

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
December 2, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5, County Annex

Members Present: Patton, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, Olson, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna and David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group, Joel Lemke, Stevens Point Public Works Department, Matthew Fleming, Portage County Purchasing Manager; and Ward Wolf.

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. Discussion/Action on Minutes of November 3, 2011 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Patton moved approval of the November 3, 2011 minutes and Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on a License Agreement for Little Scholars Child Care to Utilize the Park Centre Parking Lot for Overflow Parking as Needed for an Event Scheduled December 6-8, 2011

Wallace explained Little Scholars Child Care has not yet submitted proof of extended liability insurance required to be in place for the area of the parking lot. She suggested the Committee could approve utilizing the parking area pending proof of liability insurance. Idsvoog clarified the liability insurance may not be obtained and Wallace replied that was correct, and if the insurance is not obtained, Little Scholars cannot utilize the parking area.

With no further discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve overflow parking in the Park Centre parking lot for Little Scholars with the condition proof of liability insurance be provided to the County prior to the event. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Portage County Business Council, Lot 3, for a Waiver from the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XI, Regarding Temporary "For Lease" Sign

Wallace stated the Committee had previously approved the sign in question for one year, which ends December 7, 2011. At this time, the Business Council is seeking an extension of that approval for the exact same sign.

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve a waiver extension to allow a temporary "for lease" sign for the Business Council for an additional one year period. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Requests from Angus Young and Associates, (City Transit Facility, Lots 101, 102) for Waivers from the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XIV (B) Requiring the Use of High Pressure Sodium Exterior Lighting; Section XV Landscaping and Open Space Requirements Regarding Street Trees and Foundation Plantings; and Section XXI, Maintenance Responsibilities Regarding Use of No-Mow Areas

Schuler referred members to revised landscaping plans, which he described as good. Schuler went on to discuss the use of LED exterior lighting, which he feels will be a request the Committee will see from others as well because when the Covenants were written, LED lighting was "not on the radar." It is a new, more efficient technology and staff will recommend approval of this type of lighting as long as the tenant meets other Covenant criteria such as candlepower, shielding, etc.

Krogwold asked if there was a way to have LED lighting approved at the staff level, rather than having to come before the Committee. Schuler replied the Covenants do not address LED lighting. Krogwold felt this type of change is within reason. Scholfield noted he has seen this type of approval revert to a staff decision. Idsvoog asked what is LED lighting. Krogwold replied it uses one-half the electricity. Idsvoog asked if the light looks any different. Scholfield stated LED lights are more efficient and longer lasting. Wallace clarified LED lighting is more white than yellow. Krogwold asked staff to check into the process of having LED lighting approved at staff level.

Schuler moved on to a no-mow area discussion. The request is to not irrigate certain portions of the site. Schuler noted this request is different from the USDA request that recently came before Committee. In that request, the USDA did not want to install any irrigation anywhere on the site. On the Transit Facility developed portion of the site, there would be irrigation and mowed lawn in certain areas, along with no-mow and no irrigation areas. The site in question is 18 acres, and at this time, approximately 10 acres will be undeveloped. The proposal is to leave 10 acres in its natural state, with only certain routine maintenance to give it a manicured look, without an irrigation investment because it is uncertain where buildings would be constructed on that area in the future. Schuler felt it a reasonable request, as long as there are measures in place to keep the area in a manicured, compliant look. It will not include wild growth.

Lemke referred to the map, stating all white areas shown off pavement are proposed mowed areas. This includes medians adjacent to the buildings and all interior areas of the site. Areas as no-mow (to be mowed a couple times a year) are adjacent to the wood line and up to Brilowski Road. Krogwold referred to areas on the bottom and right side of the map, asking if those areas are for possible additional parking, future development, or would it be mowed in the future. Lemke indicated future structure and parking expansion areas. Scholfield added the area to the north is left for rail development.

Lemke explained natural areas to be mowed would be west of the cul-de-sac, with remaining natural areas being kept in a fescue-type cover with a maximum height of 4 inches. Schuler stated there is a maintenance plan for these areas and staff supports this request. He noted they are irrigating and having manicured lawns surrounding the buildings and on several larger areas.

Schuler brought up the number of street trees and type of foundation plantings. Staff feels it is on the right track and no real waiver is required for these portions of the request. Staff will offer suggestions for areas requiring more formal plantings; particularly, at the southwest corner of the building where four trees are indicated in a large area and on the western edge near the cul-de-sac area. This would improve the site entry area. On street frontage, a tree is required every 40 feet and this site has frontage on Brilowski Road and a cul-de-sac. Staff will work with the tenant on street tree plantings and foundation plantings.

Schuler stated Committee action is required on the LED lighting and no-mow areas. Krogwold moved to approve waivers to allow LED lighting and no-mow areas, including the 9.7 acres, as described on the City Transit Facility site and Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote, with Patton abstaining.

Olson asked if a bike path would be developed on the City Transit property to be integrated with the existing path. Schuler replied the City's long-term goal is to have a multi-mode transportation hub, including regional buses, local buses, and train. As long-term bike path needs are discussed, this site will be considered. Part of the City's easement for sewer along Copps Drive includes a bike path. Scholfield added this is also part of a discussion for the 800 acres to the east.

#### 7. Discussion/Possible Action on Membership of Business Park Landscaping RFP Selection Committee

Schuler explained the RFP to obtain bids for redoing landscaping at the Business Park entryways and signs has been released. A meeting was held recently with five different companies interested in responding to the RFP. The next step is to review the proposals once received.

Fleming explained RFP's are due back on December 16, 2011. A kick-off meeting will be held December 19, 2011 to distribute the proposals and provide instructions. All proposals are reviewed against criteria, with 1,000 points in scoring. He described it as a fair amount of work; as an example, 10 hours work on five proposals. On January 9, 2012, there will be an initial scoring meeting. The last step will be interviews, if two proposers are relatively close, which is planned for January 18, 2012.

Idsvoog clarified staff involved as Fleming, Schuler, and Wallace. Idsvoog suggested a member of the Committee be involved, and asked if a Park tenant should also be involved. Idsvoog noted tenants have provided feedback and concerns in the past. Patton volunteered to be part of the selection committee. Idsvoog felt Scholfield receives feedback from Park tenants and he could be the person to represent tenants. Scholfield noted during the bike path development, there were tenants who regularly participated. Schuler noted he would find a way to reach out to tenants. Krogwold cautioned keeping the member number reasonable and Wallace added they had anticipated up to 5 total members. Idsvoog asked the member to be Scholfield, and if not, a Park tenant.

8. Discussion/Possible Action on Small Office Complex Name Reverting from Oakwood to Park Centre  
Krogwold moved to revert the small office complex name back to Portage Park Centre and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Scholfield noted reverting the existing signs would result in an expense for the County. Two of the signs remained the same, reading Portage Park Centre, but the large sign was converted to read Oakwood. Scholfield noted people have asked about the name change because they do not want to be affiliated with the Oakwood foreclosure and he believes this is the right move to make. Motion passed by voice vote.

9. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues  
Scholfield noted the GSA parking lot is in. Schuler noted Adventure 212's parking lot has its first layer of asphalt down. Staff is looking forward to getting the Park landscaping addressed and developing a RFP for Park maintenance.

10. Review of Vouchers  
No vouchers.

At this time, Idsvoog acknowledged this as being the last Economic Development Committee meeting for Harvey Olson who is wintering away from Wisconsin and will not be running for County Board re-election in 2012. Schuler offered Olson thanks and appreciation for his support of the Planning and Zoning Department through his membership on the Planning and Zoning and Economic Development Committees.

11. Adjournment  
With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Patton 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 Economic Development Committee  
November 3, 2011 – 7:30 am – Conference Room 5, County Annex

Members Present: Patton, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, Olson, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna and David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; and Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council. Arriving after agenda Item 4, John Kneer, Rettler Group.

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. Discussion/Action on Minutes of October 13, 2011 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved for approval of the October 13, 2011 minutes and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Ruedebusch Development and Construction, Inc. (Lots 45 and 46) for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XV, Regarding "Underground Sprinklers Shall Be Installed for Irrigation"

Idsvoog stated a meeting was held with several Business Park tenants at the WIAA building. Unanimous feedback was received from tenants to continue to require irrigation within the Business Park. Schuler agreed that Ruedebusch did not prove their case regarding waiving the requirement for irrigation; it appeared the request was more about money than the LEED certification. Pazdernik asked if denied the waiver, will they irrigate the entire lot, and Schuler replied they would do what is required by Covenants. Patton added that many tenants, from personal experience, stated the proposed waiver of irrigation is not successful in sandy soil as found in the Park. Idsvoog said, in the long-run, those tenants also found it less costly to irrigate than maintain the plant life.

