

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee
December 7, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Schuler, Wallace, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; David Hicketier and Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Patty Dreier, County Executive; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; Ward Wolff, First Weber Group; and Tim Karcheski, Chair, Town of Plover

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 November 11, 2010 Meeting

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

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

Wallace stated Lot 3 is a multi-tenant lot, and one tenant has moved out. The Business Council wants to fill that vacancy; therefore, they are looking to install a temporary 4'x8' "For Lease" sign. Wallace referred members to a map indicating the location, as well as other tenant signage situations. No one has come forward for a waiver in the past, although similar situations have existed. Examples of temporary signs in the past include a 4'x8' "For Sale" sign, and other "For Lease" signs at locations with multiple tenants.

Idsvoog questioned a 5'x10' sign versus a 4'x8' sign, to which Wallace replied past precedent has been set with other 4'x8' signs indicating "For Sale" or under construction. Idsvoog stated he has no problem with the request. Pazdernik indicated he has no problem with the request; especially if the sign looks as nice as the example provided.

Schuler replied the request for a 4'x8' sign keeps the tone of other requirements in the Park in that the signs are low key and minimalistic. There have been larger discussions regarding requirements for business identification signs. Schuler stated he does not want to have large signs advertising "For Lease" or "For Sale" allowed in the Park, and a 4'x8' sign fits with the general intent of the Covenants. Schuler described this as a reasonable request.

Patton asked the length of time the sign would be posted. Schuler responded duration would need to be decided. Patton felt duration is important because the sign may deteriorate if up too long, and he is concerned about that possibility. Idsvoog suggested approving the sign for one year. Krogwold felt it is to the County's benefit to fill the Park and temporary signs should be dealt with on a case-by-case basis.

Patton moved to grant a waiver for a temporary "For Lease" sign to be allowed for one year for the Portage County Business Council. Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Temporary Signs within Portage County Business Park
Idsvoog asked members if they wanted Planning and Zoning staff to pursue a policy dealing with temporary signs in the Park, or should the Committee deal with them on a case-by-case basis. Olson felt temporary signs should be dealt with case-by-case because they are temporary. Patton added he felt it is a matter of enforcement. Schuler stated the Planning and Zoning Department would provide enforcement. Records would be kept in the office as each person comes in for and is granted temporary sign approval for one year. Krogwold stated he has seen large "Sale" signs at the Furniture and Appliance Mart warehouse. Schuler noted those signs are technically illegal. Krogwold added, after the sale, the sign comes down, and there is no problem.

6. Discussion/Possible Action for Ideas on Economic Success for Wisconsin Information to Governor-Elect Walker and the WCA

Schuler described this as a general call for input on ideas for economic development in Wisconsin. At this time, he has no suggestions to offer. Idsvoog asked members to provide Schuler with any ideas they may have.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield reported the Government Service Agency occupancy has been pushed to 2012 while waiting for an answer from Washington.

Wallace stated she met with Ken Gliszinski from the Portage County Highway Department regarding landscaping in the Park. They will meet again in the spring to determine plants in need of replacement, and to look at the Park's entranceways in an effort to keep the area at a level we expect. Schuler noted a new Highway Department employee would be assigned to the Park to emphasize routine maintenance. He further noted that County Executive Dreier has ideas/scheme for lands within the Business Park. Dreier noted she has not read the Business Park Covenants and asked if there were provisions for an emphasis on native plants. Schuler replied no. Patton added that Travel Guard had plans that included native plants. Schuler noted Travel Guard ultimately decided to mow the "no-mow" areas.

8. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers for review.

9. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik 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. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee
November 11, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Schuler, Lucht, Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; David Hicketier and Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Susan Lemke, Stevens Point Transit; Kevin Kawleski, The Portage County Bank; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; Michael Ostrowski, Stevens Point Community Development Director; and Nick Paulson, Stevens Point Journal

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 September 1, 2010 and October 4, 2010 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the September 1 and October 4, 2010 minutes and Pazdernik 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 Negotiate Terms for the Sale/Conveyance of Lots 101 and 102 in the Portage County Business Park

Krogwold moved to enter closed session and Pazdernik 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.

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

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

Patton moved and Krogwold seconded the motion to accept the offer and grant a waiver from the Business Park Covenants for the City of Stevens Point to purchase Lots 101 and 102 in the Portage County Business Park for its new transit facility, including a directive to the Corporation Counsel Office to prepare a cover letter outlining the waiver. Motion passed by voice vote.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Bike/Pedestrian Trail Project

Schuler reported that after lengthy discussion with Business Park tenants regarding a bike/pedestrian trail project, it was found that some agree to the concept, while others have issues with it. The Planning and Zoning Department recently applied for a bike/pedestrian trail infrastructure grant and was unsuccessful. There are some County funds available for infrastructure in addition to the \$40,000 committed by the City of Stevens Point. All sections of a trail were discussed with tenants, including sidewalks west of Business Park Drive by Travel Guard and an east/west trail. Schuler described these sections as legitimate and a good first phase. Tenants were emailed various

questions, with a variety of answers being received. If Park tenants cannot agree on the trail project, no action can be taken; all must agree. Schuler stated staff feels sidewalks are an important system to get people off Business Park Drive and not cutting through private property, but tenants have varying opinions. A future network would have to be built through private donations and grants. Schuler noted the County applied for and was awarded a bike/pedestrian trail planning grant in the amount of \$120,000. This planning process would be Countywide and a planned trail through the Business Park could be a conduit for the area. Discussions with tenants are on hold at this time, with future discussions planned for December or January. Schuler described the project as slow moving.

Idsvoog asked for clarification that there is \$75,000 set aside for infrastructure and Schuler replied yes, in the County's Capital Improvement Program. Idsvoog asked if a consensus was reached on trail maintenance and replacement. Schuler replied that is being worked on. Adding, sidewalks would be in the right-of-way and part of the City's standard sidewalk maintenance system. Idsvoog asked what the arguments are about and Schuler replied deciding on location has been an issue.

Patton noted a conversation with a tenant in which they had concerns about the use and being forced to have a path. Schuler replied that would never be the case; no one would be forced. Easements would be put in place. Patton asked if the County would be paying for the easements. Schuler answered that voluntary participation has been advocated. Wallace added meetings would take place with all tenants to discuss the process.

Krogwold asked about a Master Plan and Schuler replied that without consensus by Park tenants, a Master Plan would not be possible, but that legitimate connection corridors would be identified. Wallace added an outcome of the bike/pedestrian planning process would be a Master Plan.

8. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield noted the GSA project continues to move forward with possible construction in spring 2011.

Schuler reported on an upcoming meeting with Ken Gliszinski, Highway Department, regarding the rumor of a reduction in their seasonal labor force and how exactly that would affect Business Park maintenance. Schuler noted County Executive Dreier feels things should be done differently in the Business Park as relates to fountains and landscaping. He further noted the feeling has always been that the Business Park is an asset and the County "should put its best foot forward." In addition to Portage County reviewing its own landscaping and upkeep responsibilities, all individual Park landowners have been contacted regarding their landscaping, while referring them to their approved plans.

Scholfield reported the three lots that were not sold to Oakwood Ventures, which has foreclosed, are back under full Portage County control and actively being marketed.

9. Review of Vouchers

None to review.

10. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

*Joint Meeting - Portage County Economic Development Committee
and Portage County Finance Committee
October 4, 2010 – 7:30 am – Conference Rooms 1&2*

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold (Economic Development Committee)
Staff Present: Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel; Patty Dreier, County Executive; John Graettinger, Sheriff's Department; Sandra Curtis, Emergency Management Director; Jim Belke, Town of Linwood Plan Commission; Richard Barden, Chair, Town of Linwood; Bill Hanna and Trisha Heyman, Finance Department; Joan Scheider, Town of Plover; Joyce Barge, County Purchasing; Tim Karcheski, Chair, Town of Plover; Stephanie Stokes, County Treasurer; and Dale O'Brien, County Board Supervisor; and Doug Radtke and Al Haga, County Board Supervisors (Finance Committee)

1. Call to Order

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:20 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. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Resolution Approving an Agreement Between Portage County and the Portage County Business Council for Years 2011-2013

Idsvoog described the proposed agreement as having a term of 3 years and a contribution of \$73,600 the first year, with 50% to be used toward general expenses, 40% toward outside marketing for Countywide economic development, and 10% specifically targeted toward marketing the Portage County Business Park. Dreier explained the County has provided monetary support to the Portage County Business Council for years, but this is the first written agreement, which entailed a lot of work.

Radtke asked why the proposed agreement has a term of three years. Idsvoog replied both the Business Council and Portage County felt an agreement of more than one year was better for both parties. Radtke felt this was a long commitment and suggested it be looked at every year because setting the contribution at 90% of the 2010 amount may be too high. Idsvoog explained there is a one-year notice involved in terminating the agreement, a three-year agreement provides security to the Council, and he does see Radtke's concern as valid. Radtke stated the termination clause as written requires two years and McKenna offered the termination clause is actually one year and three month. Idsvoog clarified there will be a meeting next year to determine whether the agreement should be continued.

Radtke asked the total Council budget because he is interested in knowing what percentage comes from Portage County. Dehlinger replied the Council's budget is approximately \$450,000. Radtke asked if other County municipalities contribute to the Council and Dehlinger replied yes, the Villages of Plover and Amherst, the City of Stevens Point, and the Community Development Authority.

Radtke referred to the proposed agreement and the fact it refers to Section 59.42 of Wisconsin Statutes. The proposed agreement states this statute authorizes and encourages County economic

development. Radtke stated he recalls this statute defines the Corporation Counsel. Radtke remembers from his time on the Town of Belmont Board that they could not contribute to a tax-exempt organization. McKenna noted Section 59 has been re-codified causing number changes, but there is a provision in Section 59 that definitely authorizes and encourages County participation in economic development. The Section reference will be corrected. McKenna stated he commends the contract and feels it is better to have this in place from a legal standpoint versus just writing a check. Radtke agreed.

Patton noted the agreement includes marketing the Business Park for which the County contracts with a Broker to conduct marketing. Patton asked how many referrals from the Council to the Broker resulted in actual land sales and development in the Business Park. Dehlinger replied the Council refers all leads to Bill Scholfield (Business Park Broker) because she cannot sell property. Patton again asked how many Council referrals have resulted in sales/development in the Business Park. No response from Dehlinger. Patton would like a measure because 50% of the County's contribution to the Council is slated for marketing. Patton asked for a report on the number of Council leads resulting in sales/development at the end of the proposed three-year contract.

Patton asked Dehlinger if she would be providing an annual report. Dehlinger replied she would like to get together with Scholfield, but she has tried to do this for 18 months and Scholfield has not responded as far as a meeting date. Idsvoog replied he would assist in getting them together and Dehlinger replied great.

Olson moved to approve an agreement between Portage County and the Portage County Business Council for years 2011-2013 and Haga seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committees, Haga moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:35 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee
September 1, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Wallace and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; Dan Schrameyer, Aspirus Stevens Point Clinic; David Hicketier and Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; and 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 July 1 and July 15, 2010 Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the July 1 and July 15 minutes and Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on a License Agreement for the Rotary Club of Portage County Kite Festival

Wallace noted the kite festival, as proposed/licensed, would be the same as approved in past years by the Committee. With no discussion necessary, Pazdernik moved to approve a license agreement for the Rotary Club of Portage County Kite Festival and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Action on 2011 Economic Development/Business Park Budget

Cummings presented the proposed 2011 Economic Development/Business Park budget by describing each budget line item. The proposed budget and narrative were included in the Committee's agenda packet. Krogwold 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 know that figure. With no further discussion necessary, Krogwold moved to forward the Economic Development/Business Park proposed 2011 budget to the County Executive. Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

No update necessary.

7. Review of Vouchers

No vouchers for review.

8. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee

July 15, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Wallace, Schuler, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Lori Dehlinger and Bonnie Groshek, Portage County Business Council; Dan Schrameyer, Aspirus Stevens Point Clinic; Susan Lemke, Stevens Point Transit; Joel Lemke, Stevens Point Department of Public Works; David Hickethier and Mike McKenna, County Corporation Counsel Office; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; Jami Gerbert, County Executive's Office; 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

Idsvoog acknowledged those present as representing their various agenda items (see affiliation in Others Present above).

3. Discussion of Possible Stevens Point Transit Use of Land in the Northeast Portion of the Portage County Business Park

Schuler stated the City of Stevens Point is considering the possibility of relocating its transit facility to Business Park property north of Lands' End on the east side of Brilowski Road. The possibility of expansion would also be considered at this proposed site.

J. Lemke stated the City's transit facility is located at Bukolt Park and a new facility is currently in the design phase. The Business Park location offers potential for future expansion and is a good location to serve the community. Locating City bus service near a railroad allows them to be ready for a possible intermodal facility. The location seems to offer everything a transit facility would need, as well as being in an area currently underserved; therefore, developing to the east is logical.

Idsvoog asked the size of the proposed transit facility and J. Lemke replied 38,000 square feet. Patton asked about the Bukolt site and J. Lemke replied they are looking at a new site and would build/expand at this new location. Patton asked if the site would be home to City trucks or any junk. J. Lemke replied vehicles would be stored inside. Idsvoog asked the number of vehicles and J. Lemke answered the City has seven buses and would expand to 10 buses soon. Patton asked for clarification that the City would buy the property and J. Lemke replied yes, the land is now owned by Portage County. Krogwold asked if other activities are planned for the site, such as a place for plow trucks, etc. J. Lemke answered that is not planned. Schuler felt the Committee was concerned the site may be used for a public works salt storage shed, etc. J. Lemke clarified the Park's Restrictive Covenants demand good-looking buildings and they would follow that. Keeping in mind the site may serve as a transit hub in the future and should well represent the City. The building would house administrative offices and there would be no collocation with the City garage on this site. J. Lemke reiterated there are no plans to relocate the City garage.

Idsvoog asked if any negatives are seen with this proposed development. Scholfield replied he views this as positive and he finds it speaks well to a vision for the future by City Transit. A previous offer in this area of the Park included a large, metal, distribution warehouse, and the Transit facility is an upgrade from that. He also noted the Transit facility is an appropriate use for this area of the Park, as long as the City's ancillary services are not included. The City is looking at lot 102 (8.6 acres) and lot 101 (9.57 acres).

Patton questioned necessary roadwork. J. Lemke replied yes, the development, which is nearing final draft form, would be located north of the cul-de-sac. They will be entering the architecture and engineering phase. He added this location is the City's top site as they are looking at future expansion possibilities; namely, a future transit hub.

Olson noted the area would be a multiple-use type parcel of land. J. Lemke described the best-case scenario as a Transit facility, with a possible intermodal hub for people to get off the train and take a bus into the community. Parking would be required for that scenario as well, but for now, only City staff would be out there. Olson asked if the property would need to be rezoned. Schuler replied the land is zoned Industrial for rail related industries or manufacturing. He would have to look how this would fit because institutional uses were not considered as a part of the categories. Whether it needed to be rezoned or a waiver granted must be looked at. Schuler stated he is uncertain whether there is another category out there to fit this type of use. It is not a restricted use because it can be seen as a large terminal, which is anticipated under industrial use. There is no other district in the Park being closer to correct for this development.

