

MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
December 17, 2015 – 7 am – Conference Room 3, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, and Potocki

Member Absent: Gifford

Others Present: Mike Wiza, Mayor, City of Stevens Point

Staff Present: Schuler, Portage County Planning and Zoning and Jossie, County Finance

Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7 am in Conference Room 3 of the County Annex.

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.

Director's Reports:

Capital Improvements – Jossie had nothing to report at this time.

Economic Development /Business Park Update – Schuler stated a farmland/agriculture meeting would be held January 6, 2016 at 6 pm at Sentry Theater. Even though the focus is on agriculture, there is an overall impact to discussion on economic development. Agriculture experts will be present and Schuler encouraged the Committee to attend.

4. Discussion/Action on the Minutes of the November 12 and December 9, 2015 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved approval of the November 12 and December 9 minutes. Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Enter into Closed Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85 (1) (e), Wis. Stats., for Competitive or Bargaining Reasons to Deliberate, Review, and Negotiate Terms for the Sale/Conveyance of Land in the Portage County Business Park

Jankowski moved to enter closed session and Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

6. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Reconvene in Open Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85(2), Wis. Stats.

Jankowski moved to reconvene open session and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

7. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session Under Agenda Item 5

Motion by Pazdernik, second by Jankowski to approve donating the land for municipal road purposes to the City of Stevens Point to construct Worth Court, with construction related costs solely the responsibility of Stevens Point. Motion passed by voice vote.

8. Adjourn

The next meeting will held December 23, 2015 regarding Worth Court. With no further business to come before the Committee, Potocki moved adjournment and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
December 9, 2015 – 7 am – Conference Room 3, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Potocki and Gifford

Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance; Patty Dreier, County Executive Office; Mike Wiza, City of Stevens Point; Nathan Check, County Highway Commissioner; Dan Mahoney and Tom Davies, Village of Plover; and Mike McKenna and David Hickethier, County Corporation Counsel

Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7 am in Conference Room 3 of the County Annex.

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.

Director's Reports:

Capital Improvements – Jossie had nothing to report at this time.

Economic Development /Business Park Update – Schuler had nothing to report at this time.

1. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Enter into Closed Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85 (1) (e), Wis. Stats., for Competitive or Bargaining Reasons to Deliberate, Review, and Negotiate Terms for the Sale of Certain Parcels of 420 Acres of Land Owned by Portage County in the Village of Plover

Gifford moved to enter closed session and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote. Closed session begins 7:02 am.

2. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Reconvene in Open Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85(2), Wis. Stats.

Jankowski moved to reconvene in open session and Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote. Open session reconvenes 7:15 am.

3. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session Under Agenda Item 1, Including Resolution to the Board of Supervisors

Jankowski moved to accept the offer to purchase and adopt the resolution as discussed regarding the sale of certain parcels of 420 acres of land owned by Portage County in the Village of Plover. Gifford seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Adjourn

The next meeting will held December 17, 2015 regarding Worth Court, which would be a closed session meeting for competitive reasons.

With no further business to come before the Committee, Jankowski moved adjournment and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:20 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
November 12, 2015 – 7 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Potocki and Gifford

Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance; Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Mike Wiza, Michael Ostrowski, and Scott Schatschneider, City of Stevens Point; Nathan Check, County Highway Commissioner; Bruce Gerland, AECOM; Dan Drexler, Stratford Sign; Mike Theiss and Chris Ghidorzi, Ghidorzi; and Todd Kuckkahn, Portage County Business Council

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7 am in Conference Room 2 of the County Annex.

2. 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.

3. Director's Reports:

Capital Improvements – Jossie had nothing to report at this time.

Economic Development /Business Park Update – Schuler had nothing to report at this time.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the September 30 and November 3, 2015 Minutes

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the September 30 and November 3, 2015 minutes. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XI(G) – Determination of Multi-Tenant Status for the Larger Investors Community Bank Project Area, Land Bounded by County Roads R and HH, John Joanis Drive, and Carrie Frost Drive

Schuler stated there are two tasks to complete before the Committee today related to the larger Investors Community Bank project, including action as to whether the project is to be considered a multi-tenant development, and in the next agenda item action is to be taken on sign waivers.

Schuler noted requirements generally state one site, one building, one sign; or possibly two signs on a double frontage lot. An approved concept in April 2015 for this corner property included a lot layout or a master plan site with shared architecture or thematically connected as a place within the park. The signage concept has been pursued from that viewpoint.

Staff considers this project a hybrid; it is not a classic single building with multiple tenants, it is a larger site with multiple independent developed properties – a campus type environment. Based on that concept, signage could be a convenient theme carried throughout and would meet qualifications of a multi-tenant site. Staff recommends the project been deemed a multi-tenant site.

With no further discussion, Jankowski moved to approve multi-tenant designation on the larger Investors Community Bank project area. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion Possible Action on Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XI(C) – Request for Sign Height and Area Waivers, Investors Community Bank Site and Larger Project Area

Schuler stated with the multi-tenant site designation just approved, the sign plan could now be negotiated with staff per Covenants. Multi-tenant opens a development up to a more complex signage package. Given the nature of the originally proposed signs, staff could not just approve them. CIP/EDC must first designate the site as multi-tenant and then address the theme and scale of proposed signs.

Schuler stated this development is on a very important corner of the Portage County Business Park. Signs previously approved include one for the building and two internal directional signs. A pond proposed on the corner area has been removed from the site plan. Once the pond was removed from the design, the developer was asked to come back with a revised idea for that corner. Schuler noted if a retaining wall is necessary on the corner due to grading, that is fine, but must be explained to the Committee. Idsvoog asked if that was discussed with developers and Schuler replied yes. When you enter the Investors Community Bank site, the entryway leads to 3 development sites; one being Investors Community Bank, and two undeveloped sites not attached to the bank building itself, but rather standalone developments. The sign proposed for the entry is a 21-foot high, 3-panel sign, and as you proceed down the driveway, there are two 9-foot high, single building identification signs. Schuler said given the location and function of the signs, it seems a bit much, and asked to talk to the developer.

Schuler explained with that proposal, staff's recommendation, based on intent of the Covenants, was a low-key, low-impact approach to signage. Further noting, Covenants include a 5-foot high maximum on standalone monument signs.

Theiss presented graphics of the updated sign plan. He described the signage as unique and necessary to get easily to your destination. He described the site as having a campus plan, including signage. The first entryway sign, off John Joanis Drive, needs to identify businesses within the small campus. A person entering the development would see that sign and proceed down the boulevard to the businesses (Investors Community Bank, Outlot 1, and Outlot 2). There are 600 feet from the bank building to the entryway on John Joanis Drive. He described the lot as deep and unique, and to overcome that, a boulevard was planned to accommodate entryways to other lots yet to be developed.

Theiss noted once on the boulevard, the 9-foot sign is available to those developing the lots. Whether the developments will be multi or single tenant, is unknown now. The next sign, previously approved, is a small directional sign so people entering the parking lot can see how to navigate to the drive-up area, etc. A sign on the building itself had been previously approved, but will not happen; the plan has changed and it is no longer feasible.

Theiss then discussed the final piece of signage on the retaining wall facing the County road intersection. He noted the water feature previously proposed would not be built due to cost constraints. The retaining wall remains necessary and signage is proposed on the wall. The retaining wall sign is the main sign for Investors Community Bank due to the amount of traffic on the intersection of County Roads R and HH. Theiss felt the bank building does a lot for that corner of the Park.

Drexler described the three proposed sign types and provided handouts. He noted the two smaller signs were previously approved. The proposal in April 2015 included 21-foot and 9-foot signs. After talking with Schuler and reviewing signs within the Park, they understood receiving approval for their proposed signs could be difficult. Therefore, the signage plan was adjusted. The new signage proposal reflects what is felt to be effective for the businesses. The main campus entry sign has "Investors Place" at the top, to identify the property, and three tenant identification panels, with the size of this sign reduced to 15 feet high and 13 feet long. Drexler referred to the Portage County Bank sign within the Park, noting its size is almost 13 feet high and 14 feet long for one building, one location. The Adventure 212 sign measures 14 feet high by 13 feet long. With 25 mph traffic, which is a slower speed, Drexler felt the proposed sign is the minimum need to be effective even with that traffic speed.

Idsvoog asked Schuler if he was okay with the proposed sign adjustments. Schuler replied yes and felt Drexler's analysis of the other Park signs was correct. Schuler asked Drexler if the same sign materials are being used as originally proposed, including tailored stone, brick, and stone to match the building. Drexler replied sign materials have not changed; all elements of the building are included in the signs.

Drexler then referred to the two directional inlet signs for Lots 2 and 3, and noted the same materials would be used, smaller business identification panels would be utilized at 31" X 59", and the signs are reduced to 6 feet high. He further noted the signs would not be installed until lots are developed.

Drexler then described the sign located on the retaining wall – the main corner sign, and stated they are bringing back this sign as originally presented. The lot layout has a slope that is lower at the corner. The sign comes in at 5 feet high and it is felt going lower is not possible. He noted when coming to the site, driving east to west, the sign would be viewed somewhat shorter than 5 feet due to placement. The letters are 14 inches, which again, is felt to be at the very minimum and still be effective. The sign's logo and lettering falls within Covenant guidelines. The size of the structure itself is larger than allowed.

Schuler felt what had been described is reasonable and staff supports it. Schuler noted the Covenants do require landscaping around the signs, but today's graphics do not show landscaping. With the nature of the grade requiring the retaining wall, Schuler wanted to know the landscaping plan. Theiss replied landscaping would be managed around the retaining wall sign, as being done by Rettler Corporation. They must be cognizant of landscaping because when inside the building you will see the backside of the retaining wall, so there is a landscaping strip proposed around the back of the wall. He is unsure whether there is anything planned for the front. There is boulevard landscaping that would be utilized around the entire building. He offered to supply the plan to Schuler. Idsvoog felt approval, with an understanding that Schuler will oversee the landscaping, is possible. Schuler agreed and added that landscaping other than described would require a waiver. This would also address the standing landscaping requirement of the other areas as they are developed and new signs come in.

Pazdernik asked Schuler if they were just building a retaining wall without signage on it, would retaining wall approval have come before the Committee. Schuler replied today we are just addressing signs and the developer is taking good advantage of a structure needed for the property in order to ask for a sign on the retaining wall.

