

PIERCE COUNTY WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF LAND MANAGEMENT & RECORDS
PLANNING, ZONING, SURVEYING & GIS
414 W. Main Street P.O. BOX 647
Ellsworth, Wisconsin 54011
715-273-6746 OR 715-273-6747
land.mgmt@co.pierce.wi.us



MINUTES - Pierce County Land Management Committee Meeting, April 3, 2024, in-person meeting for everyone along with the option of remote attendance.

Present: Joe Fetzer, Jon Aubart, Neil Gulbranson, Eric Sanden and Dan Puhmann

Others: Andy Pichotta, Adam Adank, Emily Lund and Anna Anderson

Chairman Joe Fetzer called the Pierce County Land Management Committee meeting to order at 6 pm in the County Boardroom.

Next meeting dates: April 17, 2024, May 1, 2024 & May 15, 2024.

Approve Minutes from the February 21, 2024 Land Management Committee meeting: **Aubart moved to approve the Land Management Committee minutes from February 21, 2024/Gulbranson seconded. All in favor. Passed.**

Public Hearing to consider and take action on proposed updates to the Pierce County Outdoor Recreation Plan 2024-2028.

Staff Report – Andy Pichotta: The Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission (MRRPC) has updated Pierce County’s Outdoor Recreation Plan and has submitted a final draft plan for review and approval. The purpose of the plan is to provide information to help develop and improve the county’s recreational resources and to assure the County’s and municipalities’ eligibility to participate in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Program (LAWCON) and the State Stewardship Program. An on-line survey, developed by the MRRPC, was conducted in the winter/spring of 2021/2022. County residents and municipal board member were encouraged to participate, and results were incorporated in the draft plan. The plan lists the County’s “goals and actions” to improve the recreational opportunities in the county, which are shown on pages 51-52. These were previously developed by the Parks and Land Management Committees. Several Towns also submitted town specific goals for inclusion in the Plan.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the LMC consider any comments received during the Public Hearing and determine if any changes or additions to the plan are necessary. If appropriate, the LMC should approve the proposed plan and forward a recommendation/resolution to the Finance and Personnel Committee and the County Board of Supervisors. **Chairman Fetzer opened the Public Hearing and asked for any public input. Chairman Fetzer asked again for any public comment, hearing none, declared the Public Hearing closed.** Chairman Fetzer asked if the committee had any questions. Sanden asked if it meets all our needs and criteria. Pichotta said that it largely is an inventory of existing recreational opportunities in the County. If a town or municipality project came up after we’ve adopted this, it can be amended quite easily by putting an addendum in it and that would qualify them for those two grant programs that they are only eligible for if they are contained in the plan. Pichotta said it is just jumping through some hoops to ensure folks maintain their eligibility for certain grant dollars. Chairman Fetzer asked if we see what the townships want. Pichotta said we requested information from the towns, and we received a couple of responses. Pichotta stated we update the plan every four years or so and it is not unusual to only get a couple responses. **Sanden moved to approve the Pierce County Outdoor Recreation Plan 2024-2028 as written and forward a recommendation/resolution recommending approval by the Finance and Personnel Committee and the County Board of Supervisors/Puhmann seconded. All in favor. Passed.**

Discuss take action on Site Plan Review for a Meat Processing Business for Grange Hall Properties LLC (DBA JM Watkins), pursuant to Pierce County Code Chapter §240-75 in the Commercial District, on property located in the NW ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 18, T25N, R15W, Town of Union, Pierce County, WI.

Chairman Fetzner stated he will be abstaining from any vote on this topic.