Idsvoog asked the timetable because no action can be taken today on moving forward. J. Lemke replied if this is something the Committee feels it can support, they can move forward with architecture and engineering steered toward the Park site. The other site being considered has limitations. Scholfield noted the land is being openly marketed and there should be a timeline for Committee members to see. J. Lemke added the City is working on funding. The sooner the better, but no timeline has been set, although they hope for something prior to the end of the year.

McKenna noted an offer to purchase would be the next step. Idsvoog found a consensus to move forward.

4. Discussion/Action on Capital Improvement Project Relating to Bike/Pedestrian Plan Within Portage County Business Park

Schuler referred to the County Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Request Form provided to Committee members, which includes a brief written summary. CIP forms for the 2011-2015 funding cycle are due soon and must be completed for this proposed 2011 project. As discussed at the July 1, 2010 EDC meeting, there was a consensus to move forward with this project, work out major details, and reconfirm agreement with tenants, as well as maintenance of the trails. Again, County and private donation money will be leveraged toward possible grant opportunities for additional segments/phases of the project. Schuler told members there is no obligation associated with their action today.

Idsvoog stated he has no problem moving forward, but before money is committed toward the project, a maintenance relationship must be defined, as well as total cost and where the money will come from. Schuler reminded members a project cost estimate from County Highway was \$154,000, if they did the work. Because this project must be let for bids, the actual cost cannot be predicted at this point. After the initial phase expenditure, grant funding will be sought, which is the only way to proceed, without a large private donation. The first phase will be completed with combined municipal funds.

Olson asked the amount the City of Stevens Point has committed toward phase 1 and Schuler replied \$40,000. Scholfield noted there are private efforts to add to this as well. In addition, Schuler noted the City has offered engineering and design services for this project.

Krogwold questioned expenses noted on the CIP form, seeking clarification of Business Park infrastructure funds versus levy. Schuler responded the recommendation would be to use Business Park infrastructure funds. Krogwold said he remembers discussion about funding taking place two years ago and asked how much County funding will be used. Schuler replied the trail system is an important part of planning for the Business Park and trails will enhance the perception of the Park, which will allow the County to get out of selling land sooner. The trails have never been discussed as a City facility, except within their right-of-way. Park tenants will have an owners' association that will assume maintenance duties the County currently provides. Idsvoog suggested a letter be sent to tenants informing them of the process because he doubts they understand it. Schuler replied it is his intent to do that and all Park tenants have been well informed along the way. Scholfield agreed, stating there has been impressive tenant participation at meetings that have been held. Pazdernik acknowledged the proposed project addresses safety issues in the Park.

Pazdernik moved and Olson seconded to forward the project on to capital projects for review with the funding source as recommended by the Finance Director. Motion passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action Regarding Special Event License Agreement for the Midwestern Recumbent Bike Rally, August 6, 7, and 8, 2010 (Rolf Garthus/Hostel Shoppe)

With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to approve the special event license agreement for the Midwestern Recumbent Bike Rally and Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Wallace noted the Aspirus Clinic would like to hold a Health Fair event on Saturday, September 25 from noon to 3:00 pm at their facility in the Business Park. She has no other specifics to offer at this time. Schuler noted they expect 300 people to attend the event. Portage County Corporation Counsel has stated if the event is held on Aspirus property, there is no license required. Business Park tenants will be notified.

Idsvoog asked about a rumor he heard regarding Roundy's possibly locating in the Park. Scholfield replied he checked into this with a Roundy's representative and the rumor is definitely false.

Scholfield noted the GSA/USDA 18,000 square foot office building project on lots 45 and 46 is moving forward. They are looking at occupancy in 2012. Three companies bid on the project. He has also received two calls on the lots formerly optioned by Oakwood.

Schuler added that in order to think about paths being installed in the Park and their tie to the existing maintenance system, the Covenants will have to be tweaked because they do not include this situation.

7. Review of Vouchers (Approval Number: 20100506)

Schuler reported this voucher is \$150.86 related to water and sewer in the small park area of the Business Park.

8. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee

July 1, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Wallace, Schuler, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; Dan Schrammeyer, Aspirus Clinic; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; and Karen and Joe Milanowski, Mada Custom Apparel and Sporting Goods

On-Site Visit (7:00 am) Mada Custom Apparel & Sporting Goods Site in the Portage County Business Park for On-site Inspection of Request for Waiver Regarding Limiting the Number of Corporate Identity Signs to One

1. Call to Order (7:15 am)

Chairman Idsvoog called the meeting to order at 7:15 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. Election of Economic Development Committee Vice-Chair

Idsvoog opened nominations for Economic Development Committee (EDC) Vice-Chair. Olson nominated Patton for Vice-Chair. Idsvoog called three times for nominations and hearing no other nomination, he closed nominations. Pazdernik moved to elect Patton as Vice-Chair and Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Action on Minutes from the May 20, 2010 Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the May 20, 2010 EDC minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Mada Custom Apparel & Sporting Goods, LLC for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI(B) Regarding Limiting the Number of Corporate Identity Signs to One

Schuler stated EDC members made an on-site visit of the Mada site at 7:00 am today. Schuler noted he and EDC members felt the request for a waiver regarding the number of corporate identity signs is reasonable based on the on-site visit. Schuler went on to ask members to state site-specific circumstances for their action as part of the motion on this item. Patton moved to approve a waiver from the Portage County Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants regarding the number of corporate identity signs as requested by Mada, citing the following specifics, 1. Speed of travel on County Road R and presence of mature landscaping within the County Road R right-of-way causing hardship; 2. the additional sign should be limited to location on north elevation described in the rendering submitted; 3. the sign design and illumination restricted as described in the rendering submitted; and 4. the sign on the north elevation cannot be changed without EDC review and approval. Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Resolution Supporting an Independent Study of Wisconsin's Economic Development Competitiveness and Positioning

Schuler provide those present with background information on the resolution mailed with the agenda packet. Nine months ago, the following groups: Wisconsin Economic Development Association (WEDA), Competitive Wisconsin, Inc. (CWI), and the Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA), with support from the Wisconsin Economic Development Institute (WEDI), decided on a joint effort to make economic development a discussion point in the gubernatorial race. They feel now is the time for a comprehensive study assessing how Wisconsin fits in terms of regional, national, and global economic development. The group has decided to pursue the effort this year to try to get a study done and force candidates for governor to make this a focal point in order for to be positioned to do well in all regions of Wisconsin.

Idsvoog asked who is asking for this resolution to come forward and Schuler replied the groups listed on the resolution (note paragraph above). Schuler stated there is no monetary commitment associated with the resolution, but rather allows Portage County to support and encourage going forward with the study.

Patton questioned the meaning of the following statement in the resolution, "Whereas, Portage County authorizes this resolution in lieu of financial support to WEDA, CWI, and WCA in pursuit of this initiative" and Schuler replied it states Portage County supports the initiative, but does not allow a financial commitment. Schuler described the resolution as straightforward without hidden entanglements or commitments. Scholfield felt the group behind this initiative was better than the "Forward Wisconsin" group, which "imploded."

Olson moved to approve the resolution supporting an independent study of Wisconsin's economic development competitiveness and positioning as initiated by the groups noted in the resolution. Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Bike/Pedestrian Trail Project

Wallace stated Planning and Zoning staff have been working with Business Park tenants to identify a first phase for the proposed bike/pedestrian project. Wallace then referred members to a map of the area, specifically, the north/south "red" line on the west side of Business Park Drive, indicating that line represents an extension of the sidewalk, with an estimated cost of \$67,000 (City of Stevens Point estimate). Stevens Point has agreed to commit \$40,000 to the project, with details to be worked out. The second portion of the first phase, represented by the "orange" line on the north side of Bio-Life and WIAA toward County Road R, includes a 10' wide asphalt path, with an estimated cost of \$51,000 (Portage County Highway Department estimate). This total first phase (two projects just described) would connect the northern part to the existing loop and provide east/west access for Travel Guard. Phase 2 involves achieving a high-line trail east-west, north of Little Scholars. At this point staff is garnering support from Park tenants, some of which have given a verbal commitment, and finalizing details. Wallace felt easement documents and final costs could be available in July.

