

MINUTES  
Stevens Point Urban Area Sewer Service Advisory Committee  
September 19, 2007

Members Present: Elmer Fournier, Village of Park Ridge; Jeanne Dodge, Town of Stockton; John Holdridge, Town of Hull; Dan Schlutter, Village of Plover; Carl Karcheski, Town of Linwood; Tim Karcheski, Town of Plover

Members Excused: Andrew Halverson, City of Stevens Point and Jerry Walters, Village of Whiting

Technical Advisory Staff Present: Dan Mahoney, Village of Plover; John Gardner, City of Stevens Point

Others Present: Richard Holden, Village of Plover; Richard Barden, Town of Linwood Alternate

Staff Present: Jeff Schuler and Paula Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman Fournier called the meeting to order at 5:05 pm in Conference Room 5 of the Courthouse Annex. Cummings confirmed a quorum was present.

2. Welcome and Remarks from the Chair

Chair Fournier welcomed those in attendance.

3. Approval of Agenda

Schlutter moved to approve the September 19, 2007 agenda as received and T. Karcheski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Action on Minutes of June 6, 2007

With no discussion necessary, Schlutter moved to approve the June 6 minutes and T. Karcheski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Members of the Public Who Wish to Address the Committee on Specific Agenda Items Must Register Their Request at This Time, With Such Comments Subject to the Reasonable Control of the Committee Chair as Set Forth in Robert's Rules of Order

No one registered to speak.

6. Discussion on Individual Chapters of the Stevens Point Urban Area Areawide Water Quality Management Plan

Schuler stated the Committee has been given three new pieces of information today: 1. A copy of an email received from Tom Gilbert with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) commenting on what the Committee has done to-date. Schuler asked Committee members to use this as a reference as they go through the document. 2. Six of seven chapters of our document, which include changes from the last meeting, as well as a few others suggestions that will be reviewed today. Schuler's thought was that members would take this handout home, review it, talk about it in-depth next time, be ready to take action on it, and then move it to a public information meeting and public hearing process before final Committee action. 3. At the previous meeting, Committee members requested two maps that were missing: a map showing the combination of different constraints that are in the urban area (Map 3.6), and Map 6.1, which is a draft of what the sewer service boundary might look like when the Committee is done with the process.

Schuler noted in the DNR's feedback, they said there are some things in Chapters 3 and 4 that needed attention, along with the sewer service line. He asked members to turn to page 16 of the document provided, which is the first page of Chapter 3. The DNR is looking for environmentally sensitive areas to be defined. This is an important portion of the document and is a term the DNR looks for. These are areas you are not supposed to include in your sewer service area. Schuler looked at what was identified previously and it did not have a really good description as to how to approach this issue. Schuler stated he inserted the definition of the requirement directly from the Wisconsin Administrative Code and an explanation of how this Chapter will inventory the type of environmental areas we have. We will talk about environmental factors here in Chapter 3, but the environmentally sensitive areas for protection will be selected in Chapter 6. We are trying to simplify this for the DNR as they review it.

Schuler asked Committee members to go to page 41 of Chapter 4, which deals with projections for population, households, etc. This Chapter sets the stage for what the Sewer Service Area will look like. The DNR had concerns as to how this area was previously described. Schuler reminded the Committee that this chapter is a work in progress. Schuler has met with the City of Stevens Point and the Village of Plover to talk about how the sewer service area will be represented. Schuler stated he is having a bit of difficulty processing that information into a way he feels the DNR will embrace it and fully understand it. He wants to give the DNR the information they need to approve it in a boiled-down version. He does not want to toss too much information their way. With the recent completion of the Comprehensive Planning process, there is a lot of background information and he would prefer to give them only what they need. As part of this chapter, Schuler added two new sections by taking text that was originally in Section 4.7, a very long section, and including a projection of land uses that might be needed. He then added a new heading for the extraterritorial area that includes what is going on in the incorporated communities in Section 4.7. Section 4.8 starts describing what is in the extraterritorial area, separate from the incorporated communities. Section 4.9 on page 45, will be the focus of the chapter. It will describe the recommended boundary that came out of the comprehensive plans. Hopefully, this will be easier to read and more focused. The chart at the bottom will describe how those areas are expanded and the reasons why they are that way. That is the information we will have at the next meeting.

Referring to page 50, Schuler indicated he did not have the Village of Whiting's 2006 compliance maintenance report and will get that from Walters.

Turning to page 52, Schuler stated that is the updated table with information from the different communities.

On page 58, Schuler noted this is where, hopefully, it will be more focused for the DNR as well. This coincides with the email he provided from Gilbert today. You'll now see how we addressed the DNR's concerns within the document. Schuler stated he is looking for feedback as to whether these edits makes sense.

Chapter 3 discussed environmental areas, but it was previously made to sound like all areas were environmentally sensitive. When the DNR sees those words, they automatically expect those areas to be excluded. The DNR suggested looking at those areas in two ways; therefore, on page 58, the idea is introduced that there are certain things, namely floodway, wetlands, and steep slopes, which are going to be called environmentally sensitive areas that would not be included in the sewer service area. The rest of the things we talked about in the previous chapter, such as high groundwater, high bedrock, good agricultural land, and restrictive ownership, will be called secondary environmental areas. There will then be a distinction. The DNR felt that a good idea and Schuler agrees. It has now been rewritten along those lines, so the DNR knows they can look in paragraph A and see what is not supposed to be in there and look at paragraph B to see what perhaps are sensitive areas, but also included in sewerable area. That is the main distinction and puts a finer point on the document.

Schuler stated those are the main changes from the last time. If members are familiar with the previous document, those are the things that will be different and hopefully read better.

