Marathon County
Environmental Resources Team
Technical Advisory Team
Minutes
Monday, April 1, 2013
210 River Drive
Wausau, WI

Attendance:

Present Not Present

Rebecca Frisch ........ X
Dave Mack ................. X
Andy Johnson .................. X
Diane Wessel .......... X
Paul Daigle .......... X
Ken Pozorski .......... X

Not Present

Bill Duncanson ............ X
Tom Lovlien ............ X
Jim Griesbach .......... X
Mary Kluz ................... X (arrived late)
Dale Grosskurth .......... X
Meleesa Johnson .................. X

1. Call to Order.
Meeting was called to order by Frisch at 10:00 am.

2. Approve Minutes of the January 9, 2013 Meeting.
Action: MOTION / SECOND BY GROSSKURTH / DAIGLE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 9, 2013 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.

Discussion: The following update of the process review was provided:
• Discussions held at environmental resources committee (ERC), executive committee (EC) and with the county administrator;
  o The discussions were separate from those regarding the proposed safe water project as concerns with the process had been recognized;
  o The EC directed the county administrator to develop a simplified process and criteria;
  o The county administrator had approved the involvement of the ERC/TAT in the initial development of the process and criteria, the TAT would not be involved in the final process;
  o In the final process, the ERC would be responsible for ranking projects and making recommendations to the county board;
  o Conservation, Planning, and Zoning (CPZ) would be the custodian of records and responsible for gathering information from relevant sources, including the members of the TAT, to develop sufficient information to enable the ERC to make an informed decision and recommendation.

• A revised outline of the application/review process was distributed and discussed:
  o The involvement of the finance department would be a verification of available funds and submitting written documentation;
  o The challenge of a funded project attracting young professionals to the county and the means to measure this;
  o Review of some of the questions on the old ranking form;
  o The county’s policy to use the funds for the types of projects allowed in the original legislation which had an emphasis on environmental projects – the assumption was made that this policy would remain in effect;
  o Consistency with plans:
    ▪ Consistency between the county’s various plans and its goal of being the healthiest, safest and most prosperous county;
    ▪ Applicants should be asked to demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with county and local plans;
    ▪ Applicants should be asked to demonstrate how the proposed project would contribute to the county achieving its stated goals;
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- Implementing plans’ goals may have more weight than consistency;
  - Weight of collaboration/partnerships and multiple funding sources – contributes to “high profile” of project.
- Draft initial “sudden death” questions to “pre-qualify” a project for consideration:
  - Related to the environment / specific county plan;
  - Contributes to the county’s goal of being the healthiest, safest and most prosperous;
  - The population / geographic area served to make a regional impact;
  - Collaboration and partnerships on project;
  - Description of the demographics of the users of the project to demonstrate the benefits to the county;
  - Timeline/sources for funding of the project.
- Develop guidance instructions to accompany the application to clarify what is wanted as this could result in a shortened application form;
- The impression that the county would be interested in “bigger, broader” projects on county land or property which may make them more affordable/available to the county residents;
- Concerns expressed during discussion included:
  - The annual August 1st deadline:
    - Contrary to other funding sources deadlines, e.g. grant cycles;
    - Limits flexibility to react to an unforeseen project;
  - Appeared contrary to expectations of young professionals (the now generation not wanting to wait).

**Action:** NO ACTION NEEDED AT THIS TIME.

**Follow Through:** The discussed criteria will be sent to the members for comment/review via e-mail. The county administrator will be advised of the concerns and asked for clarification and he will follow through with the Executive Committee. If necessary another meeting of the TAT will be scheduled.

4. Adjourn.
   There being no further business to discuss, **MOTION / SECOND BY WESSEL / MACK TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 11:15 A.M. MOTION CARRIED BY VOICE VOTE, NO DISSENT.**

Submitted by:
Rebecca Frisch, Director
Conservation, Planning, and Zoning Department
April 4, 2013
RJF/ljs