Idsvoog requested a formal contract between the County and the City of Stevens Point be drawn up in regard to the City's monetary commitment, etc. to the proposed project. Schuler replied the first item staff is looking for is an answer from the Committee as to whether this approach is okay. Schuler referred to the Travel Guard sidewalk, from their driveway to the high-line, and the east-west link on the north side of Bio-Life and WIAA, as good links that could be accomplished. Discussions with the City concluded the sidewalks are in the City's right-of-way and Jeff Hild (City Surveyor) felt the City could bid the project out in spring 2011 as part of the City's normal concrete work. The Mayor is firmly in support of committing \$40,000 toward the overall project. It was discussed that if the sidewalk is in the City's right-of-way, then why not make it a City project based on their \$40,000 contribution, with Portage County paying costs over that amount to complete the sidewalk. If the City could handle the bidding process, Schuler felt it might be advantageous to the County.

Schuler reported a preliminary estimate for this phase, as received from Hild, is \$67,000, making the County's share approximately \$27,000 for this key link. Schuler asked EDC feels okay with this approach. Idsvoog said he has no problem with that, but a memorandum of understanding is necessary. In addition, a document is needed relative who will pay for maintenance upon project completion, because there is a history of the County picking-up the tab. All aspects must be "nailed down" in detail prior to moving forward. Before the trail is built, a document must be in place that spells everything out in order to eliminate future arguments. Schuler felt that was something easy to accomplish and will be part of any easement document that has to be recorded for the east/west trail; noting, no easement is needed for the sidewalk because it is within the right-of-way. Discussions will be held with Travel Guard in particular and other tenants in general, about how trails will be maintained. Consensus, at this time, is that trails will be maintained by Portage County, but not plowed, and any associated maintenance costs will become a part of the current, annual maintenance charged to Park tenants. All County performed maintenance is a lump sum bill at the end of each year, which is then divided up and billed to each Park tenant.

Idsvoog asked when all properties in the Park are sold, who pays for maintenance. Schuler replied that would transfer to tenants and function similar to a homeowners' association. Idsvoog reiterated there is a document necessary that states that fact. Schuler said there would be a mechanism in the end where that will be transferred over to the group of Park tenants. This will be a natural part of the transition from the County getting out of Park maintenance and the tenants taking it over. Schuler felt Hicketier would make certain the County, in no way, would be left on the hook for any maintenance during that period.

Krogwold noted Portage County is a landowner in the Park now and asked why this process has not already been turned over. Schuler responded there is specific language in the Covenants that says at what point it can be turned over and we are not to that point now.

Patton stated he felt uncomfortable, and finds this a "slippery slope." The County is to pay approximately \$27,000 for the first phase and then it becomes another \$10,000 for the next portion, and so on. He feels the County will be asked to contribute more money as this goes along. Schuler noted prior discussions included a possible cost of \$154,000 at one shot, which the Committee was in favor of spending. The Dillingham's, who are Park tenants, have a concern about the high-line trail link, which is thought to be a very important link. On-going discussions are taking place with them. Staff wants to bring the complete package to the Committee, with all associated costs. Idsvoog stated he hoped there would be a continuous path, and staff will have to work through the Dillingham's concern quickly. Schuler said the staff's approach to the project is that Portage County currently has \$138,000 available in the Park infrastructure account that can legitimately be put toward the project. At some point, the Committee will have to decide how much of that money they would like to devote to the project. Staff feels the two links should be developed, and then remaining County funds could be leveraged toward matching money from grants. Schuler added the Dillingham's concern needs to be worked through, but does not need to happen right away. It should be worked through in time for the next trail phase. He assured members that grant funding opportunities will be pursued. Staff does not envision the County writing a check for this entire project; rather, we want to get something in place now and work on ways to obtain outside monies to help finish the project. We know the County cannot and should not install the entire trail system.

Wallace noted the high-line trail is a much larger connection than just within the Park itself. It is felt there are much better options available for outside funding for this larger connection, versus funding options for internal paths that mainly handle Park tenant bike/pedestrian needs. Schuler added that staff wants to stress a certain amount of County money would be used toward the high impact, initial installation, and then they would work hard to obtain outside funding, including transportation grants. Adding that an undetermined amount of private funding will be coming from Park tenants who have said, in a general way, they will contribute. Exact private funding amounts have not been discussed and cannot be discussed until a project cost has been determined. Tenants want to know what percentage of the pie their contributions represent.

Schuler described the bike/pedestrian trail project as moving ahead slowly, but has the makings of a good plan. He is looking for a consensus from EDC members that this is the way to proceed. Pazdernik asked for an explanation of where the initial \$67,000 will be spent. Schuler referred to the orange line that begins on the Travel Guard site, on the west side of Business Park Drive. Wallace added that represents a 6' wide concrete sidewalk. The second part of phase 1, a red line, with an estimated cost of \$51,000 represents a 10' wide asphalt trail.

Idsvoog asked for clarification that no concrete would be poured without Committee approval and an agreement in place. Schuler replied no, concrete work would not take place. This project would be bid with the City's spring 2011 bidding process. If the Committee finds consensus on what they heard today, staff can work with the City to have the process nailed down. Idsvoog asked for the overall plan to be brought back to the Committee, including a tentative timeline, costs, and legal agreement language prior to any action. Schuler replied absolutely.

8. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield stated he has verified the County now has full control over the Oakwood parcels, without encumbrances. Oakwood developers failed to exercise their options on these parcels. There have been several phone calls coming in regarding Park properties. Also, the GSA/USDA project is waiting for a federal government reply to the three companies who have bid the project. A company should be selected by August or September to build an 18,000 square foot office space.

9. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee

May 20, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, Olson, and Krogwold
Staff Present: Wallace, Lucht, and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Jami Gebert, County Executive Office; David Hickethier, Corporation Counsel Office; Joe and Karen Milanowski, Mada Custom Apparel and Sporting Goods; Matthew Woller and Chris Fish, Graphic House; Dan Schrameyer, Aspirus Clinic; and April Niemi, CAP Services

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

Idsvoog acknowledged those present as representing their various agenda items (see affiliation in Others Present above).

3. Discussion/Action on Minutes from April 1, 2010 Economic Development Committee Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Olson moved to approve the April 1, 2010 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Aspirus Health Clinic for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI(C) Regarding Maximum Height of Monument Sign and Section XI(B) Regarding the Number of Corporate Identity Signs Allowed

Lucht explained the first waiver involves sign height on County Road HH and the other waiver involves an existing monument sign on Vern Holmes Drive.

Lucht stated Aspirus would like to increase the height of the proposed monument sign on County Road HH to an overall height of 13 feet above grade to increase visibility. Justification for this increase includes the speed of traffic on County Road HH and setbacks. Portage County Bank asked for, and was granted, a sign waiver at a maximum height of 12 feet and cited the same justification. Aspirus is seeking 13 feet based on the size of the bottom panel. Lucht stated staff recommends approval at a maximum of 12 feet above grade.

Lucht noted Aspirus would like to retain the current monument sign located on Vern Holmes Drive. If this sign is retained, and the new monument sign previously discussed is allowed, there would be four signs total. He reminded Committee members that Aspirus had requested, and was granted, a third sign citing the fact the building held multiple tenants as justification. Lucht stated staff recommends denial of the request to retain the original monument sign along Vern Holmes Drive. He also noted it is inappropriate to compare Travel Guard's signage to that of Aspirus. Denying this request would allow Aspirus to still have three signs.