Gifford questioned Lot 4 on the graphic (fronting Carrie Frost Drive) and asked what was planned there. Theiss replied as far as signage, it would replicate the campus sign on John Joanis Drive, but with only two developments, it would be one panel shorter. Theiss reiterated they want the entire campus to tie together and he envisions the same type of campus sign in that area. Ghidorzi noted the buildings might be multi-tenant as there is room for two 10,000-foot users in each, which could result in three or more tenants dependent on the size they need. The sign would need to identify those tenants; possibly panels would be split.

Potocki moved to approve the sign height and area waivers as presented today with landscaping to be overseen by Planning and Zoning staff. Motion seconded by Pazdernik and passed by voice vote.

#### 7. Discussion/Possible Action on Proposed Extension of Worth Court

Schuler stated due to traffic in this area evolving with the opening and future expansion of the Skyward property, we need to address traffic during busy parts of the day. Idsvoog noted he spoke to Wiza, who told him Stevens Point would pay for road construction. Idsvoog asked if any unintended consequences of this construction had been explored.

Schatschneider stated AECOM conducted a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and as a result, it was determined signals were not a good idea at the EM Copps and County Road R intersection, and a possible driving hazard could be created for southbound traffic on County Road R due to the grade of the hill. As part of AECOM's TIA, they looked at alternatives that could be incorporated into the intersection design with low impact. As part of the TIA, Stevens Point's agreement with Skyward to improve the EM Copps and County Road R intersection, and the possible expansion of the Cold Storage Facility to the east, the improvements proposed are low impact. Improvements include turn lanes for north/south and east/west bound traffic on EM Copps Drive. Check noted the City would be required to obtain a right-of-way permit from the County Highway Department to do the work. Idsvoog asked for clarification that there are no right-of-way problems; we do not want to buy land later. Check noted Skyward owns the parcel to the north-west. Scholfield noted the other three corners are all County-owned. Schatschneider noted turn lanes were anticipated, and there is an agreement with Skyward for the land required for turn lanes.

Schuler noted the turn lanes seem to go directly over two Business Park identification signs already in place; asking is that true? Schatschneider replied yes. Schatschneider stated that is their "first crack" at improving the intersection. When it was determined signals might not work, the City wanted to look into alternatives and utilize existing signals at Lands' End Way and County Road R with minimal impact. The idea of extending Worth Court south then came up; therefore, we are introducing that today. The extension would allow folks from

Skyward to access a signal, not directly, but would allow them to utilize it to go north. Idsvoog asked if this would take care of what would happen if there were 1,000 employees; that type of intensified population. Gerland stated several scenarios for the build out of the Business Park and East Commerce Center were analyzed out to year 2026, and both intersections would function at a level of service required – Level C in the handout. Schuler asked if the build-out analysis anticipated the 14-acres south of Skyward along I39 developing for 200-300 employees as originally anticipated by the former “Ministry” project. Schuler asked if the originally anticipated development by Ministry complicates Gerland’s view of Clem’s Way with the extension of Worth Court and those additional employees. Traffic would likely utilize Clem’s Way to a certain degree as well. Gerland replied current signals can handle significantly more traffic than currently managed.

Jossie asked a question about the impact of leaving Skyward’s property and driving Business Park Drive to Clem’s Way, versus extending Worth Court. Business Park Drive is an existing road that goes to Clem’s Way, which gives access to signal lights. Gerland replied it provides a second access down to the signal lights at Lands’ End. Currently, with the cul-de-sac, anything that developed south of EM Copps that accesses the cul-de-sac would have to come up and then go all the way around. This would also give those properties access down to the signal. Schuler followed up by stating the logic would be the eventual second Skyward building drives the need for Worth Court’s extension.

Jankowski asked, by doing this, have any available lots become unsellable, such as on the northwest corner of Clem’s Way and Worth Court. Scholfield replied it busts up the cul-de-sac and opens up an opportunity. There is a buyer interested in two primary lots. It is a sought after corner, and the question is whether this straight routing leaves a lot that makes sense. Scholfield stated he believes, because the property is reasonably priced at .45 cents per square foot compared to \$1 per square foot in other remaining Park lots, the interested party would fit on the lot Jankowski questioned. The exact design should “hug” as close as possible to the 66-foot right-of-way. If that happens, we can create and sell a parcel to the interested buyer. If space on the west side of a new road remains, there would be a strip of land that makes no sense and could not be sold. Jankowski clarified that what cannot be sold results in the County having to maintain, and Scholfield replied correct. Scholfield added that he loves the idea of extending Worth Court, which opens up the opportunity to sell the last lots in that area, and it makes total sense. He also noted, from a non-traffic expert, road location closer to the corner would result in cars stacking back, especially if businesses release employees at the same time. He suggested keeping valuable land for sale. Idsvoog asked how to accomplish that with this approval process and Scholfield replied by adding “pending design”.

Schuler stated there is a coincidental opportunity where someone is actively seeking to purchase land at that corner at this time. While the Committee takes time to work through this, the sooner a decision, the better it will be. Regarding where the road goes, it is based on logical and efficient, safe traffic design. Idsvoog stated he just wants to have a motion made that takes care of design concerns so there is no coming back after the fact to say it was not “hugged” close enough. Schuler stated the unanswered question is how the property is transferred between the County and the City to facilitate the road, which has not been part of the discussion. That is a second level discussion after the road connection has been determined a good solution. Idsvoog clarified that will have to be worked out and acted on later. Schuler replied yes, it would be the Committee that transfers the land for the right-of-way. Idsvoog agreed going forward with the road makes sense. Gifford noted once Worth Court is extended, the road name no longer makes sense, as it becomes a through street (change Court to Street or Drive, etc.).

Wiza stated he understands the concern about where the road specifically will go and the transfer of land. He suggested a part of the motion include the exact location of the road will be worked out by staff and brought back to this Committee for final approval.

Schatschneider said to be clear for staff moving forward, would it be best to come back next month with details so the interested buyer can then move forward. Schuler noted if the Committee today agrees it appropriate to extend Worth Court to Clem’s Way, details regarding location and land transfer needs to be subsequently worked out.

Jankowski moved to approve the extension of Worth Court as described, with details regarding its location and actual land transfer be worked out. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

8. Discussion/Possible Action on Updated Marketing Signs for the Portage County Business Park

Scholfield said when his marketing contract was renewed, changing marketing signs could and should now carry more information specific to the few lots that remain to be sold. He noted there has been activity in the Park, resulting in the sale of lots 79 and 80, and a buyer interested in another parcel. The handout he provided depicts straightforward sign options, with expensive parts removed, and he is no longer seeking County funding for the signs.

Pazdernik approved updating marketing signs as proposed today, with staff approval of sign location. Motion seconded by Gifford and passed by voice vote.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Potocki moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:45 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
November 3, 2015 – 7 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Potocki and Gifford

Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance; Mike McKenna and David Hicketier County Corporation Counsel Office; Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Dan Mahoney and Tom Davies, Village of Plover

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7 am in Conference Room 2 of the County Annex.

2. 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

Tom Davies, Village of Plover President, registered to speak.

3. Director's Reports:

Capital Improvements – Jossie had nothing to report at this time.

Economic Development /Business Park Update – Schuler described successful completion of the Business Park Maintenance Contract with CW Terra Master for 2015. Planning for 2016 Business Park maintenance will now take place. He also noted the upcoming CIP/EDC meeting on November 12, which includes agenda items relating to Worth Court and waiver requests by Investors Community Bank.

4. Discussion and Possible Action on a Limited License Agreement for Point-of-Beginning, Inc., and Scott R. Groholski to Conduct Bore Sample Testing on Certain Parcels of 420 Acres of Land Owned by Portage County in the Village of Plover

McKenna noted an interested party made contact regarding the ability to conduct soil borings to verify a soil profile to be used to determine buildability/suitability of County owned property. This is considered standard business practice, and a license agreement has been developed to set limits, cover any damage that may happen to the property, outline liability, etc. McKenna described this as a simple process, which his office endorses.

Idsvoog stated he understands the soil borings involve the use of tractors and backhoes, and pits to be dug 6 to 7 feet. Mahoney clarified the work would be conducted to determine depth to groundwater and soil mottling.

Jankowski interjected that the Space and Properties Committee will be acting on a request by an individual who currently rents land at the east end of the County's ownership to continue farming it in 2016. Jankowski said he spoke to Mahoney who did not see a conflict between continuing to rent to the individual for another year and the potential land sale.

Idsvoog asked the possible depth to groundwater and Mahoney replied it could be 15-18 feet, which should be plenty of depth for any possible basement construction.

Gifford asked if Portage County would have access to the results of the soil borings. Mahoney replied the results may only be visual in nature, but if results are in a written document, he will request it be shared with Portage County.

With no further discussion, Jankowski moved to approve the license agreement with Point-of-Beginning and Scott Groholski. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Jankowski moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:50 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
September 30, 2015 – 5:15 pm – Conference Room D, Courthouse

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Potocki and Gifford

Staff Present: Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance; Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Patty Dreier and Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Nathan Check, Highway Commissioner; Dan Mahoney, Richard Holden, and Tom Davies, Village of Plover; and Mike Theiss, Ghidorzi Construction

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 5:20 pm in Conference Room D of the Portage County Courthouse.

2. 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

Mike Theiss, Ghidorzi Construction registered to speak.

3. Director's Reports:

Capital Improvements – Jossie reported a successful closing on the Steinhaugen property.  
Economic Development /Business Park Update – Schuler not in attendance.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the September 3, 2015 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved to approval the September 3, 2015 minutes as provided and Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Action on Resolution to Authorize Portage County to Join the North Central Wisconsin Workforce Development Chief Elected Officials Consortium and Approving, Adopting, and Ratifying the Consortium Agreement

Dreier explained this resolution is a requirement under law for Portage County to receive Federal grant dollars, under the North Central Wisconsin Workforce Development area, which she has been involved with for a long time. Grant funding is available under the "Wisconsin Innovation and Opportunity Act". All consortium members are authorizing this same agreement as drafted for consortium members. She also noted that McKenna reviewed the documents related to this agreement and the resolution.

Idsvoog clarified with Dreier that this agreement did not involve any costs related to expenditures as the resolution does authorize her to execute agreements.

With no further discussion necessary, Gifford moved to approve the resolution and agreement relative to authorizing Portage County to join the North Central Wisconsin Workforce Development Chief Elected Officials Consortium. Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on a Request by Ghidorzi Companies for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section VII(A), Regarding Building Materials Allowed

Idsvoog referred to an email he received from Schuler, which stated the Planning and Zoning Department completely supports the waiver requests by Ghidorzi Companies including this item related to building materials; specifically, gutters and downspouts. The requests are consistent with other approved waivers.

Pazdernik moved to approve the waiver request by Ghidorzi Companies regarding building materials – use of gutters and downspouts. Jankowski seconded the motion.

