Smart Growth Law: Involved consensus building.

1999 Smart Growth Law in a nutshell
- Definition of a comprehensive plan is described
- Citizen participation is required
- Consistency is required
- Contained a framework with 9 elements (Land Use Element, Housing Element, Transportation Element, etc.)
- Should be a “bottom-up” process

Current Map: shows that most towns and counties now have comprehensive plans as of 2014
- 66 of 72 counties have submitted completed comprehensive plans
- 1466 cities/villages/towns have had plans submitted
- 7 regional plans have been submitted

Still a few hold-out counties (6)--- they are reluctant to do a plan

Using the Comprehensive Plan

Updating the Plan: What the Law Says
- Need to update no less than once every 10 years
- Don’t have to use the same process as the jurisdiction’s first comprehensive plan: does not need to be as “daunting” as their first plan

What is meant by an “update”
- Can be amendments
- May be major changes, minor changes, tweaks or other changes
- Can be defined in the “implementation” element
- Jefferson County also has an “Amendment Section” in the implementation element
- The law does not require a total remake of the prior comprehensive plan
- May include “affirmation” of what was in the prior plan that is still meaningful and providing important guidance.
- Update does require a “public participation plan”

Why Update Plans?
- Evaluate current plan- What is working? What is not?
- What are current issues and areas of emphasis? What is new vision and strategies?

Other implications that influence update
- State Legislation (Examples), Court Findings, or New Rules
  - Wisconsin Act 391 (2015): on “development moratorium” and on “conditional use permits”
  - Reed vs. Tour of Gilbert: on sign code.
Federal Fair Housing Act- Texas Dept. of Housing vs Inclusive Community Projects, Inc: on notion of “unintentional discrimination”; counties may need to think more about housing in plan updates

HUD has a new rule on Affirmative Further Fair Housing (AFFH) Rule

- Shoreland Zoning
  - 2015 Wisconsin Act 55: eliminated county ability to do things different (more restrictive) than State
  - DNR working with counties of address these changes
  - Will be on-going efforts

- Large Scale Livestock Operations
  - 2004 Livestock Siting Law
  - Applies when a farm has 500 animals or more
  - May be some legislative actions to further restrict local action
  - Planning for Agriculture
    - Local government can adopt ag zoning districts
      - (i.e. Large scale district, small scale districts, general districts, other)

- Town and County Relations
  - Wisconsin was first state in nation to adopt rural zoning (town and country zoning relationships in 1930s)
  - We now have special and general zoning
  - Significant variety in town vs county zoning throughout Wisconsin
  - Relies on a County-Town partnership
  - Legislation authorized new provisions in Waukesha & Dane Counties
  - A lot of this relies on having good relationships

Rob Klotz-Jefferson County
- Meets with Towns Organization four times per year
- Jefferson County Interests and Priorities:
  - Update of county comprehensive plan by 2020
  - Farmland preservation plan update by 2022
  - Goal-merge in the same cycle of plan update
  - Interest in emphasizing a new transportation element as part of the plan update
  - Would like one County plan that hits all 3 updates (Comprehensive Plan, Farmland Preservation Plan, Transportation Element)

Steve Nass-Jefferson County
- Elected in 1998 and ran on the importance of comprehensive planning
- Can be painful but also rewarding
- Concerns: constant legislative changes of State; wants to tie hands of counties
- Challenges are now between cities and towns
- Transition Zones have helped
- Survey: Polled the citizens; don’t want Jefferson County to be like Waukesha County
Sauk County
  o Only ICC County to have planning staff; did their own comprehensive plan in-house (County, City, Town, Village)
  o Wonder: Should they continue to do the update for the cities/villages in Sauk County
  o Where should County planning efforts be focused: town/village plan updates or special topics like “placemaking” (or other initiatives).

Other County Issues Related to Planning
  o There are challenges in Dodge County because of the variety of way on how town zoning is handled. (Development community very concerned because of inconsistency among the towns.)

Adjournment
   Adjourned by Chair at 11:50 a.m.

ICC Participants
   Refer to sign-in sheet (attached).

Respectfully submitted by,

Steve Grabow
Professor and Community Development Educator
Jefferson County UW-Extension