

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
December 22, 2014 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 2, County Annex

Members Present: Idsvoog, Jankowski, Gifford and Potocki

Members Excused: Pazdernik

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

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Chief Deputy Daniel Kontos, Portage County Sheriff's Department; Patty Dreier, Portage County Executive; Jami Gebert, Executive Administrative Assistant; Nathan Check, Portage County Highway Commissioner

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:

- CIP Update – Jossie stated she had nothing, other than what is on the agenda.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler stated he had nothing, other than what is on the agenda.

Idsvoog said he understands there is an unapproved temporary sign located in the business park. Schuler stated there is, and they are going to be doing a survey of the park. He knows this has happened periodically in the past as there are no rules for temporary signs. Schuler said he would like to survey the park, take pictures of everything out there, send a letter to all park tenants and explain again there are no temporary signs permitted. The process is to seek approval through the Planning and Zoning Department and Economic Development Committee. Schuler stated in the past they have talked about finding a way to delegate the authority to approve temporary signs to Planning and Zoning staff, and he will work with Corporation Counsel at the same time to look at how to accomplish that. Schuler said he will update them both on what their approach will be to temporary signs and what will go on with the ones out there. Schuler stated they will take this opportunity to make all tenants aware of the rules.

Gifford stated he understands Skyward got approval for a temporary sign; however, he sees no purpose for the sign they are referencing, located at the Adventure 212 property, except for advertising. Schuler stated nobody thought about temporary signs or advertising when the Covenants were being drafted, and the main anticipated development in the south end of the Park was for office use. The only advertising for the industrial side of things is for hiring; Schuler stated Furniture and Appliance Mart does this every year. Schuler added this is not technically legal either, so they need to try to figure out how to approach the different needs as the Park has developed over time. Schuler said it would be nice to reasonably accommodate the needs of different retail components in the Oakwood area of the Business Park. Schuler said they need to think about what type of signage is appropriate for which business. Gifford asked if Adventure 212 owns the property on which the sign sits. Idsvoog stated it is across the street from the building they own. Schuler stated the family owns that property also; they own the entire lot from the small park compound down to WIAA.

Jankowski asked about the temporary sale signs like the ones that Furniture and Appliance Mart puts out often. Schuler stated it was always considered something Furniture and Appliance Mart did. Schuler said this is a good time to formalize what people can and cannot do and how they have to be approved for it. Dreier stated this is a business park and they want to attract businesses. They should be flexible and make it easy for businesses to respond quickly without going through a lot of red tape. Idsvoog agreed, adding he does not understand why that is not something staff can take care of upon request. Schuler stated they should formalize that.

#### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the December 2, 2014 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the December 2, 2014 minutes and Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

#### 5. Discussion/Possible Action Regarding Simulcast Tower Construction

Jossie stated as they have gone through the Simulcast project and in looking at negotiating leases to put the simulcast equipment on towers necessary for the equipment, the price in the lease payments has gone up significantly to the point where staff is considering whether or not it is cheaper in the long run to construct towers rather than lease them long term. Jossie stated they do not have the answer to that yet; the costs are significant enough that at this point it pays to do the research to determine if it is better to build or lease. They are at the tipping point on building being the better option.

Jossie stated this was brought before the Public Safety/Emergency Management Committee last week to inform them so they can continue doing research. Because of the cost to construct a tower, this would be a capital issue. Jossie is looking for approval to move forward with the research to see what would be the better option long term.

Potocki asked how many towers they are looking to lease, and Jossie answered at this point six with various cell companies. Idsvog stated if they build them, they are looking at \$250,000 per tower; which realistically would have a capital expenditure of \$1.5 million, which does not include land acquisition. Jossie stated they are looking at currently spending over \$150,000 annually. Kontos stated it may be a bit more than that because the cell companies charge between \$2,500 and \$3,000 per tower for those six towers. Kontos stated AT&T and US Cellular have raised the tower cost by ten-fold for putting on double the equipment. Potocki asked if we are still on some of the towers such as the Rosholt Fire Tower. Kontos stated we are not on those towers; we are on the cell tower in the Town of Sharon. Kontos said one of the options available is to partner with the Rosholt Fire Department who has a small tower. That small tower could be replaced with an adequate one that they can also put their equipment on. This would take care of the land acquisition for that portion of the County that needs to be covered.

Jossie stated they have had preliminary conversations with Planning and Zoning to look at construction related zoning issues. Planning and Zoning also provided a map of municipal land within the area the towers must be constructed. Engineering for simulcast was done according to where the communications would best fit within the county; they are looking for either County or Municipal land within a radius of those locations to build towers on to alleviate the cost of land acquisition.

Potocki stated he remembers a pipeline on Sunset or Second Street by Dewey Drive, and asked if they allow that anymore. Kontos stated the towers have to go in the right locations with the right topography to put the equipment on. Kontos added it does not matter which tower they are talking about; if it is owned by a larger company they have fixed prices. Kontos said he is not asking for a decision to move forward with the project at this time. Before they invest the time into getting answers to all the questions, they want to make sure this is not something the committee will say is a waste of time.

Dreier asked the term of the leases they are looking at that were increased ten-fold; what is the amount they are potentially looking at over time. Kontos replied the leases are five years. Idsvog asked the life of a tower if they were to build one; how long before it became obsolete. Kontos stated they could expect to get 50 years out of a tower. Jossie stated the equipment they put on a tower will become obsolete before the tower. Idsvog commented that communication in the Sheriff's Department is never enough. Kontos replied it is not just the Sheriff's Department; they could operate off of two towers in the County. Kontos stated they have such a robust system for the fire and EMS personnel in the county; the Sheriff's Department is responsible for maintaining their system. Kontos added technology is always going to move forward and anyone who says what they've got right now is all we're going to ever need is a fool. Kontos said the reality is we do not know 25 years from now if we will be doing the same. Idsvog asked how long the equipment on the tower is good for, and Kontos replied approximately 20 years. Gifford stated they will have that issue if they put it on a tower somebody else owns. Jossie added equipment will always be replaced, but the tower structure will remain. Gifford said Plover has a tower in the middle of a playground which is on a 50 year lease. Potocki stated he can remember Motorola telling him every 10 or 15 years that what they have is the best and they will get at least 95% coverage; adding they never got that much coverage. Kontos stated the system is a separate issue; this is a question of do they want to lease tower space or look at the possibility of building towers. That is the only question right here; do they want them to put the time into looking at the option of building as a better deal, or do they want to sign leases. Idsvog stated they definitely need to look into it.

Jossie stated the other issue with building versus leasing is leasing is on the operational budget. If they build, they shift things to the capital budget and you free up your operational budget on an annual basis. Idsvoog stated this is a way to spend more money under the cap. Jossie added when you're at the tax cap you may be looking for room.