Theiss noted they are working with Rettler Corporation on site planning of areas to allow roof water to spill to rather than across the parking lot where employees and clients are walking.

Gifford suggested a change to the covenants so they no longer have to deal with this type of waiver.

With no further discussion necessary, motion passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion/Possible Action on a Request by Ghidorzi Companies for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XIV(b), Parking Lot, Access Drive, and Loading Area Lighting

Idsvoog noted this lighting waiver was also addressed in Schuler's memo, which recommended approval.

Gifford moved to approve Ghidorzi Companies' lighting waiver request, and Potocki seconded the motion.

Theiss explained their standard is to use LED lighting throughout the area, in both general illumination and underneath the drive-through. After discussions with Schuler, they are going to cut the lighting down by two-thirds after hours, utilizing timers, and in the drive-through to keep some lighting and security for those using the night deposit.

With no further discussion necessary, motion passed by voice vote.

8. Discussion and Review Regarding 2016 Capital Projects Budget

Jossie provided Capital Improvements Plan 2016-2021, and 2016 Project Listing handouts to members present. Jossie referred to the following adjustments to the CIP Plan as previously adopted in August 2015:

- The 2016 Plan, under County Highway Department, previously included \$300,000 related to the County Road R project from Black Oak Drive to Porter Road. The County is not ready to proceed with that section of County Road R. Therefore, it is not in the best interest of Portage County to set aside those funds in 2016.
- ERP Phase II applications would be best moved up to allow work to begin in 2016, if time allows.
- An Elevation Data Improvement project (LiDAR) planned for 2020, has been modified and moved up to 2016 due to grant opportunities that became possible. The project is expected to cost \$226,325 in 2016, with \$182,214 in grants and \$44,111 in Land Records fund balance applied. The cost is higher than the 2020 plan, but if the project is not moved up, there will be no access to the grant opportunity.
- 2016 CIP also includes all Library projects, radio tower construction, and some highway facilities planning. These are covered by some of the CIP fund balance applied to the 2016 projects (less than anticipated), County levy funds at \$700,000 (as always planned), and if the radio construction project moves forward, the County would borrow approximately \$2.8 million dollars.

Jossie clarified there is no action necessary on these adjustments; they will be part of the budget process.

9. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Enter into Closed Session Pursuant to Section 19.85 (1) (e) Stats to Discuss the Valuation and Possible Sale Terms of Parcels Owned by Portage County Formerly Described as "H2O Project" in the Village and Town of Plover for Competitive Reasons

Potocki moved to enter into closed session. Gifford seconded the motion. A roll call vote revealed all ayes. Closed session began at 5:35 pm.

10. Motion and Roll Call Vote to Reconvene Open Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85(2), Wis. Stats.

Gifford moved to reconvene open session. Potocki seconded the motion. A roll call vote revealed all ayes. Open session began at 6:28 pm.

11. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session Under Agenda Item 9

No discussion or action took place.

12. Adjournment

Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Gifford seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 6:29 by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
September 3, 2015 – 7:45 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Potocki and Gifford

Staff Present: Schuler, Bowers, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie and Trisha Heyman, County Finance; Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Patty Dreier and Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Keith Pilger and Todd Kuckkahn, Portage County Business Council; Chris Ghidorzi, Ghidorzi Companies; Nathan Check, Highway Commissioner

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:45 am in Conference Rooms 1 & 2 of the County Annex.

### 2. 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.

### 3. Director's Reports:

- Capital Improvements: Jossie noted, regarding the 2016 Capital Improvements Program, a Federal grant opportunity just became available related to a LiDAR project proposed in 2020. She will bring more information forward regarding moving that project up in the CIP schedule.

- Economic Development / Business Park Update: Schuler – No report at this time.

### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the May 20, 2015 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the May 20, 2015 minutes as written. Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Discussion/Action on 2016 Portage County Business Council Contract

Idsvoog began by stating there were minor corrections made to the County Board resolution after being sent to members with today's agenda packet. The resolution now indicates a two-year contract and minor typographical errors were addressed. He felt, in general, the proposed contract, as prepared by Pilger, was more flexible and allowed for better communication. Idsvoog specifically referred to the contract (copy in original meeting file) as including the following provisions: 1. The Council will meet with the County on a quarterly basis to provide updates on progress; 2. The Council will develop a comprehensive map or outline of available economic development resources; and 3. The Council will work with the County and various key community leaders to facilitate an annual economic development summit. He further noted the contract price remains the same at \$73,600 per year for two years (2016-2017).

Dreier stated she was excited to move forward on this new contract and expressed her support. Schuler noted, as a person to be involved in economic development discussions, he is excited about it and the new services to be provided.

Schuler brought forward questions he had related to proposed contract language. He indicated current contract language, under the assignment clause, described some duties would be provided by the Business Council and the Business Council Foundation; with the Foundation defined as a separate non-profit corporation that supports objectives of the Council, yet that is not mentioned in the proposed contract. He further noted the current contract lists very specific economic development services; whereas, the proposed contract does not. Rather, the proposed contract includes a statement of general economic development services. Schuler noted through the Foundation, there is Workforce Development and Leadership Portage County working between business and education, which is an important aspect of economic development. He questioned whether there is clarification as to the role of the Foundation in the proposed contract. He sees them as two separate pieces of the puzzle. Pilger replied they share the same board/ governing body so he felt that was implied and

unnecessary to spell out, but it could be added. Schuler replied he wanted to fully understand the contract, as he would be a person working along with it. Pilger stated the services were to be flexible at the County's request to allow more direction from the County rather than being more specific. He noted in some cases specificity was added, including the comprehensive map, business expansion/retention survey, but it still allows for County direction as to what it prefers the Council address. Schuler noted throughout the proposed contract it states the Council will report to, work with, etc. the County, and asked for a definition of County. Idsvoog replied CIP/EDC and Planning and Zoning. Dreier added the contract provides for Countywide economic development planning, but looking beyond the Stevens Point/Plover metro area. Schuler replied he looks forward to working with the Council.

Jossie stated she felt the Contract Summary Form, as prepared the by Corporation Counsel, needs an update as to the point of contact person. She has little to do with this contract, and suggested possibly the County Executive should be that person. It was agreed the point of contact would be Dreier.

Gifford referred to Contract Section 3.(b), which reads: Of the amount appropriated by the County to the Council annually, the Council agrees to the use of appropriations approximately as follows: (i) fifty percent (50%) for general economic development operations, including staffing, education, and training associated with economic development and providing the services described herein; (ii) forty percent (40%) for marketing of Portage County, Wisconsin for the solicitation of new business in Portage County, Wisconsin and general economic development as directed by the County; (iii) ten percent (10%) for specific marketing of the Portage County Business Park and other County owned commercial properties. He stated he finds this language somewhat of a problem. He asked that reports given by the Council indicate exactly where the money the County is giving them is spent. Kuckkahn stated the Council had provided detailed financial reports, but the County has now asked for something more general. He noted the Council could do as Gifford requested. Gifford reiterated he wants detailed reports. Jossie noted she, and the County Executive's Office, have been receiving the reports and she can work with the Council to continue to provide acceptable reports. Idsvoog asked that those reports be given to the County Board as well. Jossie agreed that could be done quarterly.

With no further discussion necessary, Jankowski moved to approve a contract with the Portage County Business Council for the period 2016-2017. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Idsvoog noted the resolution provided for signature includes the changes he mentioned previously.

6. Discussion/Possible Action: Request by Ghidorzi Companies for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XI, Regarding Temporary "For Sale" Signs on the Intersection of County Road R and County Road HH

Schuler stated temporary signs are not addressed in the Business Park Covenants and Deed Restrictions. He felt this request is a typical part of business and staff fully supports their being able to advertise. Ghidorzi stated they use high quality signs built to make it through the winter, and he appreciates the support.

With no further discussion necessary, Jankowski moved to grant a temporary sign waiver for Ghidorzi as described. Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion on Status of the 13 Tax Deeded Parcels in the Village of Plover; Formerly Known as the H2O Development Property

Schuler noted the Village of Plover had recently provided a history of this property to CIP/EDC. In the meantime, he and Jossie were going to bring back a list as to who is responsible for what in terms of marketing the property, which should take place in the near future. Schuler stated there has been interest expressed by a Realtor in Wisconsin Rapids, and he will work with Jossie to develop the most updated information to provide that Realtor. Jossie added this individual had contacted the County in the past regarding this property.

Idsvoog asked whether the clubhouse had been sold. Jossie replied Smiley's had been sold. Idsvoog asked if the person who made that purchase stated interest in the remainder of the golf course property because he has heard that. Schuler replied he has not heard that directly. Jossie stated she heard that prior to any foreclosure, the property was sold and an agreement made.

Gifford asked if there was any indication that the buyer of Smileys wants to continue serving food there. Schuler replied he has not been involved in that aspect and is uncertain. Gifford stated they could not use the water for food service due to high nitrates. Dreier said an important economic development point is, if you cannot use the water and treatment costs are too high, then you must look at what that does to property values.

Idsvoog felt this property should be kept on the “front burner” and Plover should be contacted to see what is going on so this property can get back on the tax roll. Schuler hopes to provide a more extensive report at the next meeting.

Gifford asked Schuler how far Plover would have to extend services to get water to Smileys. Jankowski noted service is currently across the street from the property.

8. Review/Discussion on Proposed 2016 Portage County Business Park Budget

Schuler stated the Business Park budget is a zero base, with revenue and expense projections being equal. There was a sales table developed at the beginning of the Park’s creation, which is used year-to-year to project sales. Expenses are generally related to maintenance and utilities. Schuler noted the \$95,000 CW Terra Master contract to provide maintenance services is going well. Noting maintenance and electric bills for the year are reimbursed to the County by Park tenants based on acreage owned. In 2016, maintenance of signs and landscaping is planned. Schuler noted Scholfield has come forward with a proposal on updating signs in the Park, including possible co-branding our Park with the City’s East Park Corporate Center to the east. Schuler felt that is worth pursuing and would be discussed later. Schuler felt this also has to do with the County’s succession plan on how to transition the County Business Park from County responsibility to that of the collective landowners. Idsvoog felt that is a key activity for the next year and has to happen.

Idsvoog asked how many lots the County has left in the Park to sell. Scholfield replied four County-owned lots and three building sites in Portage Park Centre. Schuler stated if we are working on a succession plan, we must work with Park owners to determine their needs/desires and try to accommodate that going forward.