Staff Report – Emily Lund: The applicants are doing business as JM Watkins, LLC and are a family-owned meat processing business. They intend to move their business from the Village of Plum City to a new location known as Grange Hall or Ono. The Grange Hall/Ono area is characterized by two commercial uses, a church, several homes, a WisDOT park and ride lot, and the former Muskie Proppant frac sand processing facility. JM Watkins, LLC was owned and operated by the Watkins family for 66 years. Brandon Clare, a family friend, bought the business in November 2013. Mr. Clare plans to continue the Watkins tradition of quality, value, and good recipes, while adding more meat varieties including chicken, lamb and seafood. Pierce County Code (PCC) §240-75 requires Site Plan Review for new construction for commercial uses. The purpose is to assure that site designs promote compatibility between land uses, create safe and attractive site layouts and structures, provide proper access to streets and transportation, protect property values and contribute to efficient land use in Pierce County. The property is located in Section 18 in the Town of Union. It is located 600 ft east of the intersection of County Rd CC & US Hwy 10, and on the south side of US Hwy 10. The LMC approved a rezone/map amendment from Ag-Res to Commercial on 4/7/2021. The County Board of Supervisors approved the rezone/map amendment by Ordinance No. 21-04 on 5/25/2021. The Certified Survey Map (CSM) was recorded on 6/3/2021 that created Lot 1 CSM Vol. 15 Pg. 138. An additional 200 ft by 600 ft is in the process of being transferred and combined with this parcel. The WisDOT approved the highway access permit on 10/6/2023. The applicants obtained address W2431 US Hwy 10 on 10/24/2023. The DSPS approved the mound septic system design plans on 8/4/2023 and the State Sanitary Permit was issued on 3/6/2024. The DSPS approved the building design plans on 3/20/2024. The property is in the Commercial zoning district. Adjacent zoning districts are Ag-Residential, General Rural, Primary Ag, Commercial (~300 ft West) and Industrial (~900 ft East). The property's current land use is agricultural. Adjoining land uses are agricultural and residential. The applicant hired R.J. Jurowski Construction, Inc. from Whitehall, WI to manage the project construction. Kevin Lisowski, Project Manager, and Tim Abley, Field Superintendent, are responsible for daily construction activities. Construction is expected to begin May 2024 and be completed by November 2024. Roughly 4-25 contractors are expected to be onsite at any time. The applicant hired Johnson & Schofield, Inc. from Red Wing, MN to provide designs for a DNR WPDES storm water construction site general permit that was submitted 3/22/2024. Their submittal included site plans for before and after construction, storm water management & erosion control plan, maintenance agreements, hydraulic analysis and many construction details. The hydraulic analysis was completed following NR 216 and using a computer model called WinSLAMM. This analysis showed water drainage/flow paths before and after construction. A 120'x320' wet, detention pond is planned to be installed south of the new facility. This pond will keep a pool of water to treat storm water runoff and any pollutants during high rain events. If the water gets too high, the pond has an overflow structure, or outfall, for water to be released slowly over riprap and eventually overland. The DNR is continuing their review of the engineering for the storm water runoff permit. The applicants currently have 11 full-time employees that help process 10-15 beef and 8-10 hogs per week. At the new facility, they estimate having 20 full-time employees. They plan to slaughter, butcher and process up to 30 beef and 15 hogs per week. The new facility is proposed to be 11, 460 sq. ft. The main building is 10, 259 sq. ft. with an attached cooler and animal holding pen that is 1,201 sq. ft. The main building will have a kill-floor, hanging room, production floor, freezer space, smoke house, retail store and other processing areas. The equipment used for meat processing are knives, saws, meat grinders, slicers, smoker, stuffer, meat mixers, packaging machines, coolers, freezers, cut proof gloves, cleaning supplies and more. The facility will operate year-round. Meat production will be Monday-Friday 7am-3:30pm. The retail store will be open Monday-Friday 8am-6pm, and Saturday-Sunday 8am-3pm. PCC §240-15(I) specifies the purpose and intent of the commercial zoning district and is listed in the Staff Report. PCC §240-23 refers to minimum requirements and states, "*Developments shall meet the minimum requirements for the applicable district shown in the Table of Dimensional Requirements.*" PCC Ch. 240 Attachment 2, Table of Dimensional Requirements lists a 40 ft side yard and 40 ft rear yard setback from residential districts and 10 ft