Olson moved to deny the request for waiver from the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenant requiring underground sprinklers being installed for irrigation on Lots 45 and 46 in the Business Park. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Presentation by Finance Director Jennifer Jossie Regarding Portage County Business Park Debt Service/Balance

Jossie provided a Business Park debt service analysis of principal and interest, a Park sales projection table, and a Park budget status report through November 3, 2011, to those present. She explained there have been multiple general obligation notes over the years, beginning in 1996 with a construction obligation. In 2000, the County switched to actually having a debt service, and in 2007, there were Park improvements debts as well. In earlier years, there was one general obligation note for the land and one for improvements. Jossie stated in 2012, there would be a final payment on all filings related to the Business Park. Over the 1997-2012 time period, debt service payments totaled \$14 million dollars.

Jossie went on to describe transfers to debt service stating that since the beginning of the Business Park, the debt service fund has been levied to pay back the debt service of the Park; it has not just been Business Park revenue paying for it. The only piece the Business Park has paid are the transfers from the Park back to the debt service, which was based on a schedule adopted in 1996 as part of the overall Business Park financing plan. The schedule included a yearly sales projection (revenue generated), and that is what the Park revenue budget is based on each year. Sales can be more or less than the scheduled projection.

Jossie referred to the debt service fund through 2010, stating the Business Park has paid the County back \$2.4 million dollars of the \$14 million mentioned previously. Looking now at where we are headed with the Park, based strictly on the debt service aspect of land sales, the Park fund balance at yearend 2010 was just over \$5.9 million dollars. At that time, the remaining lots for sale in the Park would generate approximately \$4.3 million dollars; noting revenue from lot sales in 2011 is not included. The overall revenue expected from Park sales is \$10.2 million dollars.

Overall Park expenses for the next 10 years are estimated at \$850,000, which reduces expected revenues to \$9.4 million dollars. When you subtract \$11.6 million in remaining debt service payments, there is an overall Business Park deficit of \$2.2 million dollars. Jossie pointed out this analysis does not include any dollar figures of additional tax revenue due to improvements in the Park, which is another aspect of this analysis. Jossie stated she is unsure as to whether originally the Park was going to payback only the land notes or improvements as well. If additional tax revenues were added, the analysis would change, but at this point, that figure is unknown.

Jossie noted when individuals discuss a \$6 million dollar Park fund balance, the money is for the Business Park and an offset for paying back the County debt service, because the County had to levy for the debt service. One of the reasons it was structured that way is because the Business Park cash flow was anticipated only.

Idsvoog asked if you included improvements in the analysis, the debt would be greater, correct? Jossie replied no, that number is part of the analysis going back to 1996 with the two construction loans (1 land/1 improvements) and the \$2.8 million dollars in improvements from 2007. Idsvoog stated the long and short of this is a \$2.5 million dollar deficit. Jossie answered correct, but keep in mind the other analysis of the tax revenue is not included and the projected tax revenue to 2025 was \$169 million dollars. Jossie felt we do need to get a look at the tax revenue and put together a compilation. The last time that figure was looked at was 2005. Schuler stated the perspective would be the County's investment in the Park is \$2.2 million dollars to generate the value in increased tax base/revenue.

Referring to the Park budget status report, Jossie pointed out \$435,000 in Business Park sales to-date in 2011, and noted Park maintenance, as provided by the Highway Department, does not yet appear in the Park expenses. The transfer to debt service is listed at \$302,000, and no matter what happens, that is the number that will be transferred and any excess will go to the Business Park fund balance. The County only takes what is needed per the schedule to pay on the debt service. Once all lots are sold, whatever remains in the fund balance would be used at the County's discretion to possibly reinvest in economic development, transfer to the general fund, put in Capital Improvements, etc.

Olson asked if a portion of the money would be Portage County's and a portion would be the City of Stevens Point's. Jossie answered no, the money in the Business Park fund balance belongs to Portage County only. The money Stevens Point is receiving comes through improvements in the Park increasing their tax revenue. Schuler asked if this presentation answered Olson's questions and Olson replied yes.

#### 6. Discussion/Action Regarding Request for Proposal (RFP) to Redesign/Update Landscaped Medians and Signage Areas Within the Portage County Business Park

Schuler stated landscaping at the entryways and within the Park, around sign bases, has been discussed over time. The landscaping is becoming old, stale, and some is dying. It has been suggested we redesign those areas and install new plants; therefore, we are seeking permission to move forward with a request for proposals (RFP) to get this done. The money is found within the Business Park budget. The RFP would be sent to multiple firms seeking ideas on plantings, as well as prices.

Idsvoog asked the anticipated cost and Schuler replied under \$25,000 total; no need for a Capital Improvement request. Patton asked if sign bases with plantings were only out front, and Schuler replied several signs are found all around the Park with plants at the base. Patton asked if there are directional signs near Lot 101 to direct people where things are in the Park. Schuler stated there are "for sale" signs, and Scholfield is working on a reorganization of those signs, but there is no signage at the entryways pointing into the Park. There are stand-alone signs in the Park explaining what is for sale and who to contact. Patton stated sometimes you find the dead-end road and a directional sign may help.

Krogwold moved to allow a RFP to redesign and update landscaped medians and signage areas within the Park. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion/Action Regarding Request for Proposal (RFP) to Perform Certain Aspects of Landscaping Maintenance Within the Portage County Business Park

Schuler felt, with the changing nature of the Highway Department and the way maintenance has worked out in the Park, it seems there has been a time and/or staffing issue, and this would be a great time to go ahead and see at what cost a private firm can provide this service. If it ends up a better price, that is the way to go. Schuler stated he would work with Purchasing Manager Fleming to flesh-out details for this RFP.

Idsvoog asked where we would advertise for this. Schuler replied Fleming has a list of sources to send to, including local. Obviously, we would want someone local to more easily pay attention to needed maintenance.

Olson moved to go ahead with an RFP to perform certain aspects of landscaping maintenance within the Park. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

8. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield reported there have been phone inquiries to fill current buildings and construct new ones. Lot 47 is being looked at for a gymnastic/cheer camp development. We had heard from someone interested in a pet hotel type of operation. Scholfield stated he is working with Dehlinger on pursuing a manufacturing firm.

Scholfield made members aware of an issue that may come before them regarding the former development known as Oakwood. Because Oakwood was to buy all four lots, they were allowed to change the name of what was Park Centre. Possibly a decision should be made to return the name to Park Centre to eliminate the stigma associated with Oakwood. There are three lots to sell in that common area. The County allowed Oakwood to take the County-owned signs, flip the panels, and write Oakwood Center on them. Now that Oakwood is for sale, Scholfield believes the name should be changed back to Park Centre because it is more reflective of the original intent of the area.

9. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers submitted for review.

10. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
October 13, 2011 – 7:30 am – Conference Room 5, County Annex

Members Present: Patton, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold

Member Excused: Olson

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Dave Nelson, Ruedebusch Development; and Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:30 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. Discussion/Action on Minutes of the June 17, July 11, July 18, July 27, August 3, and August 24, 2011 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve the June 17, July 11, July 18, July 27, August 3, and August 24, 2011 minutes. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Ruedebusch Development and Construction, Inc. (Lots 45 and 46) for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XV, Regarding "Underground Sprinklers Shall Be Installed for Irrigation"

Idsvoog began by stating sprinklers have always been a requirement of the Business Park Covenants. He is concerned with complaints from Park tenants relating to this development not meeting standards and not mowing. He asked why this development should be the only exception in the Park.

Nelson acknowledged the Business Park Covenants have been in place since the 1990's, and he finds the Park well developed, and he likes the look of the Park. He stated he understands the Covenants and the development will abide by them, but he would like consideration of their landscaping plans as relates to a LEED's certification they are seeking. The development is a United States Department of Agriculture federal government project, and LEED certification is required. In order to achieve certification, guidelines must be followed. The trend is to be efficient with energy and water use, and to lower pollutants, which will prove beneficial for the future. The plan includes low-maintenance plants that grow well in sandy soil, including low-mow grass to reduce mowing, which in turn lessens the use of gas, equipment, and water consumption. Nelson stated this is viewed as a trend, and felt it would be of value to the Park to keep up with this trend.

Idsvoog asked why sprinklers could not be installed and turned on only when needed. Nelson replied that LEED certification does not allow an irrigation system, unless rainwater is stored for this purpose; no potable water use is allowed. They are seeking a LEED silver certification. They would like to achieve a higher LEED score, such as gold or platinum, but the building must at least reach silver.