Gifford asked Scholfield to again describe what is available in the Park, and Scholfield replied four individual County-owned lots, common lots, which include ponds, and three building sites within Portage Park Centre. Gifford asked if someone else owns those three sites, and Scholfield replied the County also owns them. Gifford asked for clarification that there are seven properties owned by the County. Schuler replied yes and further described available lots. Gifford asked how close the County is at turning the Park over to its tenants, and Scholfield replied there has been an uptake in interest/activity and next year he feels it will close to being sold out. Gifford agreed the transition plan needs to begin.

Dreier felt there might be a conflict of interest relative to the possibility of co-branding with the City of Stevens Point due to the fact Scholfield markets both the County Business Park and the East Park Corporate Center. Scholfield clarified he represents the owners; the City controls options. He suggested discussing the effort of co-branding to maximize exposure. In addition, Scholfield noted he is very careful to recuse himself whenever a conflict exists.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Gifford moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8:12 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
May 20, 2015 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, and Gifford

Member Absent: Potocki

Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Mike McKenna and David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; John Kneer, Rettler Corporation; Rick King, Skyward; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Matthew Fleming, Portage County Purchasing; Cammy Hammon, LK Enterprises; and Jami Gebert, County Executive Office

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 2 of the County Annex.

2. 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.

3. Director's Reports:

- Capital Improvements: Jossie – No report at this time.
- Economic Development / Business Park Update: Schuler – No report at this time.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the March 12, 2015 and April 2, 2015 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the March 12 and April 2, 2015 minutes as written. Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action: Request by Skyward, Inc. and Sky Group, LLC for the following Waivers from the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants:

- a. DRPC Section XIV(B) Requiring the Use of High Pressure Sodium Exterior Lighting
- b. Section XI(C) Allowing a Maximum Height of Five (5) Feet for Monument Identification Signs
- c. Sections XXI(A) Maintenance Responsibilities and XV(A) General Yard and Foundation Landscape and Irrigation Requirements

5a. - Schuler noted the Skyward building looks gorgeous and coming along nicely. As relates to the requested waiver on lighting, the Business Park Deed Restrictions/Protective Covenants (Covenants) do not consider LED lighting because it was not available at the time the Covenants were written. Therefore, a waiver is being sought to use this energy efficient lighting alternative. Staff recommends approval of the lighting waiver.

Schuler also noted a procedure to allow staff to approve this type of lighting without Committee action is being developed to bring before members for their consideration. Gifford felt if the Covenants were changed to allow LED lighting, it would not need staff review either. Schuler clarified that all developments need staff approval and if any portion of the development falls outside of requirements of the Covenants, those items are brought forward for full Committee action. Schuler stated he understood Gifford's point.

5b. – Schuler stated wall and directional signs for this development had been approved, but the interior monument sign does not comply with Covenants. Schuler continued that the sign was designed at 6' instead of 5' to accommodate the Skyward Corporate logo (3 stripes), and due to the restrained nature of the sign design, and scope of the overall project, staff recommends approval of the monument sign waiver.

5c. – Schuler noted the Committee had dealt with landscape requirements on other large ownerships that have undeveloped land for future development; such as the Stevens Point Transit Center where no-mow areas were approved. Staff also recommends approval of this waiver request after the Department receives and approves a maintenance plan to be put in place; to be certain it works. This plan should include a mowing/maintenance schedule, information on natural plantings, height of the no-mow area, etc.

Kneer came forward with depictions of the landscape and irrigation plans for members to consider. He described the property between Business Park Drive and Copps Drive toward the building as being a manicured area. Landscape screening will be put in place from the railroad tracks, and the street will have frontage trees planted. On the west side, the parking lot area will have turf and trees. The area between I39 and the parking lot would be the no-mow area to be maintained in the same fashion as the no-mow at AIG/Travel Guard property. Kneer stated the rear of the property would include a berm with plantings, natural area, and trees between the railroad tracks and the property. In addition, vacant land to the east for future development would be maintained similar to Rettler Corporation's vacant land, which would include mowing only, no plantings.

Idsvoog felt the plans depicted looked good. Schuler reiterated as a condition of action by the Committee, he would recommend a maintenance plan for plantings, mowing, and no-mow areas be submitted to and approved by the Department.

Jankowski moved to approve item 5c., the landscape and irrigation plans, as submitted. Gifford offered an amendment to the motion to indicate the need for a maintenance plan to be approved by Planning and Zoning Department staff for the no-mow area, mowing schedule, natural areas, and plantings, etc. Jankowski seconded the motion to amend, which passed by voice vote. Jankowski's original motion, as now amended, was approved by voice vote.

Jankowski moved to approve items 5a. and 5b. as presented. Motion seconded by Pazdernik. Gifford brought forward discussion relating to the signage waiver, noting the developer knew Covenant requirements prior to developing, yet is seeking a waiver. He questioned why there are waivers "all the time". Schuler described the original intent of the Covenants was to maintain a certain aesthetic in the Park by requiring minimal signage. Signage has been dealt with on a case-by-case basis as developments come into the Park; the original intent still holds. Schuler stated he recommends approval due to sign location and overall design of the development. He felt the developer made a case.

Gifford asked that Committee action be taken separately on items 5a. and 5b. Jankowski then withdrew his motion, which was seconded by Pazdernik and passed by voice vote.

Gifford moved to approve the lighting waiver as requested, and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Pazdernik moved to approve the signage waiver as requested and Jankowski seconded the motion. Voice vote to approved revealed 3 ayes and 1 nay by Gifford.

#### 6. Discussion/Possible Action on Bids for Business Park Maintenance

Schuler noted due to a tragic turn of events with the original vendor providing maintenance to the Park, and the Highway Department discontinuing any work in the Park, we added all functions of Park maintenance to a new Park maintenance contract bidding process.

Idsvoog stated he was surprised and disappointed the bid being considered is not a local vendor. Fleming clarified local companies did bid, but were higher priced; whereas, some out of town vendors have business in the area and were competitive. Idsvoog asked for clarification as to why there was a large range in bid amounts. Fleming stated he felt some bidders were out of touch. He noted the bid price was verified with TerraMaster who submitted the low bid. Idsvoog asked who is mowing the Park now and Schuler replied no one at this time.

Hammon stated she believes TerraMaster has only been in business since January 2014; not the 5 years required to submit a bid. Idsvoog asked what the bid document stated. Fleming replied that is not what TerraMaster stated on their bid document; they actually indicated being in business more than 5 years. Scholfield stated he is familiar with the company, which has been in business for many years, but recently incorporated under this name.

Idsvoog asked who would oversee the contract work. Schuler replied the Department would provide infield monitoring and obtain tenant feedback. Idsvoog asked if the contract included time parameters. Schuler answered the contract is weather dependent, and he anticipates mowing would take place weekly, with some portions being every other week. Scholfield noted he also inspects maintenance when he is in the Park, and tenants keep tabs and let him know as well.

Idsvoog noted TerraMaster bid \$89,689.56. Jankowski moved to award the Business Park maintenance contract to TerraMaster at \$89,689.56 and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Presentation and Proposal by the Scholfield Group, LLC for a Listing Contract for Marketing the Portage County Business Park

Scholfield referred members to his presentation as distributed with the agenda packet. He noted he has provided marketing to the Park for many years. Currently, there are four standalone lots and three Park Centre lots available for sale. The Park is close to being sold-out and work on transitioning from County oversight to that of a tenants' association is being developed. He then went on to described the status of current projects, as well as land purchased that remains undeveloped at this time, as noted in his handout. (Original in meeting file.) Scholfield explained an aerial flight of the Park, including photos, recently took place. Remaining lots have a total sale price of \$1.2 million. It becomes difficult to sell lots in the Park due to the small number of choices available to potential developers. In addition, the lots available for purchase are unique with being wooded, located on a corner, located in Portage Park Centre, etc. Scholfield stated he would be coming forward to request signs be installed on each lot available for sale that will provide detailed lot information, contact information for Portage County Planning and Zoning, as well as his contact information, and suggested a cost-share with Portage County for this.

Gifford asked if the original contract document lists Scholfield's sales commission and Scholfield replied yes, and the commission is 8.5% based on sales. Scholfield also clarified the last marketing firm bid process took place approximately 3 years ago and his contract renewal has been on a year-to-year basis since that time.

8. Discussion/Possible Action on Approving a Portage County Business Park Listing Contract Extension with the Scholfield Group, LLC

Pazdernik moved to approve a Business Park listing contract one-year extension for Scholfield Group. Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Gifford moved to adjourn and Jankowski seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:25 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
April 2, 2015 – 7:00 am – Conference Rooms 1 & 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Gifford and Potocki

Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Nathan Check, Portage County Highway Commissioner; Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel; Terry Schott, Investors Community Bank; Rick and Ross Rettler, Rettler Corporation; Wally Binder, Mike Theiss, and Chris Ghidorzi, Ghidorzi Companies; Dan Kontos, Portage County Sheriff's Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Matthew Fleming, Portage County Purchasing; Scott Schatschneider, City of Stevens Point; John Lawson, Portage County Health Care Center; Steve Witt, Finance-Health Care Center; and Todd Neuenfeldt, Portage County Facilities.

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Rooms 1 & 2 of the County Annex.

### 2. Review and Approval of Minutes

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the March 3 and March 12, 2015 minutes as written. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 3. Director's Reports:

- Jossie – No report at this time.
- Schuler – No report at this time.

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.

### 4. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Investors Community Bank Site Development Project

Schuler stated Investors Community Bank (ICB) would present a concept plan for nine acres on the corner of County Roads HH and R in the Portage County Business Park (Park). The concept includes unique requests and considerations, and involves various waiver requests as well. Schuler noted staff feels the concept is valid and the project is valuable. Idsvoog noted he reviewed the development concept further with Schuler, and described it as a great job for which he had no problems.

Rick Rettler (Rettler) described the ICB project as exciting, and noted his business has been located in the Park for 15 years. The corporate business campus project includes more than nine acres. The Lot 1 development model will set the tone with a standard of excellence for the nine acres. Rettler stated the project meets the Park Covenants and will showcase this corner of the Park. He referred to several design maps present at the meeting, noting a private driveway system, and green space accommodations, all of which meet Covenants.

Rettler again noted ICB development would take place on Lot 1 as a showcase for the main road of this campus-type project. He noted both Portage County and City of Stevens Point staff members have been helpful while the concept was being formed. Rettler noted the project would meet landscaping and storm water management plan requirements. In addition, the driveway system would meet State requirements. They are working with the Fire Department to be certain the driveway system turn radius needs, etc. are also met.