Schuler asked to verify whether the two step approach for environmental description is a good idea; it is what the DNR is looking for. There are areas that should be out, and others that should be noted as sensitive, but if you work with them properly or with proper accommodations, they are fine to include in your sewer area.

Dodge felt that must be true of other areas with this type of document; that would be why the DNR requested we list important and secondary areas. Schuler added that Portage County's original plan did not do that. Mahoney felt this clarifies the intent by explaining it in better detail. C. Karcheski felt Schuler did a really good job on this and beyond that, really went into depth on it.

Gardner asked whether some layers could be turned off on the environmental map (Map 3.6) in order to distinguish between primary and secondary areas. Schuler felt that was clarified in the document text, and Map 3.6 was not to be looked at for the area distinction, but rather it would have all the layers turned on. Dodge suggested that disclaimer be added to the bottom of the map. Schuler said that was a good point, but felt the reader will recognize that from the text.

Schuler referred to map 6.1, which is a starter, discussion map. This map includes areas that we are really trying to get a grip for what is located where. The graphics end is never straightforward and easy, but we are working through it to try to really make sure all of the information is identified, reproducible, and understandable for the DNR. Right now the approach, as staff met on this, was to proceed first with submitting a map that reflects what comprehensive plans said. The comprehensive plan said these are the lines we have drawn for what we believe future sewer service should be. Our initial submittal to the DNR will be that information. Unfortunately, Schuler stated, he has not yet been able to get this approach, with the map and table, to them for feedback. Schuler hopes to do that prior to the next meeting. If the DNR does not find that acceptable, we will then take their reasons and work on responding to them. Schuler stated he would not know why this would not be acceptable because we had three years of planning to draw those lines in the first place and we will bring out subtle or straightforward reasons from those plans as to why the lines are established like that. We will meet with the DNR, if we have to.

Holdridge asked whether Schuler was referring to the overall comprehensive plan for the urban area. Schuler replied he is referring to individual plans, which have stronger lines that were then incorporated into the urban area document. When the City of Stevens Point and Village of Plover passed their plans, those were the lines. Holdridge asked what about the towns; we also had comprehensive plans and I cannot remember what the Town of Hull passed. Did we pass something pertaining to this? Schuler answered no, you would not have done anything with the sewer service line, but the incorporated municipalities would have. Looking at the Village of Plover's Plan, it is the product of discussions with the Town of Plover. From that angle, it is a part of an agreement they reached as their plans were developed. Holdridge stated, in the Town of Hull, there has been no discussion with the City of Stevens Point. Schuler noted that is an ongoing process between the Town of Hull and City of Stevens Point. Holdridge then noted the Town of Hull has submitted requests to the City of Stevens Point with no reply and we have a couple of areas in common. We are waiting for Gardner and his crew to respond so we can get this joint thing because it was the premise of all this intergovernmental communication on plans, etc. Schuler stated Holdridge would find the sewer service line does not extend too far into the Town of Hull other than its current location. Holdridge replied he does not know what that is. Schuler referred to the map, stating the yellow line is the existing plan, and the bold, red line is the proposed new line. You can see where the Town of Hull is concerned, the line is pretty much where it was before. Schuler asked Holdridge to call with any questions he may have regarding the proposed sewer service line. Holdridge asked whether it was safe to discard all handouts prior to those received today and Schuler replied what you have today is the most recent copy. Holdridge asked if there was one more chapter yet to come and Schuler answered yes, Chapter 7 must still be compared with the bylaws. Fournier suggested saving all maps.

#### 7. Next Meeting Date

Schuler went on to discuss the possibility of the public information meeting and public hearing being done in tandem. If the Committee receives good feedback from the DNR and we hold our normal meeting in October, then anytime in mid-October we could have a public information meeting. Schuler asked whether it was okay to meet at our normal date in October, which would be the first Wednesday. Holdridge said his intent is to run the proposed Sewer Service Plan through the Town of Hull Plan Commission and get their recommendation because they are involved in this. He would also run this by the Hull Town Board. Fournier felt the public meeting could be held after municipalities involve their Plan Commission and Board. Dodge felt that was a good idea, noting the Town of Stockton has virtually all new Plan Commission members since the comprehensive plan was completed. Holdridge noted the Plan Commission advises the Town Board and it is good to get all those people involved. Fournier felt the more involved they are, the more ownership they will have. Dodge felt you might get more feedback from the Plan Commission and Board than from those attending the public hearing. Schuler felt if we get an okay from the DNR, at the October meeting the Committee may feel the document is good to go to the public hearing process and set the dates at that time. Fournier asked municipalities to run this through their Plan Commission and Board before the end of October. This would allow the Committee to hold its public meeting and hearing in November. Holdridge asked when the Committee would have Chapter 7 and Schuler replied in a couple of weeks. Fournier clarified the Committee will receive a final draft, hopefully with the DNR's blessing, at the October meeting. We will then take the Plan to our respective Boards and Plan Commissions and come back the first Wednesday in November to hold a public meeting and public hearing. Holdridge suggested sliding the process into January; he does not see the hurry at this point. Mahoney felt we should not wait because each municipality has one month to bring the document to the necessary parties at regular or special meetings. Holdridge did not want to pressure the Town of Hull's Committee and Board members. Dodge noted Schuler stated he would have Chapter 7 available in a couple of weeks, which would be October 3, and Schuler stated that would not be a problem. Fournier felt the schedule he read through should work. Fournier asked members whether they agreed to the schedule and hearing no negative reply, found consensus by members.

8. Adjournment

With no further discussion necessary, T. Karcheski moved to adjourn and Dodge seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 5:33 pm by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Elmer Fournier, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.