Dreier stated if we own a tower, we could potentially rent to offset some of the other costs over time. Dreier asked about broadband coverage so they can finally address the issue of coverage in limited service areas. Dreier said this will be a benefit for economic development, home schooling, other schooling, higher education, and helping people all across the County. Dreier stated even municipalities that are struggling to get documents sent electronically would be able to access through a more modern system. Dreier said other counties have invested in broadband while Portage County has not. Dreier would like them to look at the chances of Portage County being able to do that. Idsvoog stated that should be made part of the research.

Jossie stated another consideration with Planning and Zoning was looking at building a tower option that would hold more than our equipment; but for the initial purpose moving forward, they would be primarily just for public safety purposes. When talking about building them to rent, they were concerned about the debate about competing with private enterprise in terms of renting out tower space. In addition, zoning becomes a different issue in terms of where they could build towers. When it is public safety, there is an exemption for tower construction. Idsvoog stated they would get criticism from the private sector if they rented tower space. Jossie stated we would definitely build to suite more than just our equipment; but at a later date they should have the discussion in terms of renting or leasing.

Dreier stated in looking at broadband, the other companies are not investing in the infrastructure in the other outlying areas because it is not economical to do that; if it was, they would have done it a long time ago. Dreier said by having Portage County do that and allowing them to potentially lease from us to help offset some of our expenses, it would be good for the whole.

Potocki asked if there is a cell tower ordinance, and Schuler answered yes. Jossie noted the ordinance stated Public Safety is exempt. However, if it becomes private, they must then follow the ordinance and it is questionable whether it is exempt. Jossie stated if it is for public safety or if they put up a tower and Rosholt piggybacks on the tower, it is still considered being used for municipal functions.

Motion by Jankowski to proceed with research on tower options. Motion seconded by Potocki and approved by voice vote.

#### 6. Discussion of the Role of the Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee in the Portage County Comprehensive Planning Process

Idsvoog stated he had a 45 minute discussion with Lori Dehlinger at the Business Council on Friday. Idsvoog stated she is out of town this week on vacation and he would like to postpone this item until she is able to appear in front of this Committee and explain her operational process and strategy relative to the municipalities that she works for in terms of economic development in Portage County. Idsvoog believes the dialog needs to be open and frank, and if there is some disagreement with how that operates, they should have that discussion. Idsvoog would prefer to not have any more discussion on what they do or don't do until they have that face to face discussion.

Schuler stated it is a great idea to invite Dehlinger, and it will be a benefit to have some sort of discussion on what they understand about the contract with them, what the work program is that they've published, and what they were going to do for 2014. Schuler has documents from 2014 and another describing the work program for 2015, and stated if they took a look at those, the Committee could figure out how to ask questions and understand when she is giving responses. Schuler stated if Dehlinger comes in and is asked questions cold, it will be more like a presentation. Schuler believes there needs to be a real dialog. Idsvoog asked Schuler to send those documents out. Schuler stated he will, along with an analysis of where he thinks this Committee might benefit from asking questions about.

Jossie asked if the Committee members had the contract, and Schuler answered yes. Jossie stated she was unsure on the percentages so they were a little off from what she stated in the meeting. Jossie asked the members to be sure to look at those percentages.

Schuler stated he knows members were to come to the meeting today with things they wanted to discuss; he asked everyone to keep those in mind or forward them to him so he can try to incorporate them into the discussion.

## 7. Continued Discussion: Strategic Planning/Economic Development

Idsvoog stated his comments in front of the County Board are critical and they've had discussion about that. Idsvoog stated in terms of what Jossie has told them about future borrowing and how they manage money going forward, and from what Dreier has mentioned a number of times as well, they have to get some decisions made for 2016 prior to the formation of the County Executive's budget, relative to what they are doing with the nursing home and doing or not doing with the jail. Decisions need to be made to do something or ship for the next five or ten years. Idsvoog stated he is not so concerned with what the answer is, but they need to get an answer. Otherwise, they will be sitting with a lull relative to what they can or cannot do financially.

Jossie stated there are a lot of capital improvements they need to do; boiler and chiller fixes, all types of maintenance things, as well as highway projects. Jossie stated her concern long term is if they have a vision of the things in the current capital improvement plan, if they miss a window they may not get another opportunity if the debt service drops to do this without having to go back to the taxpayers and raising taxes. Jossie stated while it may not be a concern this budget, it will need to be addressed in the future budgets. Jossie said it is concerning to her, as well as the way the decision making process has been going; she is fearful there will be an expectation that they will turn around and say build tomorrow and have the money. Jossie said that is not how capital projects work; especially when they need to take into account not only do they need to possibly build a facility, regardless of what facility that is, but they need to plan for the library lease, chiller replacements, and the highway project. They need to make sure there is some type of long term plan on when those things will be staged; adding this is from the financial perspective and making sure it all fits so when they go and tax, they are as steady as they can be.

Idsvoog asked Check if they are still looking at building at the Highway Department. Check replied there will be some sort of improvements at Highway, whether it is a new building or expansion of existing buildings. Check stated it would be for expansion of the operation of the Sheriff's Department secure evidence and impound lot. Idsvoog asked if that is part of next year's budget or 2016, and Check stated 2015 is the concept plan and 2016 would be refining that plan and getting the architectural work done. 2017 – 2019 would be construction. Jossie stated there are various components into that project, in addition to storage for highway; it is kind of a multi-layer project.

Schuler is happy the CIP and Economic Development Committees are now working together and he is happy to be working with Jossie. Schuler asked what he can do to help make this happen because they have a potential planning process that includes everyone talking together and right now nobody has a way to do that. Schuler asked what he and Jossie can do to help get the needed information as the CIP part of the Committee; is there something they can do to reach out to other committees to try to help them with discussions they need to have to bring information forward? Schuler said he and Jossie are really the only two people in the position to coordinate between committees. Idsvoog stated the hard data is very important and the appropriate oversight committees have got to get going and get some decision making processes. Jankowski stated the Space and Properties Committee has some data on the justice center that is already prepared and by March there should be something on the County Board desk as to an initial plan. Idsvoog stated there are some things that have to come together and this Committee, along with Finance and the County Executive, needs to be looking at the kind of dollars they are looking at spending over the next five years. Idsvoog added he does not believe this is something the County will be able to do all at once. Schuler stated he and Jossie will work together to figure out what committees need to make what decisions and what the time table might be, and come back to the committee with a sketch.