Rettler noted there had been an issue with one lot size being too small (not meeting covenant requirements), so they have decided to combine Lots 3 and 4, so the lot area requirements have now been met as well. Sewer and water district requirements are also being met with the ICB project.

Binder presented renderings of the ICB facility. The outside of the building will include split face and tailored stone, and brick. There will be a log element on the façade and building ends, and two different roofing materials will be used - metal and asphalt shingles.

Binder described a signage concept that includes the ICB name on a pond retaining wall utilizing halo LED lighting. The main entrance to the ICB campus concept includes the name "Investors Place" and is proposed to have three panels used to display the names of businesses located within the development. Signs would be metal face, all letters would light up internally on the monument signs, and signage would include materials found on the building's façade. Binder stressed the signage concept includes controlled lighting. There would be interior lot signs located by driveways, as well as directional signs, which meet size requirements. The ICB name will also be lighted and appear on the building's south and north faces; the only two signs located physically on the building.

C Ghidorzi stated Lot 1 is a priority for ICB, and will set the standard of excellence throughout this proposed development. Maximum building size, parking, and 50% green space requirements would all be met with this concept. Sites will be kept flexible at this time for end users, which could include restaurants, business offices, medical/dental facilities, etc. Ghidorzi felt, with the number of employees in the Park, a restaurant located within this campus would be a welcomed addition.

Schuler stated he would like to know the timeline for the proposal. Rettler replied they are awaiting the Committee's decision before going forward with design of Lot 1, and construction could begin within a short period. Easement agreements are needed, as well as other legal work and CSM's, in order to move forward as well. Rettler said they are looking for agreement with the concept today in order to go forward with Lot 1 and continue planning.

Schuler noted a waiver on the prohibition of subdividing of lots is necessary. He described the project as an awesome concept. In addition, signage needs discussion, based on previous sign waivers in the Park. As proposed, the concept includes what would be the largest sign in the Park. There needs to be approval of the master plan presented today, with signage waivers being dealt with in the future.

Gifford moved approval of the master plan presented today, as well as a waiver on the prohibition of subdividing lots for this development, while signage waivers would be acted on in the future. Motion seconded by Jankowski.

Gifford referred to the ICB proposed large signs and noted this has been prohibited on other developments. Schuler stated signage size options would be worked through; adding the Covenants allow a certain amount. This proposal is a hybrid because we are dealing with standalone buildings versus multiple buildings in a campus concept.

With no further discussion, motion passed by voice vote.

##### 5. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Lease of County-Owned Parcel for Agricultural Crop Purposes – Kennedy Avenue, Plover

Schuler noted this agricultural lease was previously approved under another County Committee's authorization, but now that CIP/EDC has assumed oversight of this property, the request is coming forward here today. Jankowski clarified Space and Properties Committee previously dealt with the request. McKenna stated there could be an issue with this lease, if the property is sold/transfer of ownership takes place mid-crop.

Idsvoog asked what would happen to the lease, if the property were developed. Jankowski clarified the farmer under the lease did not use the well on the property, and the lease was approved year-to-year by Space and Properties. Jossie asked what happens if the land is sold mid-crop. McKenna responded that is a downside to the lease, which has a cap of three years. The lease encumbers the land, but the County could get out of the lease in 2016. If an issue would arise, it would have to be resolved between the County and the farmer.

Idsvoog asked for an example. McKenna stated the farmer would make an investment in the property in 2015, including seed, fertilizer, etc. Idsvoog clarified the crop would have to be harvested or the County would have to pay for it in order to get out of the lease. Fleming felt even if there were a buyer today, any development would take a long time. Scholfield noted the cycle of a crop includes harvest sometime around October, which is not optimum building season. If the property were sold, there would be at least 6-8 months of planning and development approvals. Idsvoog stated the County has to be cautious with leasing after 2015. Scholfield replied correct; keep control in the County's hands with the farmer. Idsvoog suggested any motion approving the lease include wording that 2015 could be the end of the leasing practice.

Jankowski moved to approve the lease of County-owned land on Kenney Avenue, Plover for agricultural crop purposes with the stipulation 2015 could be the end of the leasing practice. Pazdernik seconded the motion.

Gifford felt there was currently no intention of selling the land. Schuler noted the land is under a development agreement. Gifford asked if it would be a good idea to remove the wells. Jankowski replied the wells were there for agricultural purposes, not for the former golf course. Neuenfeldt noted there are two wells on site.

With no further discussion, motion passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Memorandum of Understanding with the Village of Plover Concerning Tax Deed Property (former Plover Development Parcels)

This item is not ready for discussion or action.

7. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Resolution Approving an Agreement with Clearpath Connections for the Provision of a Nurse Call Replacement System at the Health Care Center (HCC)

Jossie stated in 2013, \$97,350 was approved for replacement of the nurse call system. The HCC and Fleming conducted a Request for Proposals process on the system, which came in at a cost of approximately \$110,000 plus a 10% contingency, bringing the total cost to \$120,044. With that being the case, additional Capital Improvements Program funding is needed. The HCC approved shower and kitchen remodel projects came under budget because only the kitchen remodel took place. As a result, not all funds were spent, which could allow unexpended funds to be transitioned to the nurse call system. Jossie described the nurse call system as a critical part of the HCC.

With no further discussion, Gifford moved to approve an agreement, by resolution, with Clearpath Connections for a nurse call system that requires a budget adjustment of \$22,694. Motion seconded by Jankowski and passed by voice vote.

8. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Resolution Authorizing a 2015 Budget Adjustment to the Capital Improvement Fund for Ongoing Capital Improvement Projects

Jossie stated that during County budget preparation each year, a "best guess" is made relating to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) expenses. Actual, year-end expense totals relative to 2014 budgeted CIP projects are known in 2015. Unspent funds from 2014 projects that are ongoing in 2015 can be re-budgeted into the 2015 CIP. Jossie referred Committee members to a handout indicating items/projects needing an adjustment and the resolution authorizing a budget adjustment of \$4,917,025 for CIP to continue ongoing authorized projects.

Pazdernik moved to approve the 2015 CIP budget adjustment as presented and Potocki seconded the motion.

Pazdernik clarified the budget adjustment is authorized to complete projects started in 2014, but not completed, and Jossie responded yes.

With no further discussion, motion passed by voice vote.

9. Discussion and Update Regarding Tower Construction Analysis

Jossie explained as the simulcast project continues moving through the process, discussions with cell companies have taken place regarding the County leasing space on towers for simulcast equipment. It was determined the cost to lease was high; therefore, research took place on the cost to Portage County to build towers for the simulcast equipment. Jossie reported Fleming has been gathering cost information related to towers, land purchase (if necessary), and tower maintenance. Six towers would need to be built, while others could be leased. Towers have a life expectancy of 50 years, and it would take 20 years to payback the tower cost. Jossie also noted that because towers would be constructed for "public safety," County zoning does not apply.

Idsvoog asked the total cost related to the towers and Jossie replied approximately \$2.5 million. A bidding process has not taken place. Idsvoog felt this was an increase of \$1 million from previous estimates. Jossie stated the previous estimate was \$2 million, which did not figure land related costs. In addition, the County may be able to partner with municipalities who own towers, and there could possibly be County-owned land for tower construction avoiding land purchase costs.

Idsvoog questioned the 50-year life expectancy of a tower. Fleming replied he found that life expectancy while researching the project. He further noted the towers would be self-supporting, not guyed towers. Idsvoog asked whether tower communication will become obsolete and Kontos replied not in our lifetime. He added that Portage County has never had a comprehensive radio solution; we have always used "band aides."

Scholfield described the County's pursuit of building its own towers as a unique perspective. He felt more people want to lease tower space. He noted Marathon County leases tower space and has found this to be a powerful cash flow builder. Jossie clarified with Portage County Zoning, tower construction related to "public safety" does need to meet County Zoning requirements, but if you construct and lease to other entities, the tower becomes subject to those requirements. Therefore, if you build to lease, Zoning regulations come into play.

Fleming said the tower project is stalled at this point until decisions as to how to proceed are made. Jossie suggested the project be accelerated; we have been waiting for simulcast to proceed. A decision is necessary. Idsvoog noted the decision would flow from the Public Safety Committee, to Finance Committee, and then to CIP for decision.

Potocki reiterated that the County has a tower ordinance and if the County wanted to allow others to lease, County Zoning requirements must be met. Jossie agreed, noting if the County did not want to lease tower space for others, it may construct towers. Schuler stated the Zoning Ordinance is clear on towers being constructed under "public safety" versus commercial construction. There would be concern with action of the County resulting in competition with private business. Gifford asked if tower construction under "public safety" would preclude leasing space to an entity like the Almond Fire Department. Schuler replied that scenario falls under "public safety." Jossie stated work on a financing plan should begin.

#### 10. Discussion Regarding Performance Contracting

Jossie reported a meeting with Siemens to explore Performance Contracting as an option for financing necessary capital improvements through cost saving measures. She then referred members to a handout from Siemens. The process involves a preliminary assessment, comprehensive analysis, contract agreement, and implementation that would result in an agreed to cost savings related to a project involving an existing facility, energy, operations, and maintenance costs. If the agreed upon cost savings are not realized, a check would be issued to Portage County for the savings amount that was guaranteed to be realized.

Idsvoog asked what this process could be applicable to and Jossie replied HVAC, windows, energy costs, etc. The preliminary assessments would be conducted at no cost to the County. If the County agreed to move forward, an agreement would be scoped out, and analysis with detailed improvements would take place, followed by a contract agreement to be approved by the County Board that includes a locked-in cost savings guarantee. To begin the process, a Request for Proposals (RFP) would be needed after projects have been decided on and scoped. Buildings that could be analyzed include: Annex, Library, Courthouse, Health and Human Services, Highway, etc. The Law Enforcement Center, HCC, and Ellis Street property would not be part of the process. In addition, the analysis could include fuel costs at the Sheriff's Office and Highway Department.

Pazdernik asked if more than one vendor can conduct this type of process and Jossie replied yes. Gifford brought up LED lights in the Library and cautioned if adding a guarantee on this would result in additional upfront purchase cost. Jossie felt that could be true, but the guarantee on cost savings could be worth it. She noted that yes, the company will make money; they are in business to do that. Schuler felt this is an opportunity to minimize cost and realize maximum savings; you must assess whether to do this or not.

Jankowski asked whether this type of analysis covers new construction as well and Jossie answered no, only existing buildings, so they can become more energy efficient. Gifford asked if the company would guarantee a dollar amount to be saved and Jossie replied yes; the savings is measured on use, not dollar amount.