side yard and 10 ft rear yards setbacks from all other districts when building in a Commercial zoning district. The site plan verifies these setbacks will be met. PCC §240-27(A) regulates structure setbacks from State and Federal highways. *“The required setback for all structures fronting on state and federal highways shall be 110 feet from the centerline of the road or 77 feet from the edge of the right-of-way, whichever is greater.”* The WI DOT right-of-way along this lot is 80 ft. Therefore, the setback to the centerline of the road shall be no less than 157 ft. The plans show the structure 176 ft from the centerline and 96 ft from right-of-way of US Hwy 10. The applicants plan to have exterior security lighting on the building. The applicants plan to have 2 on-premise advertising signs that is no larger than 32 sq. ft. that is out of the US Hwy 10 road right-of-way. PCC §240-31 states, *“Landscape buffer requirements shall only apply to proposed uses in cases where a commercial or industrial use abuts a residential or agricultural district; or such landscape buffer is required by a provision of this chapter.”* PCC §240-31(C) lists the general requirements of landscape buffers:

- (1) Landscape buffers shall be located in such a manner that principle buildings and outdoor storage areas associated with the proposed use are screened as viewed from the vantage point of the principle structures on affected adjoining lots.

(Other requirements are listed in the Staff Report)

PCC §240-31(D) states *“Landscape buffers, at the time of establishment, shall meet the design specification on file in the Zoning Office as approved and incorporated into this chapter.”* The Land Management Department Policy on Minimum Landscaping Requirements states *“Vegetation, earthen berms and or fencing shall be placed between nonresidential development and adjacent properties so as to render the development as visually unobtrusive, as is practical, from adjacent properties or from public view. Native vegetation should be utilized whenever practical. Vegetated screening buffers shall be maintained in good condition.”* The applicant has presented a landscape buffer proposal in the application that they believe will meet the minimum landscaping requirements. The proposal includes 5 apple trees that are 6 ft tall and spaced 25’ apart. They will be located northwest of their parking lot and will be planted along the Hwy 10 road right-of-way as shown on the attached map. The Committee should review this plan to determine if the proposed landscape buffer satisfies the requirements or if changes are necessary. The committee may also wish to establish size, exact location, and species of trees used in the proposed landscape buffer plan if deemed necessary. The LMC has, in previous cases, not required a buffer from an adjoining property if that property owner has waived the screening requirement. PCC §240-54(A) requires 1 space per 200 ft of primary floor area for retail stores, 1 space per employee during the peak shift, and 2% of the total number of spaces provided for physically disabled persons. The applicant said they currently use 4-5 parking spaces during peak hours at their current business location. The new facility will have approximately 1,100 sq. ft. in retail space that requires a minimum of 6 parking spaces. Also, 20 spaces are needed for the proposed 20 employees. And at least one space is needed to be ADA compliant for physically disabled persons. The applicants will have over 26 customer parking spaces and at least 1 parking space will be ADA compliant. Based on advice from Corporation Counsel, staff is not recommending any conditions that requires permitting of, or compliance with, other agencies, organizations, or departments regulations or rules. The applicant is strongly encouraged to comply with relevant local and state ordinances and regulations and secure all necessary permits and licenses.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the LMC review the proposed Site Plan and determine if any changes or modifications are necessary. The LMC should consider proposed structures, architectural plans, neighboring uses, use of landscaping and open space, parking areas, driveway location, loading and unloading areas, highway access, traffic generation and circulation, lighting, drainage, water and sewer systems, as well as proposed operations. The LMC may impose time schedules for completion of buildings, parking areas, open space uses, drainage and erosion control systems and landscaping and may require appropriate sureties to guarantee that requirements will be completed on schedule. If no changes or modifications are determined to be necessary, staff recommends that the LMC approve the Site Plan as proposed with the following conditions:

1. Activities shall be conducted consistent with the application and as presented to the Land Management Committee unless modified by a condition of this approval.
2. Landscape buffer shall be established at the time of the lots development according to the plans submitted in the application and/or as modified by the Land Management Committee.

3. Applicants shall obtain a Land Use Permit prior to any construction, reconstruction, location, relocation, erection, extension, enlargement, conversion or structural alteration of any existing or future buildings/structures.
4. Applicant shall obtain a Land Use Permit for all on-site/off-site advertising signs.
5. Applicant shall contact the Town Building Inspector, All Croix Inspections, to determine whether commercial plan approval is required from the Department of Safety & Professional Services.
6. At least 26 parking spaces shall be provided and at least 1 parking space shall be ADA compliant per Pierce County Code §240-54(I).

Chairman Fetzer asked applicant Brandon Clare if he had anything to add. Clare had nothing to add. Chairman Fetzer asked if the committee had any questions. Sanden asked about where it says in the staff report that the LMC, in previous cases, has not required a buffer from an adjoining property if that property owner has waived the screening requirements, has that been done in this case? Sanden asked if we have heard from the adjacent property owners how they feel about it? Pichotta said that we have not specifically heard from the adjacent property owners. Pichotta said that under PCC §240-31C, it basically states that we should screen from the vantage point of the principle structures on affected adjoining lots. Pichotta stated given that neighboring use is a nonstructural use, the committee could determine that the screening is not necessary or simplify things if the adjoining property owner were to waive that requirement, then the determination would be if the apple trees along the road are adequate. Pichotta noted that the purpose isn't to render anything invisible, it is to break it up, and in this case some visibility is probably a good thing given that it's a retail establishment. Chairman Fetzer asked if Clare has talked to the new neighbor. Clare stated he will stop to talk with him. Sanden said compared to some of the other buffering plans we've seen, 5 apple trees seems a little low, but as was pointed out, a commercial business wants to have some visibility, so that makes sense. Sanden asked the applicant what the time frame is for the construction on the site. Clare said they are tentatively planning to start middle of May and hopefully the major part of the construction will be done by December 1st. Chairman Fetzer stated usually the buffer is pines, etc., but he thinks the apple trees will be a good idea. Pichotta said when we have required to two staggered rows and a berm, typically that is for an Industrial Use that's going to create noise and vibration. Puhmann asked if we would be eliminating #2 of the conditions that talks about the Landscape buffer. Pichotta said if you were to approve as is written with conditions 1-6, the landscape buffer would be that which was proposed by the applicant. **Sanden moved to approve the Site Plan for a Meat Processing Business for Grange Hall Properties LLC with conditions 1-6/Gulbranson seconded. All in favor. Passed**

Discuss take action on potential Code Amendments to Pierce County Code §240-75 Site Plan Review and §240-32 Accessory Structures.

Staff Report – Adam Adank: At the January 17, 2024 LMC meeting, staff presented a proposed concept for amendment of §240-32 – Accessory Structures. The proposed concept would allow one accessory structure for personal storage in agricultural zoned districts prior to the establishment of a principle use other than agriculture. The proposed code amendment is shown below. Staff is also proposing an amendment to section §240-75 Site Plan Review. The intent of the proposed site plan review amendment is to ensure that thoughtful and professional site plans are being submitted for commercial, industrial, institutional, and multi-family uses. Proposed language is also shown below.

§240-32. Accessory structures.

Accessory structures are permitted subject to the following:

- A. Permit required. Accessory structures shall require a Land Use Permit except:
 - (1) Minor structures, such as birdhouses, yard light poles, birdbaths, doghouses (housing dogs which are licensed as the personal pets of the residents of the property), tree houses, noncommercial fuel storage tanks and pumps, clothesline poles, lawn ornaments, flagpoles, mailboxes, garbage containers, ice fishing shanties and school bus waiting shelters. Non-habitable structures of not more than 100 square feet, which can be easily moved, and meet applicable setback requirements, are also exempt.
 - (2) Fences.