Idsvoog stated at the WCA Board of Directors meeting there was discussion on the issue of TIF districts being misused and at what point is enough enough in one particular area, relative to what it does to the tax base. Idsvoog will get more information on this. Idsvoog believes we are in a process right now where the intent of the law in 1978 and how it is used today is a whole different world. Idsvoog knows the State Legislature has amended it, but he knows just from a financing standpoint, how much land you want frozen in a given taxing area. Idsvoog believes the political resentment between who gets the good deals and who does not is going to increase; he sees more conflict coming out of this.

Potocki stated as far as the building at the Highway Department, he heard about this six months ago, and is there money in the Capital Improvements for that building? Jossie stated that was just for design/engineering. Check stated there was \$25,000 for design. Potocki asked what is taking so long to design it, and Jossie stated it is in the 2015 plan; the money is not available until January 1, 2015. Jossie stated the plan was adopted in August, and based on the plan in August, that is what gets put into next year's budget, which is not appropriated until January.

Jankowski stated they run into these issues in several different committees where they say the money is there, but it is only in the initial stages. He added we need to be very careful when they say where the money is. Jossie explained why they do some of the planning money up front on larger scale projects. When they get estimates for capital, there have been years when they have been off; they think a project will cost a certain amount but it ends up costing more. Jossie explained capital is a rolling budget for the project which carries from year to year. Jossie stated they have tried to get people planning money in the first year and then construction and implementation money the next year so they have firm costs to be planning on. Potocki stated the way the economy is now and how it is still pretty good for building, the longer they wait the more it will cost; Jossie agreed. Jossie agreed in terms of current financing, but does not want to get into a problem spot where they go and borrow more than needed.

Gifford stated that from a finance perspective, when the storage area is built at Highway, unless they add more staff, once it is built there will not be much in the way of ongoing costs. Gifford said the jail is an entirely different matter. He is not confident they can build a new jail and have fewer staff. Even if they add just ten more officers to staff it, where does that money come from? Idsvog stated the argument is that it makes sense only if the amount of money they are spending on shipping is going to pay for the additional personnel relative to the capital expenditure. The capital expenditure is one time for the building; but if you have to for example, double the operational cost relative to personnel, then you have something you cannot afford. Jossie stated they cannot afford to do it if that happens; there is not room on the cap. When it gets to this point of the decision making and they start to weigh options, if this was the case, they need to make a choice to discontinue some other county operation and not fund it, or they choose not to build it.

Potocki stated he believes officials from Wood County and Marathon County would send inmates here if we were to build a jail. Potocki added they are spending \$2 million a year. Potocki said Waupaca is laughing right now because everyone asked why they built such a big jail; now they are hauling in money. Potocki stated that could have been ours.

Jankowski stated they have been very careful in all the times they spoke about building extra jail beds and that they would not use that as a crux; that they were going to bring people in. Jankowski stated there are chances they could use those extra beds that are there to cover that. Potocki stated if they build a jail like Outagamie County where you have a center with all of the main functions and put spokes on; that will last for 100 years. Next meeting will be Friday, January 16, 2015 at 7:00 am.

8. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Gifford moved to adjourn and Jankowski seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:31 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
O. Philip Idsvog, Chair

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
December 2, 2014 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 3, County Annex

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

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

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Attorney Pilger; and Cliff King, Skyward

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 had nothing new or unusual to report at this time. Projects are moving forward.

-Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler stated there is no update at this time.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the September 19, 2014 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Jankowski moved approval of the September 19, 2014 minutes and Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Action: Request by Skyward, Inc. and Sky Group, LLC to Install Temporary Identification Signs During the Period of Construction (Until December 31, 2016) Along Interstate 39 and E.M. Copps Drive in the Portage County Business Park

Schuler reminded members that temporary signs are not addressed in the Business Park Protective Covenants; therefore, temporary sign requests have been acted on by the Committee. A letter explaining the request, from Attorney Pilger, was included in the agenda packet. Planning and Zoning staff have no problem with the temporary signs as proposed. Schuler also stated he believes the letter includes information on the extent of all signs requested, but as a condition, the Committee could allow staff approval of other temporary signs relative to this project, if requested.

With no further discussion, Potocki moved to approve the Skyward/Sky Group request to install temporary identification signs as outlined in Attorney Pilger's letter, as well as allowing staff approval of any other temporary sign requests related to this project. Motion seconded by Jankowski and approved by voice vote.

6. Discussion and Possible Action on 2015 Maintenance Contract of the Portage County Business Park

Schuler provided members the current list of duties of Gone West, which provides maintenance service of the Portage County Business Park. He noted the service was bid out a couple years ago, with auto renewals in place. Staff has been pleased with work conducted by Gone West. The contract is now up for renewal, but with Business Park land sales (i.e.: Skyward), the amount of acres under contract will change for 2015, thereby lowering the fee. As a result, there is no firm contract dollar amount available at this time. Schuler noted the Committee could act on this renewal now, or later once firm numbers are available.

Idsvoog stated his preference is to wait for final numbers to be available. He also asked for reasons to stay with Gone West or rebid for maintenance. Schuler replied Gone West was the low bid, their work has been exemplary, and he is comfortable with a renewal for 2015. He would suggest bidding again for 2016. Idsvoog asked how much acreage reduction is expected for 2015 maintenance. Schuler answered Skyward's large acreage purchase is the reduction (Lots 75, 103 and 105). He noted Gone West's prices have not increased since their initial bid.

Potocki questioned work being done around the pond areas. Schuler answered they mow around the ponds. Idsvoog asked when the contract would be ready and Schuler replied next month. Jankowski asked if the contract includes any snow removal and Schuler replied no.

Committee postponed item until revised numbers are available from Gone West for their 2015 contract.

7. Discussion of the Role of the Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee in the Portage County Comprehensive Planning Process

Idsvoog stated he has talked with both Jossie and Schuler about this role, and found a growing need to press the point with oversight committees for decisions on long-range fiscal items in the County, such as decisions on a justice center (JC), the Health Care Center (HCC), building at Highway Department, etc. All are related to long-term borrowing.

Jossie said when looking at the Capital Improvements Program over the next five years, decisions are necessary on borrowing, using reserve funds, and fund balances in capital projects. She is concerned with projects falling under "let's do that next month" and decisions are not ready/cannot be made because of the number of things being talked about. The County needs to use its money wisely, with a sense and a direction on commitments, and also when those commitments are occurring.

Pazdernik felt the Finance Committee understands this need, and suggested a joint meeting between the Finance and Planning and Zoning Committees.

Schuler felt the scope of the County Comprehensive Plan (created by Planning and Zoning Committee and ultimately approved by the County Board) involves every department in the County, and this was not as strongly understood when the plan was developed. There are many abstract ways committees have an impact across the County as those individual committees conduct their business. All committees involved must work together, and EDC is part of the discussions on JC, HCC, etc. As County Supervisors, all are connected with and deal with large County operations. The question is how we coordinate that.