#### 11. Adjourn

With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Jankowski seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
March 12, 2015 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Pazdernik, Gifford and Potocki

Staff Present: Schuler and Stewart, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Jami Gebert, Portage County Executive Office; Nathan Check, Portage County Highway Commissioner; Lori Dehlinger-Van Alstine, Portage County Business Council; Mike McKenna/David Hicketier, Corporation Counsel Office; Dan Schlutter/Dan Mahoney/Richard Holden, Village of Plover; and Jake Barnes.

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 2 of the County Annex.

### 2. 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

Jake Barnes registered to speak on behalf of Friends of Standing Rocks.

### 3. Director's Reports:

- CIP Update – Jossie distributed a handout (Capital Projects, 2014 Projected Year End Close Out, 2015 Projected Budget) and addressed the Preliminary 2014 Closeout. Jossie stated they are still finalizing the figures, but wanted to address the following:

- Highway Projects: Jossie stated they were doing a lot of moving around with the projects; this is the reason the 2014 available balance for some is negative and some is a surplus.
- Standing Rocks Development: They did receive a \$100,000 donation from the Friends of Standing Rocks.
- The Transfer column lists projects that were closed out.
- 1039 Ellis Street property: This did run over; however, that was due to having to pay City taxes.
- Undesignated Reserve in the CIP Plan for 2014 available balance was approximately \$754,000. This was the amount of money they had projected at the 2014 year.
- Looking at the other Fund Balance Transfers, at the end of 2014 they anticipated having just over \$1.3 million; they are closing out approximately \$603,000 that was unused or unspent on various projects.
- In 2015, they plan to use just over \$821,000, which brings them down to approximately \$536,000 available at the end of 2015. Jossie has shared with the Finance Committee that she is concerned this number is getting low, and has requested that when they look at surplus balances for 2014 that they take, if possible, extra surplus funds within the County's General Fund and transfer it to Capital Improvements.
- A few projects being tracked for 2015 include:
  - The Nurse Call System for the Health Care Center. The current projection is going to run about \$28,000 over budget. There are two other projects they do not expect expending; money from a kitchen remodel and money from a north and south shower complex. Between those two, it should be covered. That will be on the next CIP agenda to amend.
  - Radio System Simulcast; this was where they were exploring towers and they should have something at the next meeting. Information is being finalized for Public Safety to review, and then it will be brought before this Committee for evaluation in terms of whether they would rent or construct towers.
  - Jossie stated one project that is not updated, but will be after the County Board Meeting this month, is the land acquisition in the Town of Sharon. There was a request for additional funds to make that project work.

Jossie stated she is still working on closeout balances, so these numbers will change a bit, but this is a good projection.

Barnes commented regarding the Friends of Standing Rocks; he wanted to make this Committee aware they are still out there. They have had a few meetings this year and have discussed phase 2 and possibly being involved in the phase 2 development, which includes a multi-use structure on Standing Rocks Road. Barnes stated the feeling from the group is they are mildly interested in staying involved with the County should things continued to develop. Barnes added they are doing cleanup work and things are going good with the Parks Department.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler mentioned the ongoing discussions with the Rettler Corporation and Ghidorzi Construction about development of the lot on County Road HH and County Road R; the property where Community Investors Bank will be located. Schuler stated they previously discussed having an overall concept for what they want to do with multiple buildings on the property. It could involve land division and interesting design concepts they have not seen previously in the Business Park. Schuler is hopeful this will move forward and they will try to have a meeting with the Committee fairly soon so they can discuss their concepts as they get more information.

Idsvoog asked where they are on signage, and Schuler stated they are still working on that.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the January 16, 2015 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the January 16, 2015 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion of Status and History of the 13 Tax Deeded Parcels in the Village of Plover, Formerly Known as the H2O Development Property

Mahoney gave a brief history with respect to the property and stated the following:

In 2003-2004, a group came forward to the Village of Plover talking about building an aquaplex project. It was a proposed mixed-use development; the centerpiece of the project was building and constructing two man-made lakes for waterskiing events. It also included a 27-hole golf course, a mixture of residential development, and some commercial and light manufacturing associated with the boating industry. Village of Plover did put zoning in place; that was a Planned Development District that would allow those uses to be put in place. A master plan was developed for the entire property that showed how it would be developed, and a developer's agreement was put in place between the Village and the developer that called out certain requirements of each party. The Village then agreed to establish a Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) district; a pay as you go TIF district which meant that the development would not get dollars from the Village until the development was created, went forward, and the developer started paying their taxes. Mahoney stated unfortunately this particular developer was not able to get the financing for the project. DLR Developers were potentially interested in doing that project, but when they found out about the terms and conditions of the TIF, they lost interest because they did not want to front the money.

Mahoney stated after that, because of the deal they had made, Kennedy Funding was in play as well because they provided some financing to the developer. Because the project did not move forward, Kennedy Funding took control of the property. Mahoney stated Kennedy Funding did not pay their taxes, therefore, after a period, Portage County took control of the property. In the meantime, the Village had been working with other developers who had talked about doing something very different on the property. There was still a desire to do the golf course and residential portions of the property, but the lake aspect was completely out. Mahoney wanted the Economic Development Committee to understand that the original developer's agreement that was signed was recorded at the Register of Deed's Office and runs with the land. That means that anybody who purchases the property at this point forward is tied to that developer's agreement. The Village understands that they will see different development than was originally to occur there, so this means the developer's agreement will have to be updated and revised. Ultimately, that is the key component of moving forward so when individuals reach out to the Village to talk about it, this is one of the things they have to bring up.

Mahoney said just as with Portage County when they took over the property, the Village has additional assessments that still need to be collected on the property. Mahoney stated this is a challenge with respect to working with developers because they would be required to go through a bidding process with Portage County. Mahoney explained the bidding process and added that by State Statutes, they have to be able to collect back taxes, interest, and include penalty interest. On top of that, there are other assessments. Mahoney stated this is why when bids went out, there were no legitimate bids on the property; because there were two owners from a financial standpoint.

Mahoney said through all this, there was a group that came to the Village and was primarily interested in doing the golf course. They were searching for partners to help them out with the residential portion of the property, because that was very necessary with respect to creating value on the property. The golf course itself is reestablishing value on the property, but it is not creating new value. The key to creating new value is the TIF district. Mahoney explained there is a TIF on the property and the Village has expended some dollars for

improvements; the County Roads B and R intersection was redone with TIF dollars, and sewer and water is expected down Pleasant Drive to County Road R, and then up County Road R through the County Road B and County Road R intersection. There has been significant dollars spent, and the expectation is the TIF District will reimburse the costs fronted by the Village.

Mahoney said this is why it is very important for the Village of Plover to see this property back on the tax rolls and developed. When Portage County took over the property, they essentially removed over \$1,000,000 in TIF, which is having a significant negative impact on the Village's collection of tax on the property.

Mahoney said there are developers still interested in the golf course. There is another group that is interested in the property west of County Road R; that would be the property between County Road R and Highway 39, which is approximately 80 acres. Mahoney stated the general thought process is multiple-family and business park development along the highway. Mahoney stated there were discussions and they expect to hear something next week. If they do hear something positive, they will have a meeting with Planning and Zoning and Economic Development Committee to start talking about details with respect to their thoughts and plans or how they want to deal with the property. Mahoney added he believes the interested group is very legitimate in nature and is a group that is known in the area. Mahoney stated after a conversation between Idsvoog and the Village, they agree it is time to basically transfer the property over to the Economic Development Committee because that will allow them to begin working on a marketing plan and strategy for moving the project forward, and getting the property back on the tax rolls.

Mahoney said in the past, the County had to rely on the old bidding documents and information. Mahoney stated some of the people that have contacted the County and wanted this information have recognized it is out of date information that is not adequate for marketing the property. Mahoney believes there is a real need to work together to develop a marketing plan and strategy.

Idsvoog asked what kind of tax sacrifice would he like the County and Village to make. Mahoney answered that obviously the County should get back the dollars owed in back taxes, assessments paid to the Village of Plover, and the penalty interest on the property, and all costs associated put into the property. Mahoney explained the cumulative interest and how it was calculated, and stated the total for penalty interest is just short of \$1 million for the past four years of non-payment of taxes. Jossie stated it was approximately \$990,000. Mahoney asked if it is realistic to anticipate they could collect almost \$1 million in penalty interest. Mahoney stated they should be realistic in looking at those dollars, and it is probably not likely to collect. A decision the County has to make is what they are looking at from their perspective in order to get that property back on the tax rolls.

Mahoney stated the suggestion from the Village standpoint is they cannot, nor will they tell the County what to do. Their thought process is, if they could get the dollars back they initially expended on the property, the back taxes paid, and the assessments paid to the Village, that would at least make the County whole, and it makes sense they have a much better chance to sell the property. Another strategy could be that they start development going on the property, and as that gets going, it would drive up the property values so they could look at charging more for the property as they move forward.

Mahoney stated the Village of Plover does have assessments out there and they have to look at working with the developer with respect to paying off those assessments, as they do have to be paid. The TIF District is a way of incentivizing the developer to build on that property. If a portion of those costs are covered, they are more likely to develop that property.

Jossie stated the amount the County has spent through 2014 is just over \$4.5 million total, including the interest payment. If you take out the \$902,000, it is approximately \$3.6 million.

McKenna stated if there is legitimate interest in the 80 acres on the west end, he suggests to the Committee they think long and hard that if that 80 is sold as a whole, there will not be the line in the road; they could try and market that as a whole. McKenna asked if they start selling off bleeding chunks, does that increase the value of the other property or decrease it. If a developer is looking for a big land project, and they sell off that, it could affect the other. McKenna stated that is fine; this is the discussion the Village and County have had all along. They should be advised if the property is sold off, how much of the \$4 million would be recovered; this is something that should be discussed.

Mahoney stated the ability to sell 420 acres in one piece at one time is unrealistic. Based on the Village doing business for years, they do not see that type of acquisition occurring ever in the Village. Mahoney stated it is important to remember the plan that is out there, which calls for mixed-use development; the general concept of multiple-family and business development west of County Road R, makes sense. Those are going to be different developers than the developers who are on the east side of County Road R, which would be primarily residential in some form. There may be multiple-family, some two-family, but the vast majority of that will be single family. Mahoney stated if there is interest in the golf course and someone ends up doing that, it would be great. If not, the Village has always targeted that area for single family residential. Mahoney stated that is one of their two major growth areas from that standpoint.