Idsvoog referred to a detailed maintenance plan and asked how watering would be completed during a dry month. He felt the landscaping would become an eyesore. Nelson stated he drove through the Park today and saw sprinklers running in the rain. He wants to conserve resources.

Krogwold referred to the Planning and Zoning staff memorandum included in the agenda packet, noted the statement on watering, and asked how that would be accomplished. Nelson replied watering would take place in the early stages to get the plants started; it is temporary. Wallace clarified continued maintenance/watering was her interpretation of documents submitted by Nelson. Patton asked about the temporary watering process and Nelson stated it would be done through above ground sprinklers or a watering truck.

Krogwold asked if there had been any reaction by Park tenants to this request. Wallace stated all tenants are notified of all meetings, and no one provided any type of feedback. Scholfield added that Travel Guard built to LEED certification. He felt Park tenants tend to lean toward conservation practices, and this being a government building, it is their standard language. Krogwold questioned if the Covenants and Deed Restrictions need to be re-written to offer this landscaping possibility to others. Scholfield replied a rewriting would be difficult; that is why the waiver possibility is included.

Idsvoog questioned the amount of green space on the site. Nelson answered the building is 16,000 square feet with less than 50% impervious. There is a 10-year lease in place. The land purchase allows room for future expansion. Idsvoog felt irrigating the green space is reasonable. Pazdernik asked if there will be any mowed green area and Nelson replied yes, around the building itself, with the remainder being low-mow.

Schuler noted a specific schedule of maintenance would be necessary, if this request is approved. Idsvoog stated the Covenants exist, so people must follow them; especially with little oversight in the Park. Again, Idsvoog stated his concern regarding current Park tenant reactions to this type of landscaping plan. Idsvoog felt, if we had a dry summer, this lot would stand out. Nelson replied he would not deny that, and understands Idsvoog's concern. Nelson felt in times of significant drought, tenants would not be required to continue watering in order to conserve that resource.

Idsvoog once again stated the County demanded other tenants follow the Covenants. Patton asked who would take care of the landscaping and Nelson replied they would. Patton asked if plants were dying would you bring out the watering truck or let them go dormant. Nelson replied they would usually go dormant, but they would water, if the plants were dying. Dead plants would be replaced within 60 days as required by the Covenants.

Pazdernik asked if the area to be mowed by the building would be irrigated. Nelson answered a drought tolerant species would be used and no sprinklers would be installed; you negatively affect your LEED's points with irrigation/sprinklers.

Idsvoog stated before he would support this request, a meeting must be held with Park tenants to see whether they support this type of landscaping for the future; in the name of fairness. Krogwold agreed. Patton asked if tenants were aware of this meeting, and Schuler replied they receive agendas and minutes.

Pazdernik asked if Travel Guard received LEED certification. Scholfield replied LEED certification was in place for Travel Guard dealing with the building, its materials, irrigation, etc. You are allowed to pick-and-choose the LEED criteria. Pazdernik questioned if the LEED certified Travel Guard had irrigation and Scholfield replied portions are watered and portions are no-mow.

Patton asked the construction time schedule. Nelson stated they would like to begin construction next month. Krogwold asked when the lawn would be put in and Nelson answered in the spring. Patton asked if a decision is needed prior to next spring. Nelson felt a decision is not necessary right now, but they would like to begin construction soon and details on irrigation are needed for the permit. Scholfield added their building plan must indicate necessary plumbing.

Patton suggested postponing action until next month. Krogwold agreed that postponement should take place until Park tenant input is received. Scholfield asked if tenants could be polled. Krogwold felt that would be fine as long as you obtained their reasons for or against the landscaping plan. Idsvoog noted the detailed watering statement was not accurate because there is no watering, except at the start. Nelson stated he would clarify that and resend the information to Planning and Zoning.

Krogwold moved to postpone action on this item, with the hope it does not impede construction, until feedback from Park tenants has been received. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Ruedebusch Development and Construction, Inc. (Lots 45 and 46) for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Section XXI, Maintenance Responsibilities Regarding No-Mow Areas

Schuler stated this request involves the east half of the site. Patton moved to approve the maintenance responsibilities of the no-mow area as defined, and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Idsvoog questioned expansion possibilities. Nelson replied there are no expansion expectations at this time, but the possibility is left open due to how the building is being located on the site. Motion passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Ruedebusch Development and Construction, Inc. (Lots 45 and 46) for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants, Sections VII(A) and IX(b) Regarding Allowing the Use of Gutters and Downspouts

Schuler noted drainage goes to the rear of the building due to the roof pitch; therefore, this request makes sense. With no further discussion, Patton moved to approve the use of gutters and downspouts and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion on 2012 Non-County Agency Funding Recipients to Report to the Economic Development Committee

Schuler referred members to letters sent to non-County agencies, receiving funding in the 2012 Portage County budget, with the requirement they report to the Economic Development Committee. The letters were sent by the County Executive's office. Idsvoog said that due to having a contract in place with the Portage County Business Council, they would not be reporting to this Committee. Schuler questioned the type of reporting necessary. Idsvoog felt they should report once; there is no format. This is an opportunity for those agencies to report what the County is receiving for money given. Schuler asked if the reports should be done in the spring of the year prior to budget work starting. Jossie stated agencies are to come in to report prior to the new year as to what is planned. Schuler clarified that would require two appearances.

8. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield reported contact with Ministry Health's Al Pennebecker who said due to Obama Care, the building is on hold. Ministry appreciates the County's patience. There have been six inquiries recently; one from a pet care business. Schuler stated trails in the Park have been paved and ramps should be installed soon. Tenants have not provided feedback, positive or negative, as to this installation.

9. Review of Vouchers

None

10. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:56 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
August 24, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5, County Annex

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; and Jeff Hild, Stevens Point Public Works Department

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. Discussion/Possible Action on Easement Between Portage County and INREIT Regarding Installation of Multi-Purpose Trails Within Portage County Business Park

Schuler stated INREIT has suggested additional changes to the easement agreement and provided a signed version for Committee review and action. He went on to say a decision is needed today on this so the City of Stevens Point can either change the construction contract or allow the project to move forward.

McKenna stated the final document has a clause allowing INREIT the ability to demand the trail be removed at any time, for any reason, at their complete discretion. McKenna felt he and his staff worked on this agreement to come to a place where the language could be accepted, but this is not that document. The document is written on INREIT's terms. He cautioned the Committee should not sign this agreement, unless they accept the fact the trail can be constructed and INREIT can yank it out the next day for any reason. Idsvoog stated he agrees with McKenna, and inquired as to why the County would want to sign this document.

Olson stated he felt there should not be a problem because the land in question is unusable, undevelopable, and cannot be committed to anything in the future. Idsvoog stated he would not sign this agreement as written. Schuler felt it unlikely the trail would ever be removed and Idsvoog felt anything is possible. Schuler asked members to balance the risk of trail removal against the gain for the Park if the trail is constructed. He felt the gain outweighs the risk and stated he supports the easement. Idsvoog asked then why not have this same agreement with all property owners.

Patton asked if money is set aside in reserves to remove the trail, if it comes to that. Schuler replied there is money available in the Park infrastructure account.

Krogwold asked about alternate routes. Schuler responded that a lot of time and discussion had gone into selecting this site. The City of Stevens Point is overseeing project construction for Portage County. They included this trail in their City bidding process to get the best price. If the trail does not go in here, now, another place would have to be found in the future. He noted this location makes the most sense.

Idsvoog asked about informing other owners who may want this type of agreement. Schuler replied if this agreement is good for this segment of the trail, then why not others. Scholfield added that TOLD sees this trail as an asset. Normally, he would not favor signing an autonomous deal.

Schuler felt, relying on his heart, he would hope the Committee would take the risk on this asset. Krogwold questioned repercussions from other tenants. Scholfield felt that would not happen because all other property owners see the trail as an asset. Schuler noted other property owners have encouraged INREIT to sign an agreement.

Krogwold asked if there is any legal way to slow down trail removal, if INREIT were to do that. Hild stated the City Public Works Director had no issues with a condemnation process. He added INREIT is an absentee landlord, and Bio-Life, which occupies the property, supports the project. Krogwold asked again if the County could legally stall trail removal. McKenna said the short answer is, no. He suggested the County not rely on that possibility. Hild noted if an agreement is not signed, the City could proceed with condemnation, and bid the project again next year.