Schrameyer stated the Portage County Bank sign measures 13 feet and not 12 feet; therefore, they are seeking 13 feet as well. Schrameyer considers the other monument sign as a secondary feature. He is concerned because as the Business Park continues to fill, the Aspirus sign has become difficult to see, making Aspirus harder to find. He stated he struggles with Aspirus being considered a corner lot on Interstate 39 and County Road HH, and asked if that was typical. He suggests the frontage is three roads. He further noted the capability of installing directional signs, which if installed, would be replacing a sign already in place.

Lucht noted the original sign for Portage County Bank was approved at a maximum height of 12 feet from finished grade. It seems there was an issue as to whether that was 12 feet from finished grade of planting bed or finished grade of surrounding land. Staff recommends 12 feet from finished grade for the Aspirus sign height because that was what the Portage County Bank was actually granted.

Lucht clarified the first Aspirus request is for an extra sign and, if approved, the Committee would be granting a fourth sign, if the sign now being discussed were not removed. Business Park Covenants state, by virtue of having double frontage, you are allowed an additional sign, meaning two total signs. This site had previously been granted a waiver for a third sign. Lucht noted smaller directional signs are a possibility and may actually be preferable. Directional signs will indicate the exact entrance for visitors, emergency response personnel, etc. Two directional signs may be more effective than the monument sign as it presently exists.

Patton asked if the MRI truck parked on the side of the Aspirus building along Interstate 39 is in violation. Lucht replied no, the capability was there to begin with, but they are supposed to have screening installed. He noted an approved landscape plan exists that should be taken care of soon. Schrameyer added this is planting season and after this meeting, he will be having a discussion with the landscaper regarding a planting timeline.

Pazdernik referred to the Portage County Bank sign asking for clarification that the sign is actually higher than the 12 feet granted by the Committee. Lucht replied yes, the sign is 13 feet. Pazdernik felt Aspirus is asking for the same 13 feet. Lucht replied that is correct, but it appears Portage County Bank played a bit with the finished grade. Idsvoog asked if Portage County Bank was approved for 12 feet and played with the grade making it 13 feet, what should happen. Pazdernik stated he referred to the 13 feet only because he felt sign height should be consistent. Lucht reiterated that Portage County Bank was granted a 12-foot high sign from finished grade. Lucht stated with the way trees are currently planted, eventually you would have trees in the way of the signs as they mature. When a vehicle comes over the County Road HH overpass, you only have a little bit of time to see the sign to your left and still be safe. Within 4-5 seconds, you have to turn your head at a dangerous intersection; therefore, they decided to move the trees back, making the sign much more visible.

Krogwold moved to accept recommendations of Planning and Zoning Department staff, which are to approve the proposed monument sign at 12 feet in height from finished grade and not the height of any raised planting bed, and to deny retention of the Aspirus monument sign located on Vern Holmes Drive. Pazdernik seconded the motion.

Patton questioned finished grade. Krogwold felt finished grade is predetermined. Lucht replied that is correct. Patton referred to Portage County Bank's sign and asked if they added more ground to make the sign too high. Lucht answered that Portage County Bank did build up the grade. Patton was concerned about the ground being built up in this instance as well. Idsvoog explained what the Committee has tried to accomplish in the past is to rely on the Planning and Zoning Department to make consistent recommendations relative to the Business Park. Idsvoog suggested more effective monitoring in terms of what is going on in the Park must take place. He stated the Committee tries to work with each tenant, yet have consistent practice in the Park. Idsvoog felt without effective monitoring, Committee action becomes pointless.

Voice vote revealed four ayes and one nay (Patton).

5. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Mada Custom Apparel & Sporting Goods, LLC for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XI(B) Regarding Limiting the Number of Corporate Identity Signs to One and For Allowance of Additional Letter Height

Wallace explained there are two waivers being requested by Mada Custom Apparel and Sporting Goods. One waiver involves installation of two wall-mounted signs and the other deals with installing lettering greater than 10% of the wall height for a portion of each sign.

Wallace noted the Mada building was previously a multi-tenant building. After checking with County Corporation Counsel, regarding the building now being a single-tenant building, it was determined Mada's should follow single use restrictions in the Park Covenants. This would allow one sign and one elevation. A similar request came forward from Portesi, which is a single-tenant building, for two signs on a corner lot. This was denied by the Committee due to the fact no justification for the request was brought forward to the Committee by the owner. This would be the only comparison at this time.

The second request for both signs involves the word Mada with the "swoosh" logo, which as proposed, exceeds 10% of the building height by six inches for the letters "M" and "d". The Custom Apparel and Sporting Goods wording meets both the height and total area requirements. The word Mada is considered their logo and is their name. Wallace noted staff recommends approval for additional letter height.

Idsvoog asked whether Planning and Zoning staff is recommending approval on both requests. Wallace replied there is no specific recommendation on the first request other than to note Corporation Counsel has said requirements for a single-tenant building should be followed. There is no other business in the Park with this type of waiver; therefore, the decision made today will set precedent. The Committee decision should be made on justification presented today. Wallace referred to the Adventure 212° property, which was granted a waiver on sign height due to speed of traffic on County Road R. That can be taken into consideration when making a decision on the Mada request.

Pazdernik asked for clarification that Mada is requesting two signs, whereas other tenants only have one. Wallace replied correct, single-tenant buildings having a corner lot, currently only have one sign in the Park. She added corner lots are not considered double frontage lots.

Fish felt trees in the right-of-way of County Road R will hide the one sign Mada is allowed. K. Milanowski came forward with pictures of the area in question explaining the location of the building and proposed signs. She noted you could not see either sign. Pazdernik asked why request a second sign, if you cannot see it. K. Milanowski replied it is the largest section where we can have the largest sign. She further explained if you are traveling north on County Road R, you cannot see the sign, and would actually have to look back to see it.

Idsvoog stated his preference on this request, since it has not been granted by the Committee in the past, is to discuss possible consequences with Jeff Schuler, Planning and Zoning Director. He then suggested postponing action on the second sign, conducting a Committee on-site of the area in question, while approving the letter height waiver today. Wallace stated staff has no problem with the letter height request described previously. She noted the letter height waiver, if approved, would affect one or both signs once the Committee takes action on the request for an additional sign.

Krogwold moved to approve the request for additional letter height and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Pazdernik moved to postpone action on the request for two wall-mounted signs until the Committee conducts an on-site of the area in question and Krogwold seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

Fish brought up that double frontage lots have an allowance for an additional sign. He questioned the intent of that portion of the Covenants. Idsvoog replied intent is questioned by the Committee when dealing with changes that are and are not allowed. The Committee's goal is consistency in the Park and not making decisions that launch requests by every Business Park tenant to do something different. Fish noted he has to comply with various sign related ordinances and codes. He feels the Covenants' intent for double frontage lots applies to corner lots as well, and he asked the Committee to consider that.

Olson suggested Fish meet with Schuler prior to the next Committee on-site/meeting to get more information from him.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Children's Discovery Center for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section XV(A) Regarding Landscaping Plan To Allow Installation of a Garden

Wallace stated CAP Services recently called to inquire about installing a garden area at the Children's Discovery Center so children could have a learning experience by growing vegetables. Because the inquiry was recent, Niemi was asked to attend the meeting to further explain the request, indicate the exact location, and show pictures of the garden they have at their site on West River Drive. Wallace noted the Covenants do not specifically allow nor deny a garden. The request is for a waiver for an area not used for a structure, which Covenants state is to be maintained in grass or landscaped areas.

Idsvoog stated he spoke to Schuler about the request. This garden would be a learning experience for kids, produce would be utilized, and the garden will be maintained. After this discussion, Idsvoog felt the request sounded like a good thing.