Schuler stated from a Planning and Zoning perspective, as described by Mahoney, there is a developer's agreement, so technically anyone that walks in the door is bound to that agreement or negotiates a change to it. In terms of control over what can happen on the property, it is based on a re-working of a new development agreement that would be needed to proceed with any development of the property. Schuler stated McKenna made a good point that if you start to divide it you can end up with some sort of haphazard unrelated group of uses that certainly would be less than what the entire single project was intended to be last time. Schuler stated this is where the planning comes in; they find a way to be flexible with the type of way that people have access to purchase the property, but they have a very good framework in place for how whatever develops up there needs to be connected in some cohesive way. They do not need to direct exactly what happens on the property, but working with the Village, they have an idea what type of image it would project for the Village of Plover. It is going to be a very prominent and important development for the Village of Plover. Schuler believes they should try to put whatever mechanisms in place that they can and make sure that the discussions take place, and that it will work without putting up too many roadblocks to whoever wants to come in with an idea. They should be open to ideas but they all have to make sense together. This is where Schuler believes his department comes in working with the Village to try to come to some basic understanding of how to move ahead with the properties.

Idsvoog asked Schuler if they need to come up with a new developer's agreement and update how they currently advertise. Schuler stated the developer's agreement would be the specifics of how they are going to build on that property. Schuler believes they should come to some agreement on what should happen overall; a master plan. The developer's agreement is the nuts and bolts and says what is going to have to happen on the property. Schuler stated whoever is going to buy, the end of it is going to be a negotiation for the specific responsibilities for both parties of how they are going to develop. Schuler believes that technical term is not the right term; what they are looking for is some sort of a master plan or overall concept for how they want to market the property with enough flexibility to let people move the pieces on their own as they see fit.

Jankowski stated what he is envisioning is everything on the west side of County Road R would be planned out to be heavier commercial along the highway, a mix of residential closer to County Road R, and on the other side would be single family residential possibly with a golf course, and asked if that is the plan that the Village is working with. Mahoney replied that is the general concept of what they want to see. Mahoney stated the master plan has to be developed out there, but he does not think they need to worry about haphazard development. The village will never have haphazard development. Mahoney stated it is absolutely critical it is done in the right way, so they have been looking at it for a long period of time. The zoning out there generally allows them some flexibility, so if a developer wants to tweak within the general concepts of what they just talked about, they will have some ability to tweak that a bit. Generally that is the thought process of the transition and what they would like to see.

Gifford referenced a piece of land that extends east of County Road R, the Smiley's property, and stated they have no control over it; adding there are a lot of back taxes owed on it and it is about to go into foreclosure because of the bank loan. Gifford asked if that is something of a difficulty in trying to do a coherent plan for the entire development. Mahoney stated there are two pieces of property, and asked if they are referencing the clubhouse area or the 20-acre piece along Kennedy Avenue. Mahoney stated from a clubhouse standpoint, this is a concern because there is not direct control over it. Mahoney stated that will be interesting to see what happens; if it does end up in foreclosure and is purchased, that opens new doors that are not currently out there. For the property on the far east end, that property is annexed to the Village of Plover and it is part of their comprehensive plan. At this time, it is agricultural type land and is not developed; that piece is very easy to deal with. Gifford asked about the little "finger" of property that extends east of County Road R, and Mahoney confirmed that is the clubhouse and added it is a bit of a challenge. Mahoney stated a lot of it depends on what happens with respect to the golf course. Mahoney explained how this would be a natural fit if a golf course comes back. Mahoney stated if they intend on doing something else, they would see this as a redevelopment piece.

Gifford asked how close this property is to Village water, adding it is his understanding they really should not have something that serves food or anything like that there, given the water quality. Mahoney stated at one point in time it was immediately adjacent to because they did extend sewer and water. When the County took control of the property, the area between the two is no longer there, so now there is not direct access to that property. The DNR had been pushing very hard, especially because of the nitrate issue in the well water, for them to hook up to the Village's municipal water system. At this time, there is not a direct land connection, so in its current configuration that would not be possible. Mahoney stated if there is something that can be worked out, and if that is the thought process for somebody else moving forward, that might paint a different picture, and that would be very easy to make that connection. It could be as simple as an easement, if somebody wanted to retain land.

Ildvoog stated in terms of moving to item six and in terms of any action or direction today, it would seem to him that they need a new master plan developed.

Mahoney addressed the thought process of the developer's agreement and stated the Village would like to make it very clear that any updated developer's agreement would actually be between the developers themselves and the Village of Plover. There really is not a role for the County to play in that because it would involve the TIF District and performance acceptance and those types of things. The County will play the role of seller of land. Mahoney stated they would attempt to share what they can with the County in respect to that.

McKenna stated the parties can work together to put in place a new developer's agreement. They are all working toward the same goal of putting the property back on the tax rolls and having a viable economic entity. McKenna asked what the impact is of the developer's agreement; and said there is a strong legal argument that once the taxing process takes place, it might be null and void. McKenna stated this is something that does not need to be addressed at this time; he believes all parties would agree to work with the Village to put on a new developer's agreement, if such is necessary. McKenna stated he believes the developer's agreement was primarily there when the Village was trying to fund the project to bring the water and sewer and put restrictions on the land with the developer. McKenna stated this leaves them with a developer's agreement for a project that never came through with terms and conditions that may have been viable in 2005. McKenna does not believe this is an impediment. The County's role is not to enter into and work with developers. On the other hand, Portage County is the owner of the land so they do have some say in how it is sold.

Jossie stated she and Schuler have been discussing coming up with some type of structured Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Plover and the County in terms of what the roles and responsibilities are going forward. It is very clear they need a development agreement to go with the land, and they need to be able to sell the land to go with the development agreement. There are different roles in the process and they need to work together so everyone is on the same page.

Schuler stated they do not need to be mired in semantics. For the County to effectively market the land, they must have a good understanding of where the Village is coming from. At this time, the County's direct communications to interested parties has not been able to fully communicate a lot of information that is totally in sync between the Village and the County. Schuler reiterated the County and Village need to be on the same page.

Gifford stated if the land is sold off in chunks they would technically have multiple agreements, and they need to be careful as they do that so they do not have agreements that conflict. Mahoney stated the agreements would be separate because they really come into play with respect to this particular property because of the TIF. The Village still has expended some dollars they need to get back, and that is when they work with the developer. Mahoney stated the philosophy is each separate parcel will be treated separately with that owner so they do not get a crossover because that would create all sorts of problems. Typically, when dealing with developer's agreements, it is specifically with that developer on that parcel. Gifford stated that is why it is critical they have some sort of master plan so they have some guidance as they craft new developer's agreements.

McKenna explained how developer's agreements are different between different land uses. McKenna added the current agreement would not impede development.

Mahoney stressed they need some flexibility because they do not want to tie anyone into specifics until they work with specific developers. Mahoney discussed an example of this as dealing with the northeast corner of County Road R and Pleasant Drive. This could be a commercial establishment, a restaurant, or multi-family residential.

Idsvoog asked if they need a MOU; Schuler and Jossie both responded yes. Idsvoog stated he, Jossie and Schuler with work with the Village of Plover to put together a MOU and bring it back as soon as possible. That would be the action they take under item 6.

Idsvoog said he is taking it from discussions with the Village of Plover that, relative to the current negotiations, they will know something within the next month or two; Mahoney stated that is correct. Idsvoog stated that would affect what they do significantly; they should put the MOU together and wait for that action, then go from there.

Jankowski moved to put the MOU together and bring it back to this Committee and Potocki seconded, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Marketing of 13 Tax Deeded Parcels in the Village, of Plover, Formerly Known as the H2O Development Property

Gifford stated they have not talked at all about marketing. Idsvoog agreed, but stated he believes it is necessary to get the MOU done first.

Mahoney suggested the County Planning and Zoning Department have a conversation with the Village so they can come up with some concepts that can be brought back to this Committee.

7. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Gifford moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gayle Stewart, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
January 16, 2015 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 3, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Pazdernik, Gifford and Potocki

Member Excused: Jankowski

Staff Present: Schuler, Wallace, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Jami Gebert, Portage County Executive Office; Nathan Check, Portage County Highway Commissioner; Lori Dehlinger-Van Alstine, Portage County Business Council; and Mike McKenna/David Hickethier, Corporation Counsel Office

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 3 of the County Annex.

### 2. 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.

### 3. Director's Reports:

- CIP Update – Jossie stated she would provide a Capital Improvements Program update at the next meeting.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler reported he recently viewed temporary signs in the Business Park and found Adventure 212 to have a sign that is an issue to be addressed. He will work with the Corporation Counsel's Office to develop language to address the issue and will provide members an update, once a good approach is determined. In addition, Schuler plans to approach Business Park tenants to discuss temporary signs. Schuler also discussed the lots formerly owned by TOLD along County Road HH and Brilowski Road. The lots are now owned by Investors Community Bank, who actually found they have more land than they need and are trying to determine how to best develop the remainder. Ghidorzi Construction and Rettler Corporation are working on that, and a meeting was held with them and the City of Stevens Point. Waivers for the possible development may be involved and Schuler wanted to make members aware of this effort and the waiver possibility.

### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the December 22, 2014 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the December 22, 2014 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Discussion of the Role of the Portage County Business Council-Economic Development-Lori Dehlinger-Van Alstine, Executive Director, Portage County Business Council

Idsvoog noted part of discussions with the Portage County Business Council (PCBC) include suggestions coming in the near future to change the emphasis of the County's 2016 contract with the PCBC.

Schuler stated this is the first of several face-to-face meetings we will have to discuss where CIP/EDC fits into economic development, and what the economic development charge to the PCBC will be. Steps will be taken to clarify the answer to that question in advance of another contract. We will work with municipalities to sketch and coordinate what people actually do in the area of economic development.

The charge to the Committee to discuss economic development came as a result of the 2006 Countywide Comprehensive Plan. It is time to generate this discussion/conversation. Staff will help facilitate that discussion. In addition, economic development planning will continue through Comprehensive Plan (Plan) updates.

Dehlinger-Van Alstine (Dehlinger) described the PCBC Foundation has one person, Judy Rannow, who is working with schools. Education is the key to success as businesses clamor for people – a qualified work force. Schools should be involved in economic development.