Idsvoog stated he would report this discussion to the County Board in December. Decisions are needed prior to budget time. Currently, there is no systematic way to plan for the County. There is nothing clear-cut as to what we are and are not capable of doing. The County is spending reserves on programs such as Healthy Families. Idsvoog said the State has imposed caps on counties, and we will be deciding what programs to cut, not add. We have no choice in that and need to press decisions.

Gifford asked the window of borrowing opportunities as we plan. Jossie replied additional debt service payments could be made in 2017, because of borrowing in 2016. Jossie felt the struggle comes when the County commits to a project and then changes direction; solid commitments are necessary. Potocki stated the County committed to a jail as the number one priority two years ago.

Gifford suggested that before the County does this, it needs to know some things relative to committees that are making decisions, yet they may not have been acted on. There are investments of time and capital to do these things and reasonable cost expectations should be known. Jankowski pointed out that Venture Architects is working on jail costs, and he is unsure about HCC costs, although there are mechanical problems that need attention. Idsvoog noted discussion is set to begin early 2015 with the Sisters of Saint Joseph of the Third Order of Saint Francis (Sisters) on the City's north side (convent) regarding HCC. There are many variables to be resolved. We cannot let boilers go out at HCC; we must maintain the building. Potocki asked about any proposals from the Sisters and Idsvoog replied there have been initial discussions only. This is an example of public and private coming together.

McKenna suggested adding the H2O property to the project list. Jossie noted the terms of H2O sits with the Space and Properties Committee as a tax deed parcel. Jankowski noted this is a unique piece of property.

Gifford asked if Venture Architects is looking at a jail and Jankowski replied both a jail and courts (Justice Center).

Schuler suggested the County establish priorities in different areas. He asked if citizens understand the County process; the Comprehensive Plan can organize thoughts and processes. Schuler noted functions and decisions will not please everyone. The Comprehensive Plan can bring about coordinated discussions, and citizens can then see priorities, conclusions, etc. Schuler felt staff is frustrated because they can do great things, but there is no place or process to help make the best decisions.

Idsvoog felt that would be a nice world, if it worked that way. The County Board and County Executive have different directions. Given relationships and various points-of-view, there could be conflict.

Schuler stated a process would help the public understand. Potocki felt the public does not understand; they do not get necessary information. Schuler stated if the public asks, we should be able to tell them the process. Idsvoog provided the following example: 10 years ago during the jail planning process, the public claimed they knew nothing, yet it was the most publicized discussion ever.

Gifford said the jail project was set as the number one priority, yet nothing has been done, leaving the priority subject to change. The HCC could become the new priority. Gifford stated once priority is set, concrete steps should be taken to move it forward.

Jossie noted there are two years of planning to get project money in place; there needs to be a forward track. She felt there are some things that cannot be controlled, such as citizens coming to meetings. We must move forward. Jankowski felt we cannot go to referendum and then re-educate the people; the County Board needs to take responsibility.

Jossie noted staff could help with planning; we need to let the democratic process take place. She felt the County sometimes retreats, if not everyone agrees.

Idsvoog said, if okay with Committee members, he would give a short summary at the December County Board meeting. Firming up a process may require joint meetings between CIP/EDC and other committees. Potocki cautioned providing "scary" cost figures because figures change. Gifford agreed, noting if the public sees a cost figure of \$50 million dollars, they will automatically say that figure will rise. Jankowski also suggested caution with letting out cost figures; we should hold tight until the project is bid out.

#### 8. Continued Discussion: Strategic Planning/Economic Development

Idsvoog stated he had a few discussions with Schuler and Jossie on strategic planning related to economic development. He noted some Supervisors have concerns with the Portage County Business Council (PCBC), which is important, if we think they should be doing/focusing on certain things. We provide them \$73,000 a year, and we should tell them our expectations for that money.

Gifford added he is unsure what the PCBC does with the money; our contract with them previously required bills, etc. Jossie noted the current contract includes an expenditure breakdown; 25% on economic development, 25% on Business Park, etc. We should focus on their role in economic development, and be clearer on their role in the Business Park and other business activities. Pazdernik felt the most recent discussion has been what they are doing that we do not want them to do. McKenna stated the PCBC contract has goals. Are we getting the "bang for our buck" with a fabulous web page? There are loftier goals in the contract. Jossie felt economic development is on a continuum and the question is whether the PCBC is meeting the County's needs on that continuum (goals/visions/development). Gifford felt the web page is mainly for member services and asked if we should be paying for that.

Schuler stated from the planning side, the 2006 Comprehensive Plan said economic development discussions should be held in the County. The question is how. This is a broad topic with roles that need to be defined. The County is not the director of economic development in the County; that cannot be our role. Idsvoog noted when former Planning and Zoning Director Chuck Kell was here, he moved economic development forward with creation of the Business Park. The County did receive opposition for that, and Idsvoog felt the County should not do another Business Park. Idsvoog felt once Kell left Portage County, the Planning and Zoning Department had economic development duties removed. We have given the PCBC money to do economic development in Portage County. We have to tell them what they should do, if we need to. Should the PCBC sustain and grow jobs for the next 50 years? We need to give the \$73,000 to someone to actively pursue business development.

Gifford referred to some of the money being given to the PCBC to be utilized toward the Business Park, and asked when the Park is full, does the County stop giving them that portion. Schuler suggested bringing members of the PCBC before the Committee so they can explain what they do to advance economic development in Portage County. McKenna felt that conversation is needed now to change the contract. Schuler also suggested having the PCBC explain role #1 and make certain the money allocated by the County means something. You may have to tell them they do not achieve that, and then give the money to someone

who can. Idsvoog felt the County needs to be proactive and not be negative. Schuler replied his statements were not to be taken negative; he is not anti-PCBC. Gifford said the meeting would not be held to "punish" the PCBC; it is not to tell them they are doing something wrong, but rather asking what they do. Potocki suggested the PCBC come before the County Board. Idsvoog felt it more important to tell the PCBC what we want. If they present before the County Board, we thank them and they leave. A meeting with this Committee can be substantive and specific. McKenna noted reporting to the County Board is in the PCBC contract. He suggested the County needs to look at what they want done and then go to the PCBC with contract changes to address those needs. Do we want to be aggressive in economic development or not, because right now we are not, while other counties are aggressive.

Schuler said it is nice to have the PCBC and the services they provide. The PCBC and Central WI Economic Development Program are the main economic development providers in the area.

Scholfield stated within the next 60 days, he would draft a letter to the Planning and Zoning Department regarding Business Park closeout. He will soon run out of work for Portage County. Idsvoog said he understood that as all land was sold in the Business Park, maintenance, etc. would transition to the tenants. Scholfield described his letter as the kick-off to that and will have defined elements on roles of the County and PCBC. Scholfield said many people are not "feet on the ground" like he is (versus a web page). He felt his letter would give the County substance and a place to start. Schuler felt Portage County would not drive or direct the process, but understand it by illustrating the process and coordination. Potocki asked if tenants are aware of the transition and Schuler replied yes, and they will be reminded.