Olson moved to sign the easement agreement between Portage County and INREIT, and construct the trail. Krogwold seconded the motion. He added he is willing to take the chance and feels this is the right place for the trail. Pazdernik asked the cost of this section and Hild replied \$10,000. Patton stated he is leaning toward supporting the easement because it involves an asphalt or concrete path, not a building. Idsvoog stated logic tells him not to sign this agreement. A voice vote revealed four ayes, with Idsvoog casting the one nay vote. Motion to approve carries 4 to 1.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Next Steps for Implementing Bicycle/Pedestrian Network in Portage County Business Park

Schuler stated this item no longer applies because of the approval vote on agenda Item 3.

Hild stated he would be contacting the contractor today.

Idsvoog added that if other property owners call for the same language, he hopes the County would not do that.

5. Review/Discussion on Proposed 2012 Economic Development/Business Park Budget

Cummings read the projected 2011 and proposed 2012 budgets. The proposed budget and narrative were included in the Committee's agenda packet. Olson asked the amount left to pay on the Business Park's debt service and Cummings replied she was unaware of the exact amount; possibly Finance Director Jenni Jossie would provide that figure. It was suggested a summary be provided at the next Economic Development Committee meeting.

6. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler stated a meeting would be held today with GSA on their building design.

Wallace added that Ortho-Molecular would be supplying preliminary site expansion plans. Schuler added that Ortho-Molecular will be constructing an addition, then tearing down the current building, and rebuilding from scratch on their site. This business projects steady, solid growth, which is exciting for them, as well as the Business Park.

Scholfield noted interest in Lots 103 and 104, which would be an excellent addition to the Park. The interested firm is seeking an incentive-driven purchase. It is a manufacturing firm already located in Portage County. Others have offered this firm "sweet deals" for their location, but the firm prefers the Business Park.

Schuler acknowledged the Committee's decision today was difficult. He stated his appreciation for the Committee's consideration and tackling of the issue. He is hoping for the best. Olson noted it would be difficult to find an alternate route.

7. Review of Vouchers

Cummings presented the following for review: voucher approval 20110521 and a purchase requisition for surveying of lots 45 and 46.

8. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Olson 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 Economic Development Committee  
August 3, 2011 – 7:30 am – Conference Room D, Courthouse

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna/David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Patty Dreier/Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Terry Schott, Oakwood/Investors Community Bank; and Doug Radtke, County Board Supervisor

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:30 am in Conference Room D of the 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

No one registered to speak.

3. Discussion/Possible Action Regarding Special Event License Agreement for the Midwestern Recumbent Bike Rally: August 5, 6, and 7, 2011 (Rolf Garthus/Hostel Shoppe)

Idsvoog asked if this is the same arrangement as previous years and Wallace replied yes. With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve a special event license for the Midwestern Recumbent Bike Rally and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on a License Agreement for the Rotary Club of Portage County Heart of Wisconsin Kite Festival: September 25, 2011

Wallace stated this license agreement is also similar to previous years. She added the Rotary Club is asking to mow the event area when the license agreement has been approved and then again just prior to the event. Idsvoog asked if the County will reach a point in Business Park lot sales that we have to say no to these events, and Schuler replied yes. With no further discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved to approve the license agreement with the Rotary Club and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Aspirus Stevens Point Clinic, for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI Regarding Temporary "Health Fair" Banner (Lot 1, Vern Holmes Drive)

Wallace stated Aspirus has not provided a mock-up of their proposed banner. In an email, Aspirus described the banner as 14' X 5', staked in the ground, stating "Aspirus Health Fair, September 25, 2011, 11 am-3 pm." The banner would be placed in close proximity to their sign located on Highway HH. They would like to put the banner up from September 12 through 25, 2011.

Idsvoog stated he has no problem with the request. Pazdernik asked if we have granted this type of waiver request in the past and Wallace replied no. Aspirus had a health fair last year, but did not install a banner. Wallace noted the Committee has approved temporary signs regarding real estate with a one-year limit. Aspirus is seeking a much more limited scope.

With no further discussion, Patton moved to approve a waiver for Aspirus to erect a banner as described. Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Update on Portage County Business Park Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail/Sidewalks Project

Schuler reported negotiations with INREIT were over at one point because they reported not being interested in this process any longer. With that news, County Corporation Counsel reached out again to INREIT in order come to an easement agreement for the multi-purpose trail.

Hickethier described the negotiation process as frustrating. After Committee approval, on July 27, 2011, of language INREIT agreed to, INREIT was sent the agreement to execute and return, but instead followed-up with more changes. Yesterday, INREIT's attorney said they were reviewing new language and he recommended INREIT agree, but we have heard nothing yet. Hickethier described the two changes as follows: 1. Striking language regarding INREIT's indemnity to Portage County. Hickethier does not have a huge problem with that because if there was a claim against Portage County, it does not stop us from bringing INREIT into a lawsuit; and 2. The paragraph that discussed amending or terminating the easement, they want amended so that it is at their sole discretion. At this point, if INREIT comes back with a signed agreement with those two changes, we would bring the agreement back to Committee for action.

Idsvoog noted that in addition to the two changes, INREIT also did not want the agreement recorded, but that is something we cannot agree to. Hickethier clarified the document absolutely has to be recorded.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler reported moving ahead on landscaping features, and working with the County Finance Director who feels there appears to be a clear way to approach that this year.

Schuler said they are waiting for follow-up information from Rick Rettler as to what to include in a bid for maintenance of the Park. There have been preliminary discussions with the new County Procurement Director as to what format a bid might take as we move ahead.

Scholfield noted the long delayed GSA/USDA office land sale has closed and construction is scheduled for next spring. Schuler asked when plans might be available, and Scholfield said he asked them to reach out to the County very soon. Scholfield has walked him through the process.

8. Review of Vouchers

None.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:40 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
July 27, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna/David Hickethier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; and Doug Radtke, County Board Supervisor

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. Discussion/Possible Action on Easement Between Portage County and INREIT Regarding Installation of Multi-Purpose Trails Within Portage County Business Park

Hickethier reported he received an email from INREIT's attorney requesting one additional change. Hickethier indicated INREIT would agree to sign the draft agreement provided to members. He pointed out this document differs from those signed by other Park tenants, but does provide as much protection to the County as possible. The largest sticking point INREIT has is the language providing them the ability to terminate the easement. The language before the Committee is softened to address amending or terminating, if there is undue hardship on them or if it is impossible to continue with the purposes of the agreement. That is a substantial difference from what they initially proposed, which gave them sole discretion on adverse impact. Hickethier feels undue hardship is a higher standard. INREIT also had a hang up with the word "permanent" (permanent easement). Hickethier has removed the word, but by law, easements are permanent. It does not matter whether that word is in there or not. Additional language was added by Hickethier to confirm the agreement is conveying title and the ability to transfer the easement.

Idsvoog asked if the County experienced this problem with other Park property owners. Scholfield replied they all agreed to an easement, and each of them could have brought their lawyers forward to challenge the document, but did not. Wallace added the only owner who made minor changes was TOLD. Schuler replied not every owner has a uniform agreement; some were fine-tuned. Idsvoog clarified that not every agreement with every owner is the same and Schuler replied that is correct. Hickethier added that the document proposed still ties into the addendum of the Covenants talking about the multi-use trails and all provisions needed to be met.

With no further discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the easement between Portage County and INREIT regarding installation of multi-purpose trails in the Business Park as discussed today. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Schuler expressed his gratitude to the County Corporation Counsel's Office for the large amount of work provided on this issue. Their work resulted in a great asset to the Park.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Next Steps for Implementing Bicycle/Pedestrian Network in Portage County Business Park

No discussion/action due to easement approval in Item 3.

5. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:05 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**NOTE:** Due to a power outage at the County Annex on July 20, 2011, the Economic Development Committee was only able to complete the on-site portion of the agenda as held at the Portage County Business Park Bio-Life Plasma Services site.

**No business meeting resumed at the County Annex and no action was taken.**

**MEETING NOTICE**

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
Wednesday, July 20, 2011 – 7:15 am

***Portage County Business Park –BioLife Plasma Services Site (7:15 am)  
Conference Room 5 – County Annex (Immediately following On-Site at approximately 7:45 am)***

**AGENDA**

**On-Site Visit (7:15 am)**

*BioLife Plasma Services Site (3325 Business Park Drive) in the Portage County Business Park for On-site Inspection of Potential Site for Multi-Purpose Trail*

**Business Meeting (Approximately 7:45 am)**

1. Call to Order
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
3. Discussion/Possible Action on Updated Easement Language Between Portage County and INREIT Regarding Installation of Multi-Purpose Trails Within Portage County Business Park
4. Adjournment

**NOTICE:** *A quorum of the Portage County Board of Supervisors or any committee thereof may be present at this meeting.*

\*\*\*\*\*

Any person who has special needs and plans on attending this meeting should contact the Planning and Zoning Department as soon as possible to ensure that reasonable accommodations can be made. Telephone 715-346-1334.