Dehlinger provided a handout highlighting language from three comprehensive plans – Portage County, Village of Plover, and City of Stevens Point, noting they contain sections on addressing issues relative to retaining and growing businesses in Portage County. She believes this fits in well with the PCBC current plan. (Handout in original meeting file)

Dehlinger's next handout listed "Components of Economic Development" compiled by the International Economic Development Council's Economic Development Reference Guide, of which PCBC is a member. (Handout in original meeting file) She felt this chart helps define roles and referred members to the two columns on the left stating they are the focus of the PCBC, which includes: business climate (working toward), business retention/expansion, public-private partnerships, marketing (website), workforce development (PCBC Foundation), quality of life, real estate development, site selection (PCBC partners with municipalities), small business development, and technology development. Referring to the middle column, Dehlinger described these items as being involved by default and include clusters, transportation, entrepreneurship (cutting edge/nano technology kits getting in to schools), downtown development, and rural economic development. Finally, the two far right columns Dehlinger described as "someone else's deal/not hands-on for the PCBC, but they offer support" in: export/trade development, brownfields, sustainable development, infrastructure, tourism, venture capital, smart growth, neighborhoods, economic development finance (TIF), and e-commerce.

Dehlinger presented another handout from the Wisconsin Economic Development Authority (WEDA) dealing with economic development training for local officials (original in meeting file). She encouraged taking advantage of this opportunity and stated invitations will be sent to the Stevens Point Common Council, PCBC Board, County Board, etc. They have committed to offering two three-hour sessions. Idsvoog added that the Town of Plover sponsored one of these in November or December 2014.

Dehlinger referred members to a pie chart handout detailing the PCBC income (original in meeting file). Of a total income of \$526, 567, Portage County provides \$73,600, which is split between general operations (50%), outside marketing (40%), and marketing of the Portage County Business Park (10%). She noted the majority of businesses within the Park are from Portage County and either built for the first time in the Park or re-located their business to the Park. She described the Park as the "place to be," a good location; adding, the PCBC likes their location. She also indicated, as the Park sells out, the 10% allocated for marketing the Park could go somewhere else. Dehlinger stated the money from Portage County is appreciated, and she felt they run under a tight budget.

Dehlinger's last handout includes results of a survey conducted by the LaCrosse Area Development Corporation titled: 2014 County Economic Development Revenue Budget Comparison Ranked by County Funding (original in meeting file). This chart indicates Portage County receives \$73,600 in County funding, \$53,800 from municipalities (\$35,000-City of Stevens Point/\$17,500-Village of Plover/\$1,000-Town of Plover/\$300-Village of Amherst), for a total of \$127,400. Under the Private Member/Grants/RLF/Other (Other) column the amount listed is \$0 due to the fact the PCBC is not eligible for grants because of its 501C(6) status. Grants could come through the PCBC Foundation, which is a 501C(3). McKenna referred to Marathon County's \$336,000 in the Other column and asked if that amount included the Central Wisconsin Economic Development Fund (CWED). Dehlinger felt it did and added that most of the funding recipients listed are Economic Development Corporations, not Chambers.

Dehlinger then discussed target analysis (referring to the Portage County Business Cluster and Target Industry Analysis developed by Redevelopment Resources); what businesses should we be going after? She felt a workforce development strategy would help and noted the recent "job fair" was sold out. Attendance was at 500 people who came to look at jobs. Dehlinger described this as an intense level of participation.

Idsvoog described the curriculum change in schools needed for Skyward employment; adding, the number of Information Technology (IT) teachers is minimal. Students have noted the outdated equipment within the schools. Idsvoog felt Individuals obtain an IT degree and leave the area. Skyward has a workforce need. Outside areas begin recruiting Juniors at University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point (UWSP) and take them to their community. Idsvoog stated we must create a "sense of space" to keep young professionals here. He described the arts, activities/events, green circle trail, etc. as enticing and speaks to a quality of life here.

Dehlinger stated they put out a community guide every other year and Leadership Portage County partners on some of that. She described the PCBC work as broad. It may not seem focused. The website is working; they are receiving calls. Demographic information is contained there as well.

Gifford stated he chaired the UWSP IT Department for 9 years, and felt the retention trouble has to do with low pay in this area. Historically, individuals have stayed, but we have not kept up with trends in pay. Gifford added that rural economic development is a major charge; not something done by default as Dehlinger stated when reviewing the Components of Economic Development chart. Dehlinger replied they need to focus on what can be done with the money they get, which results in limited focus.

Idsvoog brought up the need to meet with the Village of Plover, etc. because we would all benefit, if the PCBC, municipalities, etc. all had specific targets, such as the H2O property, which we are sitting on. We need something to happen there, and need to see what the Planning and Zoning Department, PCBC, and Plover can do to help that situation. He suggests more dialog and specific conclusions. He also added he felt the PCBC work is more complex than many realize and hard targets need to be development in the future.

Jossie referenced the Redevelopment Resources document and felt we should target businesses specific to us. We need IT, but we won't become Google. We need to focus on business resources that are a good fit for Portage County. She understands the workforce issues, but we need to encourage tax base growth to have long-term sustainability. How do we engage? Dehlinger stated recruiting is pricey and felt it easier and more cost-effective to grow what is here. Others do it with numbers and incentives. Businesses ask, "What will you give me to locate here?" Gifford felt municipalities hold their development strategies close to the vest. Dehlinger replied the relationship with the Village of Plover is good; Stevens Point plays it close to the vest. The PCBC offers support where asked. The PCBC is not hands-on with TIF Districts.

Idsvoog thanked Dehlinger for her presentation at today's meeting.

#### 6. Continued Discussion: Strategic Planning/Economic Development and Capital Improvement Programming

Idsvoog stated he appreciated the memorandums by Schuler that accompanied the agenda packet for today's meeting.

He referred to the memo regarding background for today's meeting, specifically referring to page 2, paragraph 3, and felt the County Executive should be added to the list of those having accountability for County fiscal responsibility, because the County budget is a plan for economic development. CIP and future planning requires working closely with the County Executive; otherwise, the result can be an adversarial relationship.

Idsvoog noted the election process (County Board every two years/County Executive every four years) causes the planning process to be subject to change; changes in money availability and priorities.

Idsvoog noted he spoke with Potocki and Sheriff Lukas on jail data, and found hard jail data would be made available in April or May. Courts' system needs also remain. He also talked with Dreier about meeting with the nuns regarding the Health Care Center, and he felt priority for the Highway building is up for grabs. Idsvoog felt that if we could accomplish getting those needs prioritized, with dollar amounts attached, into the next CIP plan, we will have gotten more accomplished than what has happened within the last decade. Potocki stated the County Board made the jail the number one priority. He has not heard much about the Health Care Center.

Jossie stated the County Board sets policy and the County Executive operates within that. Policies live beyond the terms of office. Idsvoog felt that priorities change. Schuler agreed, and noted there should still be set policy vs. no policy at all. Jossie added that setting policy allows you to map and better predict the future. Gifford added he felt the County does not prioritize very well; referring to the jail, Highway needs, etc. as all having their own advocates. He has seen items suddenly appear on the CIP list that have never been there before. Gifford said yes, the jail has been given number one priority, but what if the County cannot afford it. Idsvoog stated the new Sheriff sees a need for a 200-bed facility. We can afford construction within the CIP, but additional personnel may be a greater cost than shipping inmates will. Idsvoog said there is no point in moving forward with jail expansion or building a new jail, if additional personnel costs are more than shipping costs; we must work within those parameters. Idsvoog suggested more dialog with the Committee is necessary before it goes to the County Executive and County Board. We must develop a consensus. Gifford felt the Highway Department is lucky because their need is only brick/mortar related, not personnel.

Schuler said we must emphasize the tie between policy planning and fiscal planning. Annually, within a typical long-term financial planning policy, there is an assessment of revenues and services, and resulting staffing levels. We must work with priorities and planning for them. In a perfect world, staffing and building needs would be found within the CIP. The County has priorities written somewhere and the Plan update needs to reflect that. These studies include what the County Board has concluded is necessary, which the Plan should reflect. We must explain to people that there is a finite pot of cash, and we have to make decisions within that range. If it is determined you cannot afford something, you either find a way to, or go to Plan B, or it is not your priority. Schuler asked that members let staff help with well-reasoned, well-informed decision-making.

Gifford ask if there was a way to cut taxes and not affect us. Jossie felt we should learn a lesson from Detroit; you can forecast. As an example, she noted how losing the mill affected Whiting's government. How do we plan for that? Long term planning is tied to economic development. Idsvoog added that rules change and we have no control. As an example, he noted how the current jail was built during a rule change period; you cannot forecast the future perfectly. Jossie responded it is easier to adjust for change, if you have a plan. Schuler stated if it is easier to think of it as fiscal/financial planning versus comprehensive planning, that is all right. It is all about long range financial planning; moving forward in a new way – let us plan for dollars being spent. The driver is the budget moving forward.

Gifford said he agrees with Potocki that the jail was set by the County Board as the number one priority, but there has been a disconnect between the Board's perception and action. He sees the real problem being how to sell a project that large. How do we sell it? Idsvoog brought up the high cost future of ambulance service as well. Potocki felt the jail referendum was unsuccessful because there was a school referendum at the same time. Potocki also suggested when looking at inmate transportation costs, you must add all related costs, including personnel, cars, cost of being in jail, etc. Idsvoog noted the County spent \$500,000 on a study and the projections could not have been more wrong.

Schuler felt with all those studies, you can build toward something; boil it down. The general point justifies what you want to do. The jail was concluded as priority number one, but what forum do you use to tell people how and what the decision is versus the Plan as the official forum. Schuler suggested this be incorporated into some committee's decision – priorities made and established, but remain tied to money. Fiscal planning is easier to understand than long range policy planning. Potocki referred to the \$29.5 million dollar figure relative to the jail, and felt it would not ultimately cost that much because the construction industry needs work and bids would be less. Gifford felt you must equate inmate transportation costs to additional personnel costs. You must be fair and honest about the impact to property taxes, loan and interest amounts, etc. Idsvoog added you must also be honest about the condition of the building. Gifford felt we may not need a referendum, but we must educate the public. Schuler asked who has been assigned to work on that and Idsvoog felt hard data should be processed through CIP/EDC.

Schuler asked who would determine the shipping versus operation costs figures, and Idsvoog replied the Public Safety Committee. Gifford asked if they know that. Jossie asked if the architect was looking at that, and Gifford replied that is not in the scope of their contract. Schuler stated we are talking about process. Idsvoog noted that involves many people/many committees, including the Finance Committee, CIP/EDC, the County Executive, etc. Schuler asked who has the final say. Does it go from CIP/EDC to County Board? Jossie stated it has to get into CIP first.

Schuler suggested developing a speculative road map/process. Idsvoog agreed. Gifford stated that should include the jail, Health Care Center, Highway building, and ambulance. Idsvoog stated he would work on that process with Schuler and Jossie.

## 7. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Gifford moved to adjourn and Potocki seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Sec.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date