

**Meeting Minutes:
Door County “Smart Growth” Plan
Intergovernmental Cooperation Work Group – 2nd Meeting
March 4th, 2008**

1. Open meeting/introductions.

The second meeting of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Work Group was held in the Sturgeon Bay Library Conference Room, 107 S. 4th Avenue, Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin, on Tuesday, March 4th, 2008. The meeting started at 12:30 p.m.

Present:

Last Name	First Name	Agency
Guillette	Gale	Union, Town of
Kohnle	Amy	United Way
Meyer	Ken	Property Owner
Olson	Patrick	Property Owner
Overdahl	Ron	Washington Island, Town of
Paitrick	Mary	Door County Economic Development Corporation
Stawicki	Jim	Sturgeon Bay Utilities
Tepe	Roger	Door County Department of Social Services

Also present:

Mariah Goode, Door County Planning
Becky Kerwin, Door County Planning
Rob Burke, UW - Extension

2. Review previous meeting minutes.

The minutes were accepted with no revisions.

3. Review/discuss visioning work completed to date.

Prior to the second meeting, the work group was to have reviewed the county visioning summary documents including the General Issues and Opportunities, the draft Vision Statement, and the County Visioning Summary – Parts A & B. The readings for the second work group are posted to the website located at http://map.co.door.wi.us/planning/Comp-Plan/work-group_reading.htm. Intergovernmental cooperation, though not ranking highly as its own category, is closely associated with all the topics that did rank highly. Topics such as economic development, housing, transportation, social services, and natural resources protection all require participation at the multi-jurisdictional/agency level.

4. Visioning exercises re: work group topic area(s).

Goode explained that at this meeting the group would discuss the four questions listed below. She explained that an issue is a weakness that is internal to the county or it can be an external threat originating from outside the county. An opportunity is a strength that is internal to the county or it can be an external trend that could be capitalized upon within the county.

- What words or phrases best capture your preferred future vision for the county with regard to this work group’s designated topics?
- Within the context of your preferred future vision for the county, what are the key issues we currently face with regard to this work group’s designated topics?

- Again, within the context of your preferred future vision, what opportunities are available to or should be pursued for the county?
- What strategies or action items might be employed to address those issues or take advantage of those opportunities?

What words or phrases best capture your preferred future vision for the county with regard to intergovernmental cooperation?

- Telecommunications improvement
- County-based/unified web system, with links to towns and their ordinances, etc.
- Avoid duplication of efforts – communication
- Model/standard ordinances created by county; creation/adoption of county-level ordinances, when appropriate
- Codification of ordinances – standardize across towns
- Steering committee/leadership from each municipality
 - On-going discussions/meetings
 - CPC could become “official”/permanent
- Reduced parochialism and shared services
 - Get rid of divisions between county and city
 - Get rid of divisions between towns
 - Make these a priority on part of leaders
 - Examples: city on county’s phone system, parts of county on city’s utilities system
- More involvement of local officials on/with county committees
 - Invite local officials to county meetings – interact/attendance without being there due to a complaint!
- More education/training with regard to committee placement (county and local elected/appointed officials)
 - Consideration of person’s strengths/knowledge when making appointments
- Dealing with regionalization/mandates from above (Social Services, DCEDC – see issues, below)

Within the context of your preferred future vision for the county, what are the key issues we currently face with regard to intergovernmental cooperation?

- County Social Services Department – in 3-5 years, between 1/3 and 1/2 of the department’s budget will be controlled by the state
 - “Family Care” program/reorganization/consolidation efforts
 - Will affect County Community Programs and Public Health Departments, too
 - Not only funding will change, but also programs – county will be told which services to provide, to which customers, at what cost per person
 - The money will drive the programs, rather than the reverse
 - What and how it is delivered will be determined outside the county
- DCEDC is facing similar mandates/efforts from the state with regard to revolving loan funds, etc. – money/programs are being regionalized
- Conflicts between different plans, particularly with different levels of government – will we have a county-wide framework for comprehensive planning? Who will resolve conflicts? (courts, arbitrators, who?)
- Coordination of county agencies/committees with towns and their needs – are we set up to be user-friendly, efficient, cooperative?
- Population trends – aging, etc. – and impact on long-term and other care issues, schools and funding, etc.
- School funding system
- Income separation in the county – most are either low or high income; no or significantly diminishing middle class
- Development/planning/zoning
 - Segmenting/separating uses
 - Spreading them out