- B. An accessory structure shall be located on the same lot as the principal use to which it is accessory.
- C. An accessory structure shall not be permitted until its associated principal structure is present or under construction except:
 - (1) No more than (1) one structure for personal storage shall be allowed in agricultural districts prior to the establishment of a principle use, provided all other requirements of this chapter are met.
- D. Residential districts. Accessory structure such as shipping containers may only be permitted on a temporary basis.
- E. Nonresidential districts. A vacant manufactured home may be permitted as a temporary accessory structure only in nonresidential zoning districts.
- F. Temporary accessory structures. Certain accessory structures may only be permitted as a temporary structure, in specific zoning districts, upon issuance of a land use permit subject to the following:
 - (1) The land use permit shall expire 12 months from the date of issuance, and the accessory structure shall be removed from the premises upon expiration of the permit. A subsequent land use permit for a temporary accessory structure on the same parcel shall not be issued until 12 months has elapsed from the expiration of the previous permit.
 - (2) Only one such accessory structure shall be permitted at a time.

§240-75. Site Plan Review.

- C. Site plan requirements. All site plans shall contain the following information:
 - (1) Identification
 - (a) Name of Project
 - (b) Owner's and/or developer's name, address and telephone number.
 - (c) Architect and/or engineer's name, address and telephone number.
 - (d) Address of project.
 - (e) Date site plan was prepared.
 - (2) Graphic representation.
 - (a) Three copies of the site plan shall be submitted.
 - (b) Site plan scale shall be no less than 50 feet to the inch and shall show date, North arrow and graphic scale.
 - (c) Site plan shall be stamped by a certified architect, engineer, or surveyor.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the LMC consider whether the proposed ordinance amendments are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and, if appropriate, direct staff to hold a public hearing to consider their adoption. Chairman Fetzer asked the committee if they had any questions. Aubart asked to refresh his memory about the idea behind requiring a certified architect for site plans. Adank said the main reason is to get rid of 'napkin' drawings. Adank said there is a whole list of things required for site plan approval and a lot of times the applicants are not willing to put in the work to do that. Adank stated it can take a lot of staff time to help them design it and so the hope is, by requiring this, that they hire somebody to draft a complete site plan. Aubart stated he was just thinking of smaller uses and it may be a lot for someone to hire a certified architect. Pichotta stated he had that concern too, and there probably will be cases where a very simple request has to hire a certified professional. Pichotta suggested that we could build in some language that gave us some discretion. Chairman Fetzer asked based on size? Aubart stated he thought complexity of the project. Pichotta stated that we would probably do something along the lines of "may be waived by the Zoning Administrator upon consideration of the complexity of the project." Chairman Fetzer asked if that would then be brought back to the committee as a Public Hearing. Pichotta stated yes. Aubart asked if Adank was ok with the discretion part of the site plan review. Adank stated he was. Aubart said this gives you the ability to say "you need to step it up" without you or staff having to do it for them. Adank agreed. Gulbranson asked if this also includes an accessory garage? Pichotta stated no, this would mainly be for commercial or industrial uses established as a new use. Chairman Fetzer asked for any further questions. No further questions. **Aubart made motion to approve the Code Amendments for the Accessory Structures and Site Plan Review as noted and forward it on for a Public Hearing/Puhrmann seconded. All in favor. Passed.**

Discuss purpose/objective of Land Management Department Fee Schedule for potential future adjustment.

Staff Report – Adam Adank: The Land Management Department fee schedule was last reviewed and updated in 2019. Since that time, staff has identified several unlisted land use fees that could be added to the fee schedule. Staff also suggests this may be a good time to revisit the purpose/objective of the Land Management Department fee schedule to determine if any other adjustments may be warranted. The following items are intended as a starting point for discussion.

1. Pierce County’s adopted comprehensive plan suggests utilizing a fee structure that “provides incentives to produce the activities or outcomes that the County wants to “encourage” and disincentives for activities or outcomes that the County wants to “discourage”. Please consider the following excerpt from the section of the Comprehensive Plan titled “Context for discussion of Pierce County’s Comprehensive Plan” for further explanation:

Goals, Objectives, and Policy Language

The county will, when appropriate, seek to create processes, and a fee structure that provides incentives to produce the activities or outcomes that the county wants to “encourage” and disincentives for the activated or outcomes that the county wants to “discourage”.