Krogwold asked the size of the proposed garden and Niemi replied 30 feet by 30 feet, with room for expansion. They will be looking at the community for help in maintaining the garden. Niemi noted there are community organizations with grants to help maintain the garden. Krogwold asked the percent of green space that would be taken up by the garden. Wallace replied she was uncertain of the percentage of open area that would be taken away. This would be a waiver from the landscape plan. Idsvoog stated Committee action should restrict size and require maintenance.

Pazdernik asked the exact location of the proposed garden. Niemi replied the garden is proposed on the west side of the building on the north or south corner. The garden would be located in the current fenced-in playground area. Niemi stated they are also requesting to expand the fenced-in area to accommodate the garden. Wallace asked where the potential expansion is proposed. Niemi indicated an expansion area on a display map, which was on the northwest side. Niemi explained the proposed 30 foot by 30 foot garden takes up a lot of the current green area of the playground. Idsvoog stated the area must be specifically identified before action can be taken by the Committee. Niemi replied the request is for the northwest corner specifically.

Niemi went on to describe the garden as a great experience for children. Children are involved with actually choosing the products to harvest. Vegetables would be used within the center, and remaining produce would be given to the community or families of the children. Plants would be of the low-growing variety.

Patton stated he has not seen the garden on West River Drive. A University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point garden, which is maintained by students, Patton described as a mess. He went on to state that if CAP Services is asking for a fenced-in garden with low growing plants, it would probably be fine. Niemi noted they are working with Master Gardeners on this project.

Patton expressed concern about this garden bringing wildlife into the Business Park, even if fenced. Patton suggested discussing this with Schuler to determine whether the landscape plan that was approved was such that it would not attract wildlife.

Wallace stated a landscape plan modification would have to be submitted indicating the exact location of the garden, the expansion area, and the area where the fence would be moved.

Idsvoog asked the timeline for developing the garden. Niemi replied planting should take place soon, or they can wait until next season. Idsvoog reiterated a specific plan must be brought forward indicating where the garden would be, how big it would be, the height of the fence, type of low-growing vegetables, etc. A written description of exactly what is proposed is necessary before any Committee action. Niemi asked whether the playground expansion should be a separate proposal. Wallace suggested Niemi work with her on the requests. Patton again asked Wallace to discuss the wildlife issue with Schuler and Wallace agreed.

Krogwold moved to postpone action on this agenda item until exact plans are brought forward and an on-site visit has taken place and Olson seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

7. Adjournment

Krogwold moved to adjourn and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 am by voice vote. The next meeting will take place after an on-site at the Mada and Discovery Center sites, and after exact plans are submitted by CAP Services. The Committee will meet at the Business Park for the on-sites, with a business meeting to follow at the County Annex.

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee

April 1, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, and Gifford
Member Excused: Olson
Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Mark Maslowski, County Executive; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Bonnie Groshek and Lori Dehlinger, Portage County Business Council; Jenni Jossie, County Finance Director; Greg Kost, Brian Adamson, and Kevin Coakley, TOLD Development; and Rusty Mitch, Portesi/RW Mitch

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 January 28, 2010 Economic Development Committee Meeting

With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to approve the January 28, 2010 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on a Development Plan for the Meridian Property (Lots 31, 32, 33 Located at County Road R and County Road HH)

Schuler began by explaining that the Business Park Covenants have a clause that when property is purchased, you commence construction within 12 months and complete construction within 24 months. This property was purchased by Meridian several years ago and they have received extensions in the past. At this point, there is still no activity on the property; therefore, Coakley has been invited to this meeting to provide the Committee an update on plans for the property.

Idsvoog noted he has no interest in the County buying back the property. Pazdernik asked the property location and Schuler replied it is around the horn on Brilowski Road over to County Road HH. Patton brought up discussion about development not allowed in the Business Park, such as small satellite businesses. Schuler reminded members this property is the only property in the Park that has hybrid development capabilities. Every possible development option, from the southern part of the park, was at some point combined together on this property; they are unique.

Coakley stated plans for the property are to develop it and if we cannot develop it, it would be sold to another developer, which has been done in Crossroad Commons. Idsvoog asked the timeline expected for development in light of nothing happening for years. Coakley replied the market has slowed down considerably. The property has been proposed to a number of office and retail users, without success. One of the uses he thinks would work well there is a hotel, specifically, a 3-story hotel, which they are precluded from doing in Crossroad Commons. A hotel would want signage visibility along I39. If that can be secured, it would help in selling the property. Patton felt there is no money in the hotel business. Coakley stated he knows it is a tough business, run by supply and demand, as is the development business. The pace, over the last few years, has been to move about one acre a year in Crossroad Commons. TOLD has sold property to other developers to do projects because they are willing to take a level of risk TOLD is not. He has talked to other developers and retailers about corner parcels in the Business Park, as well.

Idsvoog asked whether Coakley sees something happening on the land within the next year. Coakley replied no, but they would be hopeful within two years. Coakley added they are very disappointed something has not happened on the property in the last 3½ - 4 years. Idsvoog asked Coakley, if something does not happen within the next year, would he be selling the property. Coakley answered they are willing to do that now and have proposed it in the past. Idsvoog noted the reason for this agenda item is due to the fact the Mayor of Stevens

Point has expressed concerns regarding lack of development on the property and the fact Covenants have timelines in place.

Scholfield noted the area Travel Guard and Aspirus located on was the designated hotel area. A few years ago, the owners of Candlewood Suites in this district, looked at Crossroad Commons and lands outside. Lockre grabbed up the rights to the hotel and built a Hampton Inn, and bought a hotel on County Road B. Those rights run out in October 2010. Scholfield said that nothing has moved across the street for two years either. Scholfield noted he and Schuler have talked about what can and cannot be done in regard to signage. He believes the hotel signage issue is less of a factor than just coming into the market after the Holiday Inn, etc. Idsvoog referred to the hotel next to the Elizabeth Inn that cannot open its doors. Patton asked if a hotel were to locate there, is it possible to get the preliminary issues out of the way ahead of time such as signage, etc. Scholfield replied that is not possible because you do not know what the developer may request. Adamson agreed. Idsvoog thanked Coakley for the update. Coakley reiterated they would "love to move dirt" on property they are paying taxes on and it is a disappointment to them, as well. Scholfield noted they also paid for half the access road that is heavily used. Idsvoog felt TOLD is doing very well and Scholfield added they have not recouped their cost through sales.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on the Proposed Storm Water Easement Document for the Travel Guard Property

Schuler noted the easement has been a long time in coming, and it represents the final piece of the puzzle. The language has been agreed to by all parties. This easement legitimizes the use of the storm pipe from the Travel Guard property to the County's pond. The Corporation Counsel's Office has approved the wording, and the document is ready for signatures. Idsvoog asked McKenna if he was okay with this document and McKenna replied yes, we are satisfied. Patton asked for certainty there is nothing hidden in the document requiring Portage County to pay for things in the future. McKenna replied it is a document that details the plan and how Travel Guard pays for things.

Gifford moved to approve the storm water easement document for the Travel Guard property and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on a Proposed Multi-Purpose Path Easement Document for the Installation of a Trail System through Portions of the Business Park; Feedback on the Trail Project Overall

Schuler reported long-term discussions have taken place regarding the need for off-street circulation in the Business Park. Discussion topics include path type, who should be contacted to see about the ability to cross properties, path cost, physical nature of the paths themselves, etc. It is felt, as we move forward, an easement document written to the satisfaction of both parties, addressing liability and use, is necessary. After working with the Corporation Counsel's office, Schuler provided a draft of the easement document.

Schuler noted a couple option points in the document regarding construction and maintenance. There are different avenues available to pursue those options, which he feels will be a major portion of today's discussion. Schuler said the easement document says we enter into an agreement to have recreational use of a portion of private property. No final costs are available for installation, but preliminary estimates have been provided by the Portage County Highway Department, which he handed out to Committee members.