- Old style of development – used to build around schools, commercial developments; low/moderate income housing used to be part of planning, not seen as a “separate” use to establish
- Transportation
 - Need supports, options
 - Older people may want (or be required) to walk more
 - Sidewalks
- Zoning regulations/restrictions
 - Single-family residences – should we be allowing “in-law” or caregiver apartments?
 - Will we at some point disallow further development in agricultural areas?
- Telecommunications/internet access
- Aging and Disability Resource Center – will be created in the next couple of years (state mandate? related to Family Care initiative?)
 - Will be a physical place with services for elderly and physically and/or mentally disabled
 - Will be attached to Senior Resource Center
 - Services for kids and AODA services may be added eventually, too
- Department of Transportation
 - Are we being forced into roundabouts we don’t want/need?
 - Are roundabouts better/safer for anything other than cars?
 - Will this take away money we may want/need eventually for highway improvements/expansion from the Bayview Bridge north to the 42/57 split?
- School consolidation/service sharing
 - Sturgeon Bay and Sevastopol consolidation
 - Issue should be explored further/seriously
 - Schools are less than 5 miles apart – only schools it makes sense to consolidate due to county’s geography
 - Sharing superintendent(s), services
 - Regional (county-level) administration should be considered/pursued
 - Note: consolidation may be the opposite of concept of establishing small, self-sufficient communities built around schools, commercial services, etc.
- Collective bargaining – cost of government is a huge issue with regard to all these topics
- Privatization of services/departments (relates to cost issue)
- Work to confront bureaucratic mindset
 - Government has no incentive to be proactive – change is often foisted on you (budget cuts from above, referenda, etc.)

Again, within the context of your preferred future vision, what opportunities are available to or should be pursued for the county?

- Internet savvy, telecommunications improvements
 - Computer costs decreasing
 - Technology coming that will combine TV, computers, phone – hopefully in 20 years all will have access to this combined service
 - Increasing prevalence of wireless/Blackberries
- Opportunities to say what/how we want our programs/infrastructure/services to be set up, since some of these initiatives are just beginning
 - Citizen input needed
 - Advocacy groups/advocates needed
- Bring community members into what’s happening in the community with regard to planning and other issues
- Intergovernmental cooperation in Door County is good with regard to telecommunications, emergency services, law enforcement (constables, sheriff’s department), ambulance, RFP regarding fiber optic, etc. – are there lessons there that can be applied to other issue areas?

What strategies or action items might be employed to address those issues or take advantage of those opportunities?

- Legislative pressure
 - Social Services Department issues and others
- Central source/clearinghouse of information/resources/referrals/tracking of concerns and issues
 - County-level makes sense – coordination/explanation of multi-service providers and of providers offering related services
 - Internet can also serve more and more as central source of information
 - Follow Door Tran (consortium) model?
- Make the Core Planning Committee a standing committee with “set” local government members
 - Turn-over might be an issue
 - Whether or not views of appointee are representative of community might be an issue
 - Official appointment, or possibly elect at annual meeting?
- Increased educational opportunities for elected/appointed officials
- Better/more forthcoming with requests for access to public records
- Work on ways to get more people to attend meetings
 - Broadcast local meetings on local cable access, or
 - Have available at library, or
 - Have on website – could download text (transcripts would need to be made), or audio, or visual
 - Website audio or visual download for all meetings would be ultimate goal
 - Get meetings listed in the Peninsula Pulse “events” calendar
 - Better distribute county list of monthly meetings
 - County/government article in Advocate once a week
 - Radio showcasing – WDOR and WBDK
- Need to coordinate/share beyond our borders – people live and work across the county borders
- Library service-sharing – study potential duplication of services, efforts in order to save money
- Public safety
 - Police presence/services – can more be done at the local municipal level (coordinated with county-level services), so as to ensure back-up, services specific to municipal needs, etc.?
 - Constables
 - Cooperative service agreements
 - Education needed for residents as to how all these services are currently set up, funded, subject to agreements, etc.
- School/education issues
 - Look into having one superintendent for the five school districts – see Green Bay as a potential model
 - Then look into other consolidation/service sharing opportunities
 - Continue to work on NWTC funding issues
- List in county plan of conflicts with other plans and how/when we’ll address them since we may not have time to fix those problems before 2010
- County-wide grant applications
 - Renew eCivis membership when Wisconsin component of project is complete (currently no state-level or local grant information included in eCivis system)
- Composite system for internet – fiber and wireless, etc. – fiber optic “backbone” running up county with wireless “hot spots” scattered beyond (eventually expand fiber out)
- County-based web system with links to towns, ordinances, etc.
- Tourism zone – get whole county designated as “premier” so ability to increase sales tax is there
 - Coordination/planning – use of room tax funds
- Planning Department
 - Continue to improve relationships with towns
 - Look into towns using Door County Planning Department to administer town-level zoning
- County-level coordination of efforts such as:
 - Parks (maintenance agreements)

- Signage – consistent or at least similar, no billboards
- Zoning (models, assistance for areas not under county jurisdiction)
- Airport coordination (not just Cherryland)
- Trails systems

5. Set next meeting date.

12:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, April 9th, 2008

Location: Sturgeon Bay Library Conference Room

6. Adjourn.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 2:25 p.m.

Minutes transcribed by Becky Kerwin and Mariah Goode, Door County Planning