To elaborate, in cases where the county plan “discourages” an activity – that activity should not be viewed as prohibited, but recognized as something that Pierce County wants to discourage county-wide and for which a strategy to discourage that activity may be pursued. For example, the objective; “Discourage residential subdivision development on productive agricultural land – but that Pierce County will, when appropriate, consider strategies intended to discourage the subdivision of productive agricultural land throughout the county through the establishment of a process and/or fee intended to make initiating that activity less attractive (i.e. fee could reflect full cost of service). Conversely, an activity that is to be “encouraged” might be subject to a simplified process with lesser fees.

2. Should the fee schedules for surrounding counties be considered? If so, what is the objective?
3. Should department fees be based on approximate costs associated with providing a given service?
4. In certain cases, would it be appropriate to separate fees based on the size of proposed development?
5. Would it be fair to assume these should all be part of the consideration for determining fees?
6. Can the committee think of any other factors that should be considered when establishing fees?

Recommendation: Staff recommends the Land Management Committee consider the above information and provide general direction to staff for future fee schedule proposals. Chairman Fetzer asked if we know what other counties are charging. Adank said he has started to pull some of that information but didn’t want to spend too much time on it until he got direction from the committee. Adank said he did look at a couple of surrounding counties. Chairmen Fetzer asked if we were severely behind on cost of fees. Adank stated the counties he looked at in particular are St. Croix and Dunn County and St. Croix was quite a bit higher and Dunn was a little higher. Adank said at the last conference we went to, he heard Dunn County is going to be in the process of updating their fee schedule again. Chairman Fetzer stated its been 5 years since we last looked at it, and the price of everything has gone up. Chairman Fetzer said its not like we want to ‘keep piling on’, but it is sort of the fact of the matter, with the cost of staff, production and everything going up. Chairman Fetzer asked if the committee had any questions. Puhmann asked about when it talks about the appropriate cost associated with providing a given service. Puhmann asked if staff holds their hourly wages to the project and then you cost adjust for that? Adank stated in the case of a CUP, we charge \$300, \$132 or so is to the newspaper for the Public Notice, cost of mailing, ink, paper, staff time, etc., depending on the project, it can be varying costs. Puhmann asked so it is not a flat fee? Pichotta said it’s a flat fee currently, and one way to think about it is a lot of projects that are proposed, that we spend a bunch of time on, are not necessarily by folks who are residents of the county and so if someone comes in and pays \$300 for a CUP for something that is a very complicated use and they are not a resident of the county, essentially, residents of Pierce county are subsidizing our review of that, and that’s ok, but if we were to charge something that correlated to the amount of staff time spent, it may be that the fee would be a bit higher. Pichotta stated his thoughts on the fee structure at this point is that we probably don’t have anything we want to encourage or discourage, so I’m not sure we want to disincentivize any activities currently, I do think we ought to take into consideration adjoining or surrounding counties and we