Idsvoog concluded by stating the PCBC should target and go after businesses. He felt the County could have had a casino, a golf course, and hotels, but we do not because of conflicting opinion on targeted development types. He clarified he is not for or against, but he sees the County as change resistant.

Idsvoog stated another meeting on this topic would be held and asked that all Committee members come to that meeting with specifics to tell the PCBC. The next meeting date was set for December 22 at 7 am. McKenna asked if the current PCBC contract should be sent to Committee members and Idsvoog replied yes.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Potocki moved to adjourn and Gifford seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:55 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
September 19, 2014 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5, 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; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; and Nate Check, County Highway Commissioner

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 5 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 – For informational purposes, Jossie provided members a letter from McKenna addressed to the City of Stevens Point regarding the County's offer relating to the Portage County Library lease. This was provided to members because if the offer were accepted, it would affect and be incorporated into the County's Capital Improvement Program.

Jossie provided members with a handout detailing capital improvement projects from 2013 through projected 2015 balances, which indicated a projected balance of \$609,000 in undesignated reserve at the end of 2015.

Jossie referred to two specific projects: 1. The Jordan Park pit toilet project, which was budgeted at \$70,000, but will be over budget by \$10,000; and 2. The Dewey Shooting Range project, which was budgeted at \$27,000, but due to a grant awarded for that project, the \$27,000 will not be needed and could cover the cost of funds necessary for the Jordan Park pit toilet project.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler stated the Skyward development plans being prepared by Rettler Corporation will soon come under County review. He noted other large development sites in the Park have come to the Committee due to waivers being sought, and he is not sure at this time whether that will be needed for this development.

Jankowski asked if Skyward encompasses all of the north side of the Park and Schuler replied yes, the land from I39 to the overpass.

(NOTE: Jim Gifford enters meeting.)

Scholfield stated Lot 66 is under construction at this time with an approved building that Bill Bayba is leasing to an engineering firm. Lot 33, across from WIAA, is a TOLD-owned lot in financing to become a medical arts building and should be closing within 30 days. Furniture and Appliance Mart, within the next 30 days, should bring in an offer on Lots 79 and 80 for expansion of their distribution center due to business expansion in Madison. Scholfield noted a large ongoing discussion with Skyward also includes traffic signals and other issues on their northern entrance, which influences an on-going discussion with the City regarding Lots 86, 99, and 100. Those lots were approved by CIP/EDC for development of the East Park Commerce Center; the cold storage property, which was granted access/right-of-way into the area, and it has been a year since that approval. The City is ready to make a purchase of those lots, but they are waiting for final design on signals. Scholfield stated four lots are left and three building pads in Portage Park Centre. Discussions have begun on forming an association, so eventually the County can choose its exit from the Park, so that owners will take over maintenance, etc. Also, there is a request from the City of Stevens Point that includes good promotion for the remainder of the Business Park and, for the City, certification of the East Park development. The Mayor has signed five-year options on that with several parties looking at growing it. Scholfield stated he would be developing a proposal for large promotion signs.

Schuler noted there is a strong stated intent and incentive to get the County out of Business Park management. He asked Scholfield, if there were a transition to a Park association, what can the County do to still pursue construction on the large parcels that have been sold, but are yet to be developed. He is happy there are few parcels left to sell, but there are acres purchased, but not built on. It is still in the County's best interest to have those lots developed as intended. Scholfield replied that is an on-going issue. The largest undeveloped parcel is owned by Ministry, which was a land swap for the AIG site. Ministry will be actively marketing that parcel with a national company; most of their corporate decisions are made in St. Louis at this time. Scholfield felt there would be a diligent effort to move that 14-acre parcel along I39. Ministry has been responsive to paying their maintenance fees on that lot. Lots 30 and 31, on the corner of County Roads HH and R, have been bought by Investors Community Bank, which plans a bank building on the corner and eventually a multi-tenant site. Lot 33, directly across the street, is Alliance Health, if that closes. Lots 25-28, owned by Richard Pavelski, who has ideas for the lots, but nothing has happened to date. Scholfield contacts Pavelski every three months. Lot 102, owned by the City, near the Transit Facility, is part of an existing site plan. Scholfield stated he would become the listing agent for Lot 47, next to the USDA, whose owner has been deeply involved in development around Lambeau Field and not focused on this area. Scholfield noted the covenants do follow those undeveloped lots, but decisions on who will police those lots, maintenance of ponds in the right-of-way, etc. need to be made. There will be a fair amount of things to navigate, and a framework will be developed from which the Committee can work.

Idsvoog stated a Committee agenda in the near future would include mapping out a plan for these issues.

Pazdernik stated, as he understood those who purchased land must build. Schuler replied, indeed, they are supposed to, but the County has given extended timeframes to owners. He suggested we invite Pavelski and others to a Committee meeting. The County has not optioned to buy back any property. Idsvoog asked staff to work on who should be invited to appear before the Committee. McKenna noted the Park covenants have, in fact, worked well, and a successor agreement should be developed for ease of transition. Idsvoog agreed, adding that now is the time to work on that successor agreement.

#### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the August 19, 2014 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved approval of the August 19, 2014 minutes and Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

#### 5. Continued Discussion: Strategic Planning/Economic Development

Idsvoog provided members with an economic development handout he obtained at the recent Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA) convention that focused on Racine and Fond du Lac Counties. The Fond du Lac presentation was a recap of their decisions on Mercury Marine; Fond du Lac gave them a bit more. In Racine County its County Executive is actively involved in business recruitment and operates similar to the Marathon County Economic Development Corporation; he is uncertain the number of employees. Idsvoog stated when there is Tax Incremental Finance (TIF) District after TIF District, like Fond du Lac County, questions arise such as what was the cost per job that was paid. How much money did it cost? How much of a tax advantage took place? How much does this cost the taxpayer? There is deferment on people who make the most money and no analysis on what happens to the taxpayer. Idsvoog felt it would be nice to know the answers/data on TIFs.

Potocki attended the convention's economic development presentation as well and noted that Racine set aside \$4 million dollars (County, City, municipal dollars) to put into economic development. They have a part-time Economic Development Director and target industries.

Idsvoog felt there is a debate in Portage County on what is and what is not okay to recruit as far as business types. Potocki said he remembers years ago when a casino tried to locate in Portage County; at that time, a casino was not okay. Potocki was Sheriff then and asked other Sheriffs with casinos in their jurisdictions, about how casinos affected the community. He was told casinos had not caused problems; they all have security, they all give a lot of money to communities, etc. Idsvoog brought forward a power plant as another example of development not wanted in the past in Portage County. This approach differs from Fond du Lac and Racine Counties.