\*\*\*\*\*

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
And  
Portage County Finance Committee

July 18, 2011 – Immediately Following Finance Committee Meeting  
Approximately: 7:30 am

Economic Development Committee Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold  
Finance Committee Members Present: Haga, Radtke, Krogwold, and Pazdernik  
Finance Committee Member Excused: Krems

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

Others Present: Blair Ward/David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Jeff Hild, City of Stevens Point; and Patty Dreier, County Executive.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the joint Economic Development Committee and Finance Committee meeting to order at 7:25 am in Conference Room 1 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. 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 Lots (property north of E.M. Copps Drive) in the Portage County Business Park

Krogwold moved to enter closed session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote.

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

Krogwold moved to reconvene open session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote.

5. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session Under Agenda Item 3

No action taken.

**NOTE: Joint Committee meeting adjourns at this time.  
Economic Development Committee meeting begins.**

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Updated Easement Language Between Portage County and INREIT Regarding Installation of Multi-Purpose Trails Within the Portage County Business Park

Idsvoog referred to a Park tenant who is reluctant to sign an easement document related to the multi-purpose trail without the ability to get out of the trail agreement at any time they wish. Schuler explained that in order to install the 10' wide asphalt path, private property owners had to sign an easement. The property in question, occupied by Bio-Life, is owned by a company in North Dakota, INREIT. Working through their attorney and the County Corporation Counsel, INREIT has an idea of what they need in terms of personal protections as they enter into an agreement. The easement being sought consists of 20' on the northern edge of their lot, and is a portion of their lot that can never be built on. INREIT is being protective about losing the ability to do something with this land in a general sense. Schuler noted other Park tenants have willingly agreed to the same language presented to INREIT.

Idsvoog asked for clarification that if the County agrees to INREIT's proposed language, they have the right to tear out the trail at any point. Idsvoog asked if that is the case, why bother with an agreement. Ward replied that is the reason this decision comes before the Economic Development Committee. INREIT changed the language to allow them to opt out at some point, under certain conditions. The County's preferred language is:

"This agreement is intended by the parties to be perpetual; however, can be terminated by such a recording in the event the landowner and County agree that such unexpected change creates undue hardship upon either party, or makes it impossible to accomplish the purposes or use set forth in this agreement." Ward clarified the language stated both parties would have to agree that INREIT has some sort of undue hardship or some unexpected change in order for them to get out of it. Both parties, meaning Portage County and INREIT, would have to agree something dramatically changed. INREIT's attorney did not like that language; they wanted to utilize their sole discretion to back out of the easement, with Portage County having no say about whether the easement can be terminated. In addition, "adverse" was not defined in the language proposed by INREIT, which included: .....the change would have to adversely impact INREIT's use or intended use of the land. Ward explained INREIT having sole discretion got our attention and is a concern.

Olson asked if an alternative easement was looked into, rather than that exact location. Schuler explained the multi-trail layout had been discussed for two years. All possible east-west sites, not in a difficult location to work with, were studied. Schuler noted there are tenants located in certain areas of the Park and trails should be placed to accommodate their travel, or they will continue to cut across private lots. Some of which are undeveloped lots, and when those lots are developed, the area will no longer be available. There are only a few places within the Park that an east-west connection makes sense. Currently, a large number of Travel Guard employees go to Subway for lunch; a trail in this location provides a direct route to get there. He further noted this trail project is a start of a larger, future network. We could try to put this trail across mid-block, south of the Oakwood property and north of Smith/Stout/Regnier. That may work, but many things make that difficult to accomplish. The proposed route became the obvious option and best choice to start this network.

Dreier asked what the trail looks like; what type of development. Schuler replied it is a 10' wide asphalt path, within a 20' wide easement. Dreier referred to the Ice Age Trail/footpath and others across the State. She described those as a fabric or quilt of landowners who put their piece of land in for now, which might change over time. She felt if the trail was what INREIT actually saw in action, they might get excited about it, because it is harder to say no later when they see employees using the trail. Schuler clarified that Bio-Life loves the trail idea and supports it 100%. The property owner, INREIT, in North Dakota, is opposed. Schuler clarified the land in question cannot be developed under current regulations.

Idsvoog asked if the process is logical, why the company is opposed. Schuler answered this is a knee-jerk, generic response that says this trail takes 2/10's of an acre of our land and that cannot be done. Idsvoog felt if the County gives INREIT this type of authority with an exclusive right to back out or tear it up whenever they want, then why are we not doing the same thing for everyone else. Idsvoog felt it best to find an alternative route. Scholfield offered to shed a bit of light on INREIT, which is a real estate trust; their whole deal is the asset. They could care less about where it is or what it is. They are giving a very standard, corporate speak because their job is what that portfolio is earning for them. Scholfield felt the trail is excellent for the Park as a whole, and the planning process has been extraordinary. If INREIT has a chance to sell this asset tomorrow, it is gone. He felt something could be done, if there is a comfort level to keep exploring language that may give a bit of latitude back. If this is accomplished, Scholfield felt paperwork would go into a folder and never be looked at again. You take a chance on that for the good of the rest of the Park. INREIT has no interest in the people of Stevens Point, Wisconsin, let alone the Business Park. Idsvoog felt they should; they have property here. Scholfield replied that is true, but it is only one of their 200-300 properties.

Idsvoog stated he has a problem supporting the language as brought forth. Patton asked the cost of that strip of land. Schuler clarified it is the area between the two streets, not including Carrie Frost. Hild replied \$10,000-\$20,000. Patton said you cannot develop the land, and if people just walked across it, what would they do. Patton asked if mulch could be used on that section and Schuler replied, not without permission of the landowner. Patton questioned exactly what INREIT was saying with the language as proposed, and Schuler replied they are guaranteeing something in the future that can never happen. He added that INREIT's response is predictable and an appropriate viewpoint for their type of company.

Krogwold asked if we give this to INREIT, why not give it to everybody. Schuler stated if you made a decision to do that, part of the decision would be that the Committee is comfortable enough the language could apply to everyone. If you do not want to see this applied to everybody, then your hands are tied. Ward reminded members all easements are already in place, except for this one. INREIT was the only one who asked, and if

others would ask why they did not get the same language, Ward would reply you did not ask for it. Krogwold felt this loses uniformity with trail development. Radtke felt INREIT was taking a position of its own self-interest, especially when it comes to selling property. He asked if it was possible for the County to enter into a separate agreement with INREIT, and say if you allow this easement, and it would adversely affect sale of the property later, the County will return the property to its original state. He felt that would take care of their concerns and if it is worth that to the County, we ought to pursue it. Idsvog replied, they you wind up with a trail to nowhere. Radtke felt that is true, but at least you would have a trail for as long as you could. He would rather not have people going across private property.

Idsvog felt before a decision is made, he would like to visit the property. Schuler stated there is no easy answer and parties involved are all frustrated by this turn of events. It is obvious what should happen, but there is an absentee landlord, with a different philosophy. After discussion about the urgent need for a decision so the project can proceed on time, an on-site was scheduled for July 20 at 7:15 am, with a meeting to follow at the County Annex.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues  
None.

8. Review of Vouchers  
None.

9. Adjournment  
With no further business to come before the Committee, Patton moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8:15 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
And  
Portage County Finance Committee

July 11, 2011 – Immediately Following Finance Committee Meeting  
Approximately: 7:45 am

Economic Development Committee Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold  
Finance Committee Members Present: Haga, Radtke, Krems, Krogwold, Pazdernik

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna/David Hicketier , County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Andrew Halverson/Michael Ostrowski, City of Stevens Point; Jeanne Dodge, County Board Supervisor; Jennifer Jossie, Finance Director; and Patty Dreier, County Executive.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the joint Economic Development Committee and Finance Committee meeting to order at 7:35 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. 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 Lots (property north of E.M. Copps Drive) in the Portage County Business Park

Motion by Patton to enter into closed session pursuant to Sec. 19.85(1)(e), Wis. Stats., second by Olson.

Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote of members from both committees. (Pazdernik exits meeting at 7:50 am.)

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

Motion by Krems to reconvene in open session pursuant to Sec. 19.85(2), Wis. Stats., second by Patton.

Motion passed by unanimous roll call vote of members from both committees.

5. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session under Agenda Item 3

Chair Idsvoog announced no action would be taken at this time, and another joint meeting of the Economic Development and Finance Committees will take place Monday, July 18 immediately following the Finance Committee meeting.

6. Adjournment

Patton moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 8:25 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
June 17, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, Pazdernik, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Blair Ward, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Paul Anderson, Attorney representing Ortho Molecular; Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; Bill Weronke, Portage County Highway Commissioner; and Kevin Kawleski, Portage County Bank.

1. Call to Order

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

2. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the May 26 and June 1, 2011 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the May 26 and June 1, 2011 minutes and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

3. 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/Action on Waiver Request by Furniture and ApplianceMart, Lots 77 and 78, from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XVI(C) Regarding Sale of Land Between Adjacent Owners

Schuler noted agenda items 4 and 5 are related. He stated Ortho Molecular, a long-time Business Park tenant, is expanding its business, and would like to acquire land from its neighbor to the north, Furniture and ApplianceMart. Business Park Covenants do not address land sales between owners; therefore, a waiver is requested. Agenda item 5 deals with storm water retention and the fact Business Park Covenants require all storm water to remain on site. With the proposed land sale between owners, Furniture and ApplianceMart would need to construct a new storm water retention pond. They would like to continue to use their current retention pond while the new one is being constructed.

Krogwold moved to grant a waiver allowing the sale of land between Furniture and ApplianceMart and Ortho Molecular. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Scholfield introduced Ortho Molecular's Attorney Paul Anderson, noting the Committee will possibly see him again during Ortho Molecular's expansion project.

5. Discussion/Action on Waiver Request by Furniture and ApplianceMart, Lots 77 and 78, from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section IX(A) Regarding Retaining All Storm Water On Site

This request was described during discussion of item 4. With no further discussion necessary, Olson moved to grant a waiver allowing Furniture and ApplianceMart to utilize its current retention pond during construction of a new pond necessary due to the sale of land to Ortho Molecular. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Revising the Planned Development Area (PDA) Designation for Lots 45 and 46 from Office Light Industrial to Business and Professional Office, and Accordingly, Revising the Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants and Purchase Price Applicable to These Lots to Business and Professional Office

Schuler noted this item is similar to Committee action in the past where land was sold for a higher use than originally slated. The request is to re-designate lots 45 and 46 to allow office buildings. The price and land requirements transfer with the designation.

Olson asked if there would be a negative impact to other buildings in the Business Park. Schuler stated lots around the area in question have been sold and this change would not create a strange situation. In fact, he sees this as a good fit and an extension of the area to the south. Scholfield noted the lots about two childcare businesses, and changing the designation to office buildings from office light industrial brings up the security level around those businesses. He further noted there has been more pressure for office uses in the Park. Schuler pointed out the value of this construction will exceed what would come under the current designation.

Pazdernik moved to revise the planned development area designation of lots 45 and 46 from office light industrial to business/professional office, and apply the Covenants and purchase price to the same new designation. Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion/Possible Action on Resolution Authorizing Portage County Business Park Listing Contract with the Scholfield Group, LLC

Schuler stated the Committee had selected Scholfield Group/Bill Scholfield as the Business Park marketing firm. The marketing contract requires a resolution and County Board action.

Krogwold moved to approve a resolution authorizing a Portage County Business Park listing contract with the Scholfield Group. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Idsvoog clarified the terms are the same as presented and Schuler replied yes.

8. Discussion/Possible Action for the City of Stevens Point to Create Bicycle Ways on Business Park Drive, Vern Holmes Drive, John Joanis Drive, Clem's Way, Carrie Frost Drive, Venture Drive, and E.M. Capps Drive in the Portage County Business Park

Wallace stated the City of Stevens Point Public Works is looking at striping bicycle ways on a number of streets across the City, including all those in the Business Park. On-street parking is not allowed in the Business Park, so the striping will not cause a conflict. City Public Works reviewed the project on Monday, and Common Council action will take place June 20, 2011.

Idsvoog asked if there was objection by any Park tenants and Wallace replied comments were received, but nothing negative. Patton asked if lines will be painted and Wallace answered yes, and with the striping, 14.5 feet remains available for vehicle travel. Patton asked if this would affect special event parking in the Business Park. Schuler reiterated there is no on-street parking allowed at this time and special events require off-street parking area designation.

Olson moved to allow creation of bicycle ways within the Park as being done by the City of Stevens Point Public Works. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

9. Update on Portage County Business Park Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail/Sidewalks Project

Wallace noted the City received one bid on the proposed project from Pember Companies, Inc. Idsvoog asked where the firm was located. Wallace replied she was unsure, but noted they were not a local firm. She added that American Asphalt, a local firm, would be utilized for the project as well. Stevens Point Public Works reviewed the bid on Monday, and Common Council will take action on awarding June 20, 2011. Schuler stated the project bid was within the estimated project cost. Olson asked if the project would be completed this summer and Schuler replied yes. Wallace added the project would begin in July 2011.

10. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler stated, regarding Business Park maintenance, there has not yet been a meeting held with Rick Rettler. Idsvoog noted Rettler will be returning from vacation next Tuesday and they will be in contact to set a meeting soon. Schuler stated Planning and Zoning staff met with Highway Department staff and discussed their current staffing plan. Seasonal employees are not being utilized this year. Once a meeting is held with Rettler, a report will be provided to the Committee. Ideas for upgrading maintenance from last year will be discussed.

Idsvoog asked Weronke if he has staff available for Park maintenance and Weronke replied current staff would be utilized at up to three-times the cost of seasonal staff utilized in the past. He will be in discussion with Human Resources as to the possibility of hiring one seasonal worker, who is familiar with the Park maintenance, in order to bring the cost down. He noted there is a lot of shrubbery/vegetation within the Park that takes a beating by brutal winters, and possibly shrubs could be upgraded. Weronke feels there are mixed signals between individuals as to the cost and type of maintenance preferred in the Park. He noted the Highway Department would provide the level of maintenance requested in the Park.

Scholfield stated some signs in the Park were damaged with the recent storm and are in the process of being assessed.

Krogwold asked if there has been contact between Portage County and the City of Stevens Point relating to the new business looking to locate in our area. Scholfield stated the Business Park does not have enough land available for this development. Krogwold asked Scholfield to let the Committee know of anything they can do to assist in this process. Scholfield described the development as a good opportunity for the County and the community.

11. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers presented for review.

12. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 pm by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
June 1, 2011 – 4:00 pm – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, and Krogwold

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna/David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Kristen Fish, Key Commercial Real Estate; and Ark Rhowmine, Grubb and Ellis/Pfefferle

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm 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. Reconvene in Closed Session per Section 19.85 (1)(e) Stats. for Competitive Reasons to Consider a Real Estate Agency Contract to Market the Portage County Business Park and its Provisions

Olson moved to reconvene in closed session and Patton seconded the motion. Motion passed by roll call vote.

4. Reconvene in Open Session Pursuant to Section 19.85 (2) Stats for Discussion/Possible Action for the Award of the Real Estate Agency Contract Considered under the Previous Closed Session Item

Motion by Patton, second by Krogwold to reconvene in open session. Motion passed by roll call vote.

Olson moved to award the real estate agency contract to market the Portage County Business Park to Scholfield Group for a two-year term. Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Idsvoog noted the commission is at 8.5%.

Firms were thanked for their time and effort in interviewing for this contract.

5. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Wallace noted the bike trail bids would be opened next Tuesday, and will be taken before the Stevens Point Public Works Committee on June 13 and Common Council on June 20. There is one easement left to work out for this project.

Krogwold asked about the Park landscaping and maintenance issues discussed at the Committee meeting last week. Idsvoog replied a meeting would be held after June 9 with Schuler, Dreier, Idsvoog, Weronke, and Rettler. Schuler added he would be meeting with Weronke and Ken Gliszinski, County Patrol Superintendent, prior to that meeting. Idsvoog noted results would be brought before the Committee as an update.

6. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers presented for review.

7. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Olson seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 4:07 pm by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
May 26, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Olson, Idsvoog, and Krogwold

Member Excused: Pazdernik

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

Others Present: Mike McKenna/David Hicketier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Doug Radtke, County Board Supervisor; Patty Dreier, County Executive; Kristen Fish, Key Commercial Real Estate; Corleen O'Malley/Patrick Connor/Gene Davis, Grubb and Ellis/Pfefferle; and Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director.