should be within the ball park with Dunn County and maybe not quite as high as St. Croix County. Pichotta suggested as far as the appropriate costs associated with a given service, that is going to be tough to differentiate where that hard and fast line between where we charge \$300 or potentially a bit more. Chairman Fetzer said that is hard, because if someone comes in with good plans and eases your job a lot, even though it's a large project, you didn't have to do much to it, so why should they be charged more. Pichotta said we need to try to figure out the median and charge that. Aubart said the flipside of that is this tiny project for a nonconforming structure that we have to issue a CUP for, versus a multi-million-dollar project being the same cost. Adank stated one thing done for the CUP's on the fee schedule is if we are going to issue a CUP and the proposed use has an asterisk next to it, we charge them a Land Use Permit for that activity also, whereas some of the CUP's we've included the Land Use Permit. Adank said he believes Industrial uses should be one that if it requires a CUP, we also charge a Land Use Permit, so that might be another way to capture costs depending on the project. Pichotta said even when you combine those two together, we still are quite a bit cheaper than the adjoining counties. Gulbranson asked about #4 where it says 'based on size' are you talking about value or area wise? Pichotta said it could be either. Pichotta said we are thinking more along the lines of, for example, Western Mustang, where that CUP process was hugely time consuming and then you've got things that are simple, and it doesn't make sense to charge them too much because that wouldn't really be fair. Gulbranson asked if we charge any more on the Mississippi or St. Croix and suggested maybe that was something to look at too. Adank also stated that with some of the CUP's, there are 2-year renewals, we've never charged for a renewal, so it's not like it's a one and done, they are often coming back every two years, which requires a staff report and meetings. Adank said for example, Western Mustang, still has to submit things like final grading plans, a vegetative management plan, and several other things, so projects like that, we are not done after the initial meeting, it can be years of work. Chairman Fetzer wanted to ask, since we just dealt with Brandon Clare, if Mr. Clare felt the fee we had was reasonable and also how many hours were spent on this? Lund stated she did not track. Pichotta stated this is a good example of a Site Plan that was easy to react to because it was complete. Gulbranson stated we have to be careful, because this is good for the area, and we don't want to make it too burdensome. Pichotta agreed, but we do want them to pay a fair share. Aubart said, you run into good project like this one, that may take a day or two of work, but then you have a problem project, that take 3-4 days of work and they both pay the same fee. Adank stated that for this plan, being a commercial use, they are already having to come up with state approved plans, so for an architect to come up with a site plan isn't asking a whole lot more. Sanden said that ideally if you could go back say one year and do inventory, account for everything you've done, and the cost, divvy that up and see what the average cost would be and use that as a basis, but that would be a big task and multiple weeks of your time. Pichotta stated or we could do that moving forward and try to get a sense when we do get something in, what kind of staff time, not necessarily record every minute, but have a sense, do that for a period of time and make some decisions based on that. Sanden stated, yes, he agreed. Chairman Fetzer suggested maybe we do something similar, doesn't have to be down to the minute, but at least an idea. Gulbranson stated he agreed with the idea, but also, if we felt that there were some fees that were pretty low in compared to the other counties, maybe we should hit them up a little bit now and also work on the time study. Pichotta said how about we review it, maybe come up with a few things that we think should be additions in the short term or changes in the short term and then we do the tracking thing, and have a larger discussion towards the fall. Chairman Fetzer stated he thought that was a good idea. Clare wanted to say as a tax payer, you could look at it as part of a public service that you guys provide to do this, on the other hand, anytime I talk to my attorney or my tax accountant, they are billing me by the minute. Clare said maybe there is a compromise between the two. Clare said he could not ask Lund to do everything she did for \$300 versus an attorney, if they respond to an email its \$5. Clare said as a consumer he would expect to pay a little more than what he did for the service he received. Sanden stated the department is supported by tax money, so it wouldn't be 100% recouped through fees, but some percentage of it. Chairman Fetzer thanked Clare for the input. Pichotta stated that is what we will do, and there is no need for a motion, we were just looking for some direction. Sanden wanted to say that he wouldn't want the tracking to be onerous, nothing down to the real specific, if that is going to burden you to have to document every little thing you do, just a general picture. Chairman Fetzer asked for any further comments. No action taken.

Approved

Discuss take action on Travel/Training Requests. Pichotta stated he had no Travel/Training Requests.

Future agenda items: Pichotta stated we don't have anything for April 17th or May 1st, we do have Western Mustang coming to the 2nd meeting in May to give us an update on what is going on with their solar project, and possibly preliminary plat approval for Chad Stone in the Town of Diamond Bluff. Aubart noted that we will also have the re organization for the committee at that meeting.

Motion to adjourn at 7:01pm by Puhmann/Aubart seconded. Motion passed.

Respectfully submitted by A. Anderson