Schuler reported there is some consensus on the maintenance portion; it seems very acceptable to Business Park owners who have been consulted. Owners felt maintenance was seen as legitimately fitting within their regular, annual maintenance payment. As it works now, all maintenance to the Business Park's common areas and infrastructure is performed by the Portage County Highway Department, and is then billed to owners based on the amount of land they own in the Park. Portage County, as a landowner, pays a portion of that cost as well.

Idsvoog asked when all lots in the Business Park are sold and Portage County is, essentially, out of this, what is the leverage to make sure owners are going to pay for maintenance. Schuler replied that a mechanism exists within the Covenants, similar to a homeowner association, which says at which time the County has completed its duties, the function is passed to an organization made of people who own land in the Park. McKenna concurred with Schuler's description of maintenance responsibility. Idsvoog asked what would happen if the "association" or the County wants a vendor other than Portage County Highway, or the Highway

Department no longer has resources to provide the service. Schuler replied when the relationship changes, the association finds a way to maintain on their own. Idsvoog asked the maintenance obligation; is it signed on an annual basis. Schuler replied if ties break with the Highway Department, they would find another vendor. McKenna offered the possibility of a multi-year agreement with Portage County Highway. Idsvoog felt it made more sense to have a renewal period after a certain amount of time. Adding, the County does not do too well without specific, written contracts; agreements are generally misunderstood by everyone involved. Schuler agreed it would be to the County's advantage to have this very well established and accounted for because we do not want anything to happen that is a detriment to the Park. Schuler felt McKenna's suggestion is a viable way to assure that.

Patton asked the annual maintenance cost estimate and Schuler felt it would not be too costly. Patton considered less mowing, because of paths, would lower maintenance costs. Schuler responded the nature of asphalt paths is there is not a lot that has to be maintained with them; especially, if they have pedestrian/bike use. The only variable is plowing.

Gifford asked when Portage County no longer owns lots in the Park, does the woodland area pass to the collective ownership at that time? Schuler replied yes. Gifford asked when landowners are consulted regarding maintenance being based on square footage owned, does it also include landowners to the east. Schuler replied, yes, to whoever owns land in the Portage County Business Park. Gifford questioned whether Lands' End is happy to do this when none of the paths even comes within blocks of them. Scholfield replied Lands' End seems to be good corporate citizens. The sizable group of landowners who attended the group discussion all had the same questions on cost, maintenance, etc. There is a cooperative nature at this time. Scholfield added that everyone knows the children attending childcare businesses in the Park have to get off the streets due to increased traffic, etc. Scholfield felt Schuler has nicely moved this discussion along to a point where we are starting to get some definition. The question is good, but at this stage, there is no real answer. A multi-year agreement makes sense, costs are spread throughout the Park, and as lots sell, the price remains reasonable.

Patton felt the estimated cost of \$154,000 could go a long way at Health and Human Services. Patton asked would we get to the point where the County pays for everything. If yes, who would make that agreement? Does the City have an inclination to help pay for the paths? Schuler replied yes, the City of Stevens Point has agreed to contribute some money. Schuler added different funding sources are being looked at such as grants, City participation, County participation, etc. There is County funding available in an existing account for Business Park infrastructure that has not been tapped into for some time. We would only want to do that to an amount that is prudent and not exhaust that fund through this project. I hope we feel that a use of a certain amount of that fund is legitimate. There is also a question of phasing either through length or type of trail put in; i.e., gravel for first year, hold fundraising efforts, and then pave them over subsequent years are possibilities. Several discussions must be held with those in the Park to see what works best for them. Therefore, there is a wide variation on start-up costs. Schuler feels the bulk of the installation costs could legitimately be seen as being a City/County/grant situation with subsequent contributions for maintenance from the owners. Schuler cautioned this has not yet been established. Some owners have offered to pitch in some money.

Idsvoog asked for clarification that the agreement, as proposed, indicates the County will pay for all of it. Schuler replied no, there are three options, and that is one of the options. Schuler noted those types of decisions have yet to be made. Patton noted surprise at the cost; he felt it would be higher. Scholfield added the scale of the project has improved because the Green Circle Trail people are at the table now too, which is a great organization. Schuler noted he would appear at the next Green Circle Trail Committee meeting to talk about this particular route through the Park and how that might, at some point, qualify as an actual spur to the Green Circle Trail. Travel Guard is very interested in that possibility and it would be a very nice official designation as a spur of the Green Circle Trail. Patton asked how long it would take to know the costs involved. Schuler answered this information came in late yesterday afternoon and now we have something to shoot at.

Schuler stated that if the Committee were comfortable with the general nature of the proposed multi-purpose path easement document, without the cost for installation and maintenance, we would know we are on the correct path and can work to define those two elements. We are also hoping the discussion of liability is satisfactory for Park owners to agree to enter into this relationship. Patton stated he would like to see this project all done at once, but if we do not, can sections be prioritized. Schuler responded the project could be looked at in two parts – regional movement and Green Circle participation, and internal movement in the Park. Schuler feels the highline section is very important, although there are issues to be addressed in terms of one of

the day care providers and their sense of security. Discussions are necessary. Looking at the project overall, the east-west area down the highline is very big and gets people from under the Interstate over to the County Road R existing path, and south. The County Road R path will extend, at some point, all the way down to the trail that goes out to Amherst. Schuler felt it important from a circulation standpoint for the day care providers, because they are looking for off-street paths. It would be nice for them to have small, intermediate, and long loops for strollers because they are still in the streets. Another connection, from Travel Guard up to that point, is also very important. Third, yet equal with the others, is the east-west, mid-block area between the Rettler and Smith/Stout properties straight over toward Joanis Drive through County property out to County Road R. The northern route, through the Ministry property, is very important, but grading issues may make it more problematic. Schuler noted a path already exists under the Interstate down to the pond and out to Business Park Drive. The short stretch from Business Park Drive down to the highline can be used for starters. That represents the closest secondary trail to be looked at, which is the longest piece, and if eliminated, the price would drop substantially. Schuler noted the Ministry property is not being developed this year.

Idsvoog questioned entering into an agreement relative to County funding and long term relationships. He noted this would require a resolution to full County Board. If the County is going to spend \$150,000 installing trails, Idsvoog stated he would feel more comfortable with full County Board action. Schuler replied, absolutely, and noted it would be a separate issue from the easement document. Idsvoog felt there is no way the Economic Development Committee can decide on what they want to do relative to cost and maintenance agreements because of too many variables. Schuler reiterated that type of action is not being sought at this meeting. What is being sought is a "blessing" of the overall form of the document, mainly from liability standpoint. Scholfield noted there are steps to negotiate. This was started with a blank page, other than the fact the County made provisions for the trails and the City installed a trail under I39. This is the next progression step. Without the County's "blessing" on at least the easement, we would be back to square one.

Idsvoog asked what the "blessing" on the easement would mean. Schuler replied, without knowing how the cost and maintenance issues will be settled, we are looking for the Committee to take action that they think the form of the document, establishment of the use, and how the liability is addressed, are appropriate. If that is agreed to, we can continue to work on cost and maintenance.

Schuler asked McKenna, from a liability standpoint, does the language inserted adequately address any County and Business Park property owner issues. McKenna replied certainly; the County is not reinventing the wheel, rather they are following a model used by the Green Circle Trail. He went on to say the Wisconsin Legislature has provided a blanket recreational use liability protection provision that is the cornerstone of the document presented at this meeting. McKenna felt Schuler's summary is good and the Committee may want to make a general motion to approve the idea of the trail. Once all issues are resolved, a resolution would be brought before the Committee and County Board. Schuler added this is a checkpoint for us to know we are proceeding in the right direction and to keep proceeding to resolve issues so everyone is happy with the final form. This would in no way obligate the County to any expense or particular trail.