### 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. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the April 28, 2011 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the April 28, 2011 minutes and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 4. Discussion/Possible Action on Resolution Authorizing a 2010 Budget Adjustment Related to a Community Development Block Grant for Economic Development from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce – Intevation Food Group

Cummings noted the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) money for Intevation Food Group was expected in 2009, but due to the business rebranding, changing investors, etc., the money was not received until 2010. Therefore, a 2010 budget adjustment is necessary. If approved, the resolution will be forwarded to the Finance Committee and County Board for action. With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to authorize a 2010 budget adjustment related to CDBG money from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce for Intevation Food Group. Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by First Weber Real Estate, for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI Regarding Temporary "For Sale" Sign (Lot 81, 5501 EM Copps Drive)

Schuler stated agenda items 5 and 6 are similar requests. Wallace referred members to the map and sign depiction they received with the agenda packet. Based on past approvals for temporary signs, staff recommends one sign be granted temporary approval for up to one year. Krogwold moved to grant a waiver to allow one temporary "for sale" sign for First Weber Real Estate for a period of one year. Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Scholfield Group, LLC & TOLD Development, for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI Regarding Temporary "Sites Available" Signs (Lots 31, 32, 33, intersection of Cty Rd R, Cty Rd HH)

Wallace noted Scholfield Group/TOLD Development requested a waiver from Business Park Covenants to install four "sites available" signs. Wallace referred members to the map and sign depiction they received with the agenda packet, and noted staff recommends one sign at the northeast corner of Carrie Frost Drive, and one sign, with two sides, located at the corner of County Road R and County Road HH. Allowing two, rather than four signs, is in keeping with the spirit of the regulations and past precedent. Olson moved to grant a waiver to allow two temporary "sites available" signs, as recommended/described by staff, for the Scholfield Group/TOLD Development for a period of one year. Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Reconvene in Closed Session per Section 19.85 (1)(e) Stats. for Competitive Reasons to Consider a Real Estate Agency Contract to Market the Portage County Business Park and its Provisions Including Individual Discussion with Each Applicant

Idsvoog stated three firms replied to the County's Request for Proposals to market the Business Park, and those firms will be interviewed today in closed session. If a firm is not chosen today, a meeting will be held next week to decide. Krogwold moved to enter closed session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote.

8. Reconvene in Open Session Pursuant to Section 19.85 (2) Stats for Discussion/Possible Action for the Award of the Real Estate Agency Contract Considered under the Previous Closed Session Item

Krogwold moved to reconvene in open session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously by roll call vote. Idsvoog announced a meeting would be held June 1 at 4:00 pm beginning with closed session discussion. Open session will immediately follow to take action on awarding a Business Park marketing contract.

9. Discussion/Possible Action on Revising the Planned Development Area (PDA) of Lots 103 and 104 from Large Scale Rail Industrial to Medium/Large Scale Industrial and, Accordingly, Revising the Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants and Purchase Price Applicable to These Lots to Medium/Large Scale Industrial

Schuler stated rail access will no longer work for Lots 103 and 104. Currently, those lots require rail; therefore, it is recommended to change them to another industrial category. The reference to Park Covenants means that regulations of the new category and a new lot price would apply to these lots. Committee action will not result in a change to the Covenants. Krogwold moved to approve revising the designation of Lots 103 and 104, including a lot price change as recommended, and Olson seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote.

10. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler referred members to a letter received from Rettler Corporation. Idsvoog stated Rettler is very upset with maintenance within the Park, as well as the bike trail process. Idsvoog stated he spoke to Rettler and informed him if he had known not everyone was on board with the bike trail, he would not have supported it. After talking with Rettler, Idsvoog felt he was more upset about the bike trail process than the trail itself. Idsvoog added Rettler is definitely upset with maintenance; feels it is not up-to-par. In addition, there is an American flag in the Park needing to be replaced, and it should be changed today, if possible. Schuler replied that issue would be followed through with today; the request to change the flag has been in process. Idsvoog stated he wants to hold a meeting with Rettler, Schuler, Dreier, and Highway Commissioner Weronke to straighten out the maintenance issue. Once a maintenance schedule is developed by Weronke, an Economic Development Committee meeting will be held to inform members of the maintenance schedule. Idsvoog stated he was unaware the issue had gotten this bad.

Schuler stated he too was going to suggest the issue be discussed at Committee level. Staff has been working on this issue and, over the years, more routine maintenance items have slipped. Staff has been aware and not shied away from working on this issue. He is looking forward to this conversation and getting things finalized. Schuler felt Highway Department staffing had fluctuated with budget constraints. Idsvoog felt the Highway Department has enough manpower to provide proper maintenance. Schuler added this conversation would also allow us to establish who exactly is responsible for maintenance. Schuler stated the Highway Department has cut back on summer help, and those individuals generally performed the maintenance.

Krogwold asked if the Highway Department charges for Park maintenance and Schuler replied yes. Krogwold asked if Park maintenance has ever been let for bids to determine whether the service can be provided cheaper and better. He felt that should be considered.

Patton asked if there were pictures of the areas in question because everyone's viewpoint may not be the same as to acceptable quality of maintenance. Wallace replied there are numerous pictures taken over the last year of Business Park tenant properties, as well as areas maintained by the Highway Department. Patton suggested a slideshow be developed and Wallace replied that was being worked on.

Olson referred to Rettler's statement referring to "...less than acceptable maintenance by the County after giving their land away," and asked what that meant. Schuler replied he cannot speak for Rettler, but he seems to be using the fact that they are going the extra mile to participate in the bike trail process, but the County is not providing good maintenance. Schuler pointed out that Rettler signed-off gladly on trail easements. Idsvoog stated he felt the County was going the extra mile by installing the trail. Idsvoog added that not having authority over Weronke, he must make certain through Dreier that the issue will be resolved. Idsvoog reminded members not everyone on the County Board voted in favor of the bike trail project, and the last thing needed is for a Park tenant to write a letter to the editor blasting the project. Scholfield noted the trail was a hard-fought issue with TOLD Development, but they realized the benefit of the project and came around to agreeing. He noted the project was very well presented. Idsvoog felt this reminds all of us the issues to be had in the future regarding who will be paying for Park maintenance, especially when Portage County is out of the picture. Schofield noted that provision has been provided for in the Covenants, and tenants will still have to live with each other. Idsvoog felt a difference of opinion remains relative to the value of the bike trail project and as to whether they should have been paid for the property necessary for us to install the trail.

11. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers to review.

12. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Olson moved to adjourn and Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee

April 28, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Olson, Idsvoog, and Krogwold. Staff Present: Schuler, Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning. Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; David Hickethier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Doug Radtke, County Board Supervisor; John Westburg, Office of Economic Advisors-WI Department of Workforce Development

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. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the April 12, 2011 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve the April 12, 2011 minutes and Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. 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/or Negotiate terms for the sale/conveyance of Lot 40 or Lots 45 and Lot 46 in the Portage County Business Park related to the Potential U.S. General Services Administration Project

Krogwold moved to enter into closed session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

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

Olson moved to reconvene in open session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by unanimous roll call vote.

6. Discussion and Possible Action on Issue Deliberated in Closed Session under Agenda Item 4

Patton moved to extend the U.S. General Services Administration related offers to purchase by three (3) months and to reject the offer to purchase by The Samuels Group. Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler reported four out of five trail easements have been secured, with negotiations continuing with one tenant. The City of Stevens Point will let bids on June 7 for the trail project. Schuler stated discussions with the Highway Department continue regarding revamping landscaping at the Business Park entrances, while allowing minimal use of resources to maintain the landscaping. Schuler described this as a facelift for the Park entrances using sustainable plantings. Idsvoog agreed costs should be minimal.

Hickethier reported closing on the sale of land to the City of Stevens Point for its new transit facility. Scholfield stated activity has picked-up over that of 2010 regarding inquiries related to Business Park land.

Schuler noted advertisements will be placed May 1 and 8 regarding a Request for Proposals from those interested in marketing Business Park land. May 20, 2011 is the closing date for responses. He also reminded members the current contract with Scholfield Group expires the end of May 2011.

8. Review of Vouchers

None

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Pazdernik 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 Economic Development Committee  
April 12, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Olson, Idsvoog, and Krogwold  
Staff Present: Schuler, Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning  
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; David Hickethier, County Corporation Counsel Office; Jami Gebert, County Executive's Office

### 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. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the March 11, 2011 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve the March 11, 2011 minutes and Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 4. Discussion/Possible Action on a Resolution Approving the Multi-Purpose Trail Addendum to the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants

Idsvoog noted the multi-purpose trail addendum to the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants was approved at the March 11, 2011 meeting, and a resolution to that affect is presented today for action. Patton asked if each segment of the trail will be brought back before the Committee for approval and Schuler replied yes.

Krogwold moved to approve the resolution allowing the multi-purpose trail addendum to the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

### 5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request for Proposal (RFP) for Marketing and Brokerage Services for the Portage County Business Park

Idsvoog stated marketing and brokerage services for the Business Park have not been through a RFP process for nine years, making the process due. In addition, Scholfield, McKenna, Dreier, and he met regarding Dreier's dissatisfaction with a communication by Scholfield. Scholfield added there was a misunderstanding. Adding, he feels it is a good time for a RFP and he will respond to it.

Idsvoog stated McKenna reviewed who has authority over the Business Park and necessary vendors. It was determined the Economic Development Committee has that authority and will be involved in the RFP process and vendor selection.

Krogwold ask the proposed contract timeline and Schuler replied that will be part of a negotiation process. Schuler noted the current contract has been granted several extensions over time. Idsvoog suggested the contract be set with a two-year minimum, followed by a review. Hickethier felt the RFP process could be completed by May 31 allowing time for publishing and then reviewing proposals.

Patton asked the number of responses to the first RFP. Scholfield replied there was none, and his firm did not submit a RFP at that time. Olson noted there is much less land remaining to sell at this point.

Olson moved to go forward with a Request for Proposal process for marketing and brokerage services for the Business Park, which shall include a two-year contract period. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Idsvoog asked the RFP due date, and Schuler replied April 29.

6. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler stated he would be discussing landscaping issues at the Business Park entrance with the Highway Department. Plant survival has been spotty in some instances. There is a need to work through ideas and determine possibilities for long-term plant life with less maintenance.

Scholfield noted Lots 101 and 102 for the Stevens Point transit project would close on Friday, April 15. He also noted that during the last Committee meeting, he reported the GSA project was moving forward as they were deciding on a final vendor. At this time, it appears they are not ready to move forward with vendor selection. Therefore, an extension request will appear on the next Committee agenda. Scholfield reported the "phones are ringing"; there is activity. Schuler noted the GSA project has been in process since 2009.

Wallace stated work continues on obtaining signed trail easements. Schuler reported a change in staff and an absent landlord situation have caused a trail easement issue on the Bio-Life property. They continue to work through this issue.

7. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers presented.

8. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Krogwold moved to adjourn and Patton seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:10 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee  
March 11, 2011 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, and Krogwold  
Member Excused: Olson  
Staff Present: Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department  
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; David Hickethier and Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Jennifer Jossie, County Finance Director; Michelle and Chris Peariso, Adventure 212; Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; and Kevin Kawleski, The Portage County Bank

### 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. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the December 7, 2010 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve the December 7, 2010 minutes and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Wallace wanted to clarify that she had misspoke when stating at the December 7 meeting that the Learning Center had moved out of the Business Council building; whereas, the space is not vacant, rather the lease is up and new tenants are being sought at this time.

At this time, Idsvoog asked Wallace to give a brief synopsis of agenda items 4 through 7. Wallace stated there is consensus with Business Park tenants to move toward phase one of a multi-purpose trail network. This includes a 10-foot wide trail from Business Park Drive to County Road R, and a 6-foot wide concrete sidewalk in the Business Park Drive public street right-of-way, from Travel Guard north to the existing asphalt trail near the John Joanis Drive intersection. Wallace noted Business Park Covenants do not address this type of facility in the Park, so an addendum is necessary to address liability, maintenance, plowing, property owner responsibility, etc.

An agreement with the City of Stevens Point is necessary to formalize project cooperation. The City is putting \$40,000 toward the project and the County is putting forth \$70,000. The City will also provide engineering services for the project, will conduct related project bidding, and provide contract and project management. These items are outlined in a City/County Intergovernmental Agreement. There is also a resolution to execute the agreement.

Wallace then referred to the easement provided to Committee members. She is asking the Committee to approve the form and information of the easement, which would allow Portage County to work with those affected property owners to execute the easement. A meeting with Business Park property owners was held March 7, 2011 to review information included in the agenda packet. Maintenance, plowing, and salting of the trails were specific items of discussion. Those in attendance were in favor of having the first year of snowplowing done by the County Highway Department and paid for in the same manner as current Park maintenance fees. This process would be reevaluated in spring 2012 to review usage, and gather property owner ideas and thoughts. Wallace noted all Park property owners were emailed the same information found in agenda packets and were asked to provide feedback. There were a couple owners concerned about the cost of snowplowing, and they have been reassured the process would be reevaluated; the process is not set in stone.

Idsvoog stated, as he understands, once Portage County writes a check for \$70,000 that will be the end the County's dollar contribution. Wallace replied the approved 2011 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes a larger dollar amount for the project. Jossie clarified there is \$148,000 in a non-lapsing account for Business Park infrastructure, and the approved 2011 CIP allocates \$80,000 toward this trail project. At this point, the Committee is authorizing an expenditure of \$70,000, which leaves an additional \$10,000 in approved project dollars. Money left in the Capital Improvement Fund related to this project will carryover into the non-lapsing fund for future projects. Wallace noted originally the CIP approved funds would be put toward a DOT infrastructure matching-grant, but that grant application was not successful.

Idsvoog referred to trail maintenance, reconstruction of sidewalks, and snowplowing, and asked if those costs would be picked-up by Park property owners, and Wallace replied correct.

Idsvoog asked if anyone had questions or comments. Peariso asked to clarify that snowplowing would be reviewed in spring, and Idsvoog replied yes, because if no one is using the trail in the winter, there is no need to plow it.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on a Proposed Addendum to the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants to Specifically Include Creation of a Public Multi-Purpose Trail Network

With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved to approve an addendum to the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants to specifically include creation of a public multi-purpose trail network. Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on an Agreement Between Portage County and the City of Stevens Point Regarding Responsibilities Pertaining to the Installation of Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Within the Portage County Business Park

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve an agreement between Portage County and the City of Stevens Point regarding responsibilities pertaining to the installation of bicycle/pedestrian improvements within the Portage County Business Park. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on a Resolution Approving Execution of Cost Share Agreement Between Portage County and the City of Stevens Point for Installation of Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Within the Portage County Business Park

With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to approve execution of a cost share agreement between Portage County and the City of Stevens Point for installation of bicycle/pedestrian improvements within the Portage County Business Park. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion/Possible Action on a Proposed Easement Agreement Between Portage County and Property Owners within the Portage County Business Park Regarding Installation of Multi-Purpose Trails

With no discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to approve an easement agreement between Portage County and property owners within the Portage County Business Park regarding installation of multi-purpose trails. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

8. Discussion/Possible Action on a Temporary License Agreement Allowing Adventure 212 to Utilize a Portion of the County-Owned Small Office Complex Parking Lot for Peak Seasonal Overflow Parking

Wallace stated Adventure 212 is seeking additional parking area by utilizing a portion of the County-owned parking area in the former Oakwood Development site. The business held a promotional event, which was very successful and resulted in parking overflow. They are working with an architect at this time to expand their parking area. The temporary license agreement would be for one month, which is different from other temporary licenses granted for a single event. With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to approve a temporary license agreement allowing Adventure 212 to utilize a portion of the County-owned small office complex parking lot and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Motion passed by voice vote.

9. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield complimented those involved in the bicycle/pedestrian trail process and the fact they were successful. He felt Business Park property owners are generally excited about the project.

Scholfield reported the GSA project is moving ahead in that a contractor should be selected within two weeks. There are lots being reserved for this development that can soon be made available. This project has been in the works for more than one year.

Scholfield stated the Oakwood development is now in full receivership and owned by Inventors Community Bank of Manitowoc. The bank plans to finish signage and clean-up the property. He noted a condo-type issue could be forthcoming on a Committee agenda because he has been approached by two individuals regarding condominium possibilities. He described the Oakwood Center area as recaptured (Lots 16 B, C, and D) and remarketed, and he has received six calls so far.

Scholfield noted a closing today with the City of Stevens Point Transit project on lots 101 and 102. At this time, lots 103-105 are no longer rail accessible because of a redesign of the railroad tracks. This will be another future agenda item. Krogwold asked if that meant lots 103-105 are no longer rail accessible and can be opened up for others to purchase. Scholfield replied correct, because this is a main line for Canadian National and they only allow so many tracks. This area was never studied until it was necessary for the City Transit project. The switching and bridge will now service the Transit's lots. This is also a future agenda item because we can introduce something to say the lots can be sold to anybody, not just rail driven development.

10. Review of Vouchers

Cummings presented a purchasing authorization for the survey of lots 101 and 102 for the Stevens Point City Transit project for \$550 as completed by Rettler Corporation.

11. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Patton moved to adjourn and Krogwold seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date