Idsvoog noted he has never heard of a TIF District not being approved in Portage County. Scholfield stated that responsible use of TIF is what he believes in. He describes TIF as a vehicle they have been given, he believes in TIFs, and TIFs he has been involved with have been dealt with responsibly. Gifford asked, as relates to a TIF, what about school districts who do not benefit one dime. He felt that rankles people. Scholfield agreed; adding there are no general fund dollars to take that on.

Idsvoog stated he heard from other supervisors that who benefits from TIFs is judgmental, selective, and used for showcase developments rather than smaller ones. TIFs are seen as subjective and unfair. Scholfield noted that in Wausau they have said to developers if you do not reach employment levels, etc., you will begin paying tax. McKenna stated other counties have different examples, have tackled this issue, and have been successful. He added TIFs have been used in Portage County to entice businesses who cannot obtain capital funding.

Pazdernik stated he attended the WCA convention discussion on economic development and noted he heard that County Executives in other counties are active in resolving conflicts, and that is not the case in Portage County at this time. He has seen free land, reduced utilities rates, etc. as needed to compete across the State for economic development.

Idsvoog sees Portage County in a support role to the Portage County Business Council, with the Council making decisions. The County's role would be limited and not out front. He further stated we need to target and recruit what we think fits in Portage County, and the Business Council should identify those targets.

Potocki felt the internet should play a role in economic development through advertising, which he has found other counties in the State utilizing. Incentives, etc. could be advertised. He added that Portage County should not "give away the farm"; no 20-year tax breaks, but rather incremental 1-5 year breaks. McKenna felt it is not the case that Portage County has not done anything, using Lands' End and Travel Guard as examples where Portage County did upfront their mortgages. Potocki reiterated that we must market Portage County. Scholfield stated Portage County does advertise on the internet now and is doing well with that. He felt tax base is important and you must expose yourself and stick to it. As an example, the community of Thorp will not carryout more than 3-5 years on a TIF; it is hard to get 10 years in some cases. He further noted that AIG does receive a tax bill. Idsvoog replied it is important to find a balance. Scholfield said, if asked how the Portage County Business Park has performed, the answer would be it has been a success. Idsvoog felt we have relocated current businesses versus bringing in new businesses. Scholfield replied that does happen. Schuler noted the discussion is about incentives and TIFs, but if the intent is to bring business to Portage County, most happen at the municipal level and the County is not involved in that decision.

Gifford felt there are two types of economic development: to move businesses around and to bring someone new into the area. He stated Portage County must enhance its "face" and to put the word out why it is good to locate in Portage County. Gifford felt Portage County has received bad press related to water; there is no water and what we have is dirty water. He stressed that should be corrected because who would locate here. Gifford also stated that education plays a role in economic development because students take skills they learn and leave Portage County. This happens because salaries are higher in nearby areas such as the Twin Cities. We must get an image that sells Portage County.

Jankowski felt decisions need to be made as to what businesses to entice here; define it. In addition, we must decide what we want to do once the Portage County Business Park has sold out. What do we do with the H2O property in Plover; we need to target that.

Idsvoog thanked members for their comments and stated he will work with Schuler to prioritize and work through members' thoughts provided today.

Schuler stated that as County Supervisors, members talked about economic development and your role in it. He then referred to the Portage County Comprehensive Plan (CP), which represents the main ideas of the County Board on a number of subjects. The CP summarizes discussion of bigger points, including economic development, the Health Care Center, the campus concept/jail, etc. The CP is a long-range planning tool; economic development is not independent of that.

Schuler noted Racine and Fond du Lac Counties talked about what was important at the WCA convention presentation. Racine said the County Executive takes the lead. Today's discussion points to a need for further discussion. The Planning and Zoning Department has been tasked for 8 years to bring people together to discuss what and how to work toward economic development. Schuler asked what about TIFs; where should they be used and why? That level of discussion is needed.

Idsvoog stated a clearly defined role is his wish – like Marathon County. Schuler felt a conceptual discussion of TIFs is needed to understand it.

Gifford noted Racine had been seen as an industrial county and that has gone away. Gifford felt agriculture is the focus in Portage County and economic development has a different mindset. What businesses do we want? How do we know what businesses we want? Who makes that decision? How do we begin that discussion?

Idsvoog felt we live by “those with the gold make the rules.” Gifford felt call center jobs are abundant in Portage County and he does not want to base the County’s future on that. We must attract businesses that make enough to contribute to the County. Schuler noted a living wage group has begun meeting and we need to invite them in to a work force needs discussion.

Jankowski felt vacant land needed for further economic development in Portage County could cause us to butt heads with the agricultural community.

6. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Jankowski moved to adjourn and Potocki seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:56 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
August 19, 2014 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5, 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; Patty Dreier/Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Nathan Sandwick, UW-Extension; Todd Neuenfeldt, Facilities Director; and Reid Rocheleau

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 5 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

Rocheleau registered to speak under agenda item #3.

### 3. Director's Reports:

- CIP Update – Jossie stated she had nothing to report other than what follows on the agenda.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update – Schuler stated he had nothing to report other than what follows on the agenda.

Rocheleau brought forward his dislike of the City of Stevens Point's purchase of land in the Portage County Business Park followed by said land being put into a Tax Incremental Finance (TIF) District. Idsvoog stated he agreed.

### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the June 6, 2014 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Gifford moved approval of the June 6, 2014 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Review of 2014 Projected and 2015 Proposed Economic Development/Business Park Budget

Cummings read the 2014 and 2015 budgets as provided to members with their agenda packet.

Gifford asked the number of lots available for purchase in the Business Park and Schuler described the location of available lots. Cummings noted, of the 372 acres in the Park, 48 acres are left for purchase. Gifford asked for clarification that when all lots are sold, Portage County would no longer be responsible for Park maintenance. Schuler replied that would be the case only if Park tenants would form a type of owners association to take over maintenance, which is not an automatic, but rather a process; otherwise, Portage County stays involved with maintenance. Schuler stated tenants would be encouraged to work toward the owners' association process. Once all land is sold, the County is out money-wise, but not responsibility-wise. Idsvoog stated he disagrees; once the County does not own it, he sees no County responsibility for the Park. Gifford asked whether the County pays its share of maintenance on lots yet to be sold and Schuler replied yes. Jankowski asked if ponds and green space are part of maintenance costs and Schuler replied yes. Schuler noted bids have been let on maintenance of the Park ponds, which is currently performed by Portage County Highway.

Pazdernik asked about the \$40,000 budgeted for maintenance and Cummings explained that is an estimate used over several years, but for 2015 a more realistic figure of \$79,000 was proposed.

Jossie referred members to page 5 of the budget, noting the account titled "Transfer to Other Funds-Debt Service," which is left blank at this time because she is looking at the debt service fund. The Park has been sold at rates different than the schedule estimated it would; it was a business plan, which will be adjusted as we determine how to use the Business Park Fund because it is paying off the debt service the County borrowed on behalf of the Park. We will look at how to level out the Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) in future years. Idsvoog asked for clarification that there is approximately \$5 million in reserve and Jossie replied yes. There

are large items in the upcoming CIP and we want to be able to use transfers from the Park in a meaningful way to keep the tax levy as flat as possible. Jossie noted she and Schuler are performing an analysis of where the Park is at and retooling the schedule developed in the 1990's.

#### 6. Review of 2014 Projected and 2015 Capital Improvements Budget

Jossie referred members to page 1 of her handout that was mailed with the agenda packet; noting it is not in budget format, but rather spreadsheet format. This page lists existing and new projects. Referring to Page 2, Jossie stated this shows what has been proposed in the CIP Plan, which is going to County Board tonight, and those amounts have been put in the 2015 levy column, adding figures to existing projects. New projects have amounts as allocated in the CIP Plan as proposed by CIP/EDC.

Jossie noted projects in 2015 total \$1,627,914 and an undesignated reserve figure of \$1,200,914 reflects how much is needed from CIP reserve to offset the projects. There is a total of \$625,000 in new levy allocated in the budget process, leaving a project fund balance at the end of 2015 of \$371,500. In addition, there is \$3.1 million sitting there relative to a building project, which was set aside for a courthouse. Jossie clarified the County had \$5 million; \$1.9 million was used to buy the Associated Bank building, which leaves \$3.1 million in fund balance. In addition, 2015 would end with \$550,000 wrapped up in unspent projects still being worked on.

McKenna asked if the original borrowing for the Park has been paid off. Jossie replied the County has paid it; the Park has not paid the County back. The Park is paying it off at a different rate than the County paid it off, which was advantageous for the County. This involved refinancing to a lower rate and paying it off at a different rate because the County could afford to do it.

Pazdernik asked how much the Park still owes the County. Jossie replied that as of the end of 2013, the Park had just over \$5.2 million in fund balance, with estimated remaining lots sales of \$4.1 million, which gives the County about \$9.3 million. Jossie provide this example: with annual expenses estimated over a 10-year period at \$850,000 (assuming the County still owns the Park), debt service payments (P&I), totaling just over \$14 million dollars for land and infrastructure, and the Park having paid the County, through 2013, close to \$3.5 million, this scenario leaves the Park owing \$10.6 million. If at that point, the Park turned over \$8.5 million to the County, which is the fund balance and estimated lots sold, there would be a deficit of \$2.1 million, but this does not take into account the value of the land through real estate taxes. The assessed value of Park properties is just over \$81 million. In 2013 alone, taxes paid by Park tenants was over \$1.9 million (keeping in mind some of the land is in TIF), of which \$422,000 was Portage County taxes alone. Therefore, what is owed will be almost fully paid back, and taking into consideration taxes paid/generated, the amount is close. Idsvoog likened it to breaking even.

McKenna asked if the County could liquidate the Park at its pleasure. Jossie clarified as to whether McKenna meant sell the Park. McKenna asked, assuming the County got out of the Business Park business, the \$5 million dollars would what? Jossie replied the \$5 million is all County money. McKenna asked when the Park pays back to the County, is that considered a revenue. Jossie replied it offsets what is levied for debt service.

Idsvoog referred back to 1978 when TIF laws were created, stating it was not intended to be used in a business park. He feels it is a contradiction as to what a business park is supposed to do.

Dreier referred to the \$850,000 in Park expenses over a 10 year period, noting that in 2013 there is \$422,000 in taxes generated for Portage County, which means in a couple of years we pay for ten years' worth of estimated expenses. Taxes generated in two years, covers expenses for 10 years (\$422,000 in taxes X 2 years = \$844,000 vs 10 years of expenses estimated at \$850,000). Dreier stated that is just a different way of thinking about revenues/expenses in the Park.

Gifford referred to an article in the Stevens Point Journal that stated every year, for 20 years, the City of Stevens Point will payback taxes to Skyward. Gifford stated he had never heard a TIF District described like that. His understanding of a TIF was that taxes never got collected. Schuler responded taxes are always collected on the base amount, and any value over that goes to repay any money spent on improvements created. Once that is paid off, the money (base and improved value) goes back into the regular tax stream.

#### 7. Discussion/Possible Action on Information Technology Department Server-Room Air Conditioning Replacement Project

Jossie referred members to a summary of proposals submitted for the IT server-room as compiled by the Purchasing Department, noting Ron's Refrigeration will be awarded the project. The bid came in just under \$44,000. There is a need for an additional \$2,700 because there was only \$35,000 total budgeted for the project that came in at \$46,700. Before proceeding with the project, Jossie wanted to inform the Committee because the project will be funded with capital projects money. The contract will be taken by Neuenfeldt to Space and Properties Committee for contract approval.

Idsvoog asked the amount Jossie wants action taken on for this project and Jossie responded \$47,000. Jankowski moved to spend \$47,000 on the IT server-room air conditioning replacement project and Gifford seconded the motion.

Neuenfeldt explained the project is 3 years old and was budgeted at \$35,000 at that time. Inflation and the market have caught up with us causing higher cost. The project is three years old due to a fluctuating heat load in the server-room as equipment was brought in and taken out over the course of 3 years. The heat load is considered stable at this time and would allow the project to move forward.

Gifford asked for an explanation of the physical component of the bid. Gifford referred to a huge difference in labor costs across the bids. Neuenfeldt replied labor costs depend on who is busy and who is not. If the contractor is busy, they will put forward a higher labor cost because of paying overtime to get the project completed.

Pazdernik asked for clarification that the \$35,000 project is now \$43,946. Jossie replied no, it is actually \$47,000 because of the additional \$2,700 not listed on the bid summary. Jossie noted the budget would be adjusted for this increase in cost, as well as a decrease in cost of the cooling tower, which had a savings of about \$30,000. Neuenfeldt explained that project came in under budget because it was decided to go with galvanized units versus a stainless one.

A call for vote on the motion on the floor revealed all in favor; motion passed by voice vote.

#### 8. Discussion: Strategic Planning/Economic Development

Idsvoog noted discussions he had with Dreier and Schuler, and referred to the attachment from Marathon County as provided in the agenda packet. Idsvoog agrees with what Marathon County had to say, which is that counties should play a support role in economic development. Over the next 6-7 months, Dreier and Schuler would like a definition of Portage County's role in economic development. Idsvoog stated this definition should include what the County should and should not do. There has been concern with the priority of the Business Park and support for the Portage County Business Council. Idsvoog stated he felt the private sector should drive economic development. He then referred to the County's Strategic Plan, which he described as a fluid document that can be amended on the County Board floor.

Idsvoog provided a handout of a Marathon County article titled "State must continue to reduce tax burden," which discusses the cost of businesses leaving the State due to taxes. Idsvoog stated taxes always increase; whereas, they should be reduced, and described himself as conservative. Adding, reducing taxes is difficult to do.

Schuler referred to and read from the 2006 County Comprehensive Plan-Action Plan where economic development is discussed. Within that Action Plan, there are three items related to this Committee and economic development. During the comp planning process, economic development was discussed and everyone was aware of someone involved with it, but no one understood the overall system. When the Strategic Plan recommendation was made, the idea was the County was in a good position to hold a discussion where everyone understands everyone's role. As noted in the Marathon County article, there is a split on what people think; everyone thinks the County should do something about something, but they do not know what or how it can. Schuler sees the Strategic Plan initiative as an education piece to help people understand what County government does and answer to those who worry about good paying jobs and long-term employment. Schuler felt it would be beneficial for the Committee to clarify exactly what the County is responsible for; what you do, what you do not do, and how it works.

Schuler stated in the Planning Section of the Planning and Zoning Department, staff is very willing to help the Committee run through discussions on just what that role can be. Not an involved, long term, boring planning process, but discussion as to what makes sense for various roles in economic development and who is involved with what aspects. The Strategic Plan has many ideas of what can be accomplished, and Schuler felt there are many interesting, individual parts that can be refined into what is a logical, complete discussion for the County to have.

Schuler noted most County documentation (i.e. Code of Ordinances, CIP/EDC definition) is geared toward the Business Park, with vague references to other economic development strategies, and it would be nice to define them.

Dreier stated she and Idsvoog attended a meeting within the last 2-3 weeks related to the Business Council and its interest in having their next "contract" with the County. Dreier said the bottom line is that it is tough to be able to ensure we have just the right contract with the Business Council, if we do not know or have clarity around what the County's role in economic development actually is. Dreier stated she is looking forward, over the next years, to getting issues flushed out so the County can know the alignment with the Business Council is done properly.

Idsvoog asked all Committee members to come to the next Committee meeting, which will focus on an economic development discussion, with two very specific suggestions about what the County should and should not be doing; do not come with one suggestion, but two or more. The next meeting should be held in approximately 3 weeks.

9. Review of Purchase Requisition(s)

Cummings stated there is nothing to review at this time.

10. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Jankowski seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:37 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County CIP/Economic Development Committee  
June 6, 2014 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5, County Annex

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

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

Others Present: Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; and Tiffany Haddow, Ortho Molecular Products

### 1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:00 am in Conference Room 5 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 had nothing to report.

- Economic Development/Business Park Update

Schuler informed members that during an upcoming CIP/EDC meeting, he and Jossie would make a presentation regarding status of the Business Park from its beginning to present day. The presentation will include information on land values, tax base, etc.

### 4. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the November 27, 2013 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved approval of the November 27, 2013 minutes and Jankowski seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Ortho Molecular for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XV(A) Regarding Landscaping Plan to Allow Installation of a Garden

Haddow stated plans submitted for a garden indicate two 6' X 10' plots and one 10' X 20' plot. This request will foster an environment of wellness and after hours gathering for Ortho Molecular employees. Haddow noted plans call for the garden plots to be fenced-in to keep out wildlife. The fence will likely not be visible from the main road into the Business Park.

Pazdernik asked the type of fence to be installed and Haddow replied it would include wooden posts with chain-link and will look nice. Schuler stated fencing details would be worked through with Planning and Zoning Department staff. Haddow added water would need to be installed to the garden area, as well.

Gifford suggested that if the garden would be abandoned, Ortho Molecular would have to restore the area to Business Park standards. Schuler stated that would be a normal part of enforcing Business Park Covenants.

Gifford moved to approve the proposed garden installation by Ortho Molecular with fencing details to be worked out with Planning and Zoning staff, and including the requirement to bring the area back to Business Park standards if the garden was ever abandoned. Potocki seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 6. Presentation and Proposal by the Scholfield Group, LLC for a Listing Contract for Marketing the Portage County Business Park AND 7. Discussion/Possible Action on Approving a Portage County Business Park Listing Contract Extension with the Scholfield Group, LLC

Schuler asked members if they had any questions relating to the information received with their agenda packets as pertains to the contract extension with Scholfield Group. Hearing none, Idsvoog clarified this proposed contract extension is the same as the current contract and Schuler replied yes, that is the case. Idsvoog asked if the extension would be for one year and Schuler replied yes.

Jankowski referred to the posted Business Park map and asked about remaining vacant areas in the Park. Schuler stated lots depicted in yellow remain vacant. He further noted that lots 31 and 32 have been sold to Investors Community Bank, and lot 33 is in the works for a medical building. Lots depicted in red are sold, but remain undeveloped, and includes the Ministry Health lots, which are being marketed. Looking at the map, it is apparent we are down to a limited number of remaining lots to sell. (Scholfield enters the meeting).

Scholfield referred members to the summary provided in their agenda packets and noted the question is how to market the last few remaining lots. He clarified that Ministry is working with a national real estate firm to market their undeveloped property. Ministry has decided not to build and have moved numerous employees into the vacant portion of the Lands' End building. Scholfield also noted the pond at the entrance of East Park Commerce Center has been pitched to the City for purchase. Furniture and Appliance Mart will be announcing growth and may expand their warehouse in the Park. Scholfield described the sell-through as great; and noted he has received seven more contacts in addition to those reported in his handout. Marketing strategies will be changed when trying to sell the last few lots. Signage was installed on several lots at the start of the Park and is a way to sell the final lots as well. Signage would have Scholfield Group listed, but if ever the marketing contract is not renewed, the signs are easily flipped to read Portage County Planning and Zoning as the place to contact. Schuler noted signage cost is proposed to be split 50/50, which is not part of the contract. Scholfield noted he would make that proposal at the next meeting.

With no further discussion, Potocki moved to extend the listing contract for one year with Scholfield Group, LLC and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Gifford noted we hold Park tenants to sign standards and he may be concerned with marketing signage; stating he does not like signs. Scholfield replied marketing signs are approved at one-year increments. He feels they are a great tool, but he understands Gifford's concern.

8. Review of Purchase Requisitions

Committee members reviewed a purchase requisition to Rettler Corporation for the Skyward property survey.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before CIP/EDC, Potocki moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:18 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date