Patton moved to approve the multi-purpose trail easement agreement subject to finalizing installation and maintenance costs. Motion withdrawn by Patton.

Gifford referred to the section along Business Park Drive and asked why this is recreational use rather than sidewalk. Could someone claim his or her sidewalk is covered by recreational immunity? McKenna felt this will somehow intersect with the Green Circle Trail, and sidewalk is another possibility for that stretch. Schuler agreed. Gifford provided the scenario of him slipping and falling out there and McKenna replied that would be treated differently under the law. Schuler added, if it is a sidewalk, it is within the City right-of-way, and if it is a multi-purpose trail, it would most likely be through private property. The easement document would only be in place for trails through private property.

Pazdernik moved to continue to proceed with developing trails in the Portage County Business Park and Patton seconded the motion. Schuler felt this was positive feedback from the Committee, which is what was being sought. Idsvoog noted any decision made regarding the County spending money on this project, as well as long term maintenance decisions, must be taken to County Board in resolution form. Gifford noted all three options presented today indicate the County pays. He further added that at some point, the County is out of the Business Park business and yet there is an easement that says the County keeps on paying. At some point, would this shift to the tenant association? McKenna referred to a global agreement between the tenant

association and County regarding maintenance that would undertake the County's obligation. Schuler read a portion of Section 7 of the Business Park Covenants; "landowners being subject to deed restrictions and shall not be construed to modify or negate the protective covenants. In the event of an owner's association, under article 12 of the Protective Covenants, which is the transfer point, the County shall have the right, by recording a written instrument to delegate its responsibility, with respect to this agreement, and the trail to the owner's association." Patton asked whether owners have a choice of being in the association or not. McKenna replied the association is part of the recorded Covenants. Schuler added when tenants developed in the Park, they also knew about and bought into the Covenants. Patton stated he is nervous how many times the Covenants have been changed and exceptions been made. Schuler replied the County has never changed the Covenants once they were originally recorded; we have only made exceptions where appropriate. Gifford asked when the County would be out of the Business Park business; at 100% sold or 98% sold. Schuler replied he did not have that section of the Covenants with him.

Coakley interjected that he cannot think of a situation where owners in a nice business park would not want an association. It is in their own best interest. It is the association's way and the property owners' way of protecting their neighborhood. Gifford felt the question is are tenants willing to do it. What if the County is stuck forever with four acres nobody wants? There must be a point at which the County can get out of the business. Gifford referred to section 4 B of the document asking what sort of person would sign a document stating they would pay half the maintenance cost and no one else has to. Schuler replied the document lists all options. McKenna clarified that would be signed by each landowner. Gifford clarified that if a trail easement goes across someone's property, the owner is obligated to half the maintenance cost. Whereas, the person across the street, without a trail through their property, has no expense. Gifford felt that unfair; noting, only about two dozen owners would be paying maintenance costs in the Park. McKenna added that once the trail is installed, maintenance costs would be low. Gifford felt the only palatable option is C.

Idsvoog reminded members there is a "baby steps" motion on the floor to move forward, with options to be decided at a future date. Motion passed by voice vote.

7. Discussion/Possible Action on Extension of Portage County Business Park Listing Contract with Scholfield Group

Scholfield noted his current contract expires May 31. Despite the fact no lots sold in 2009, they have managed to transition through the hot economy that turned cold. Scholfield noted he has enjoyed working with Schuler, Maslowski, and the Committee. He noted the Park is performing well and in 2008, there was \$2.1 million in sales, which is way ahead of projections. He is seeking a one-year contract extension. Idsvoog described the contract extension as a good thing to do.

Pazdernik moved and Patton seconded a motion to extend the Business Park listing contract with the Scholfield Group for one year with the same terms. Motion passed by voice vote.

8. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Schuler stated, from a staff standpoint, he appreciates the Scholfield Group contract extension. The working relationship is comfortable, which will prove advantageous to the County.

Scholfield stated there are a number of items coming up for the Committee to address. One is General Service Administration's (GSA) 19,000 square foot facility that has been in the works since August 2009. A site determination of 4 or 5 locations within the Park has taken place. There are builders from Madison, Iowa, Stevens Point, etc. looking at this project, which involves ownership and zoning changes. GSA does not want to occupy the building until May 2012, yet wants answers by April 15, 2010. There are multiple offers on the same lots and the government requires bidders who do the project own or have control of those parcels. This is a unique situation to work through. This development would be for the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) building. They are currently located on Kirschling Court.

Scholfield added the Oakwood Ventures issue would have to be revisited. They will not be exercising their option, which the Committee had extended. Therefore, on April 15, those options will no longer be in place and those parcels will be opening up for sale.

Patton asked if the USDA would be paying property taxes and Scholfield replied yes. Pazdernik asked the percentage of Business Park land sold. Scholfield replied we are running out of professional office space, with

only 4 lots left. The Committee will be asked to consider rezoning a couple of lots for professional office space. The Park has gone from a "soup to nuts," hotels to heavy industry, area to a true business park versus industrial park. Scholfield feels in 2011-2012 the market will pick up, but not 2010. Schuler clarified that a bulk of the higher end use land is gone.

Scholfield noted the City of Stevens Point has extended sewer and water for annexation to the east. This may help us with maturing of the Park. Gifford asked if you go with the Business Park model, northern lots would be the toughest to sell; they are large and next to the railroad tracks. Patton asked whether sound barrier walls could be installed to aide in selling lots along the railroad tracks. Scholfield said that was addressed on lots 105 and 106 with green space, parking lots, and building involved with the Travel Guard option. He further added that as you head toward County Road R, those lots do not have to deal with the wellhead protection issue, and are good lots for warehouse development, which can blend businesses.

Schuler noted the County is always open to suggestions and opportunities within reason. The wellhead protection area brings along certain limitations to full-blown industry.

9. Review of Bills

None presented.

10. Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Committee, Pazdernik moved to adjourn and Patton seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 7:55 am by voice vote.

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES

Portage County Economic Development Committee
January 28, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Room 5

Members Present: Patton, Pazdernik, Idsvoog, and Gifford
Member Excused: Olson
Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Mark Maslowski, County Executive; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Kevin Kawleski, Portage County Bank; Bill Scholfield, Scholfield Group; Trisha Heyman, County Finance; and Doug Radtke, County 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/Action on Minutes from August 20, 2009 and January 7, 2010 Economic Development Committee Meetings

With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to approve the August 20, 2009 and January 7, 2010 minutes and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

4. Discussion/Possible Action on Request by Portage County Bank, 5417 Vern Holmes Drive, for a Waiver from Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants Section VII(A) Prohibiting Gutters and Downspouts in the Business Park

Schuler stated Portage County Bank is requesting to add gutters after construction to address safety issues that have come about. Kawleski described the proposed steel gutters as being the same as the building's soffits and fascia. He said there have been several slip-and-falls reported, there is ice around the doors, and tenants have complained.

Idsvoog stated he sees no problem with the request. He then asked if it makes sense to have the Covenants not allow gutters. Gifford asked how many waivers have been granted for gutters and Schuler replied three. Kawleski stated the Portage County Bank development cost \$3 million dollars and they would not install anything tacky with this waiver. Idsvoog questioned with waivers being granted for gutters, why have the Covenants written so as not to allow them. Schuler explained when the Covenants were drafted not allowing gutters, it had to do with a question of appearance.

Gifford moved to grant a waiver from the Portage County Business Park Deed Restrictions and Protective Covenants to allow gutters at Portage County Bank and Patton seconded the motion.

Schuler asked where the gutters would be installed and Kawleski replied above the four exterior doors.

Gifford questioned whether it would make sense to consult with tenants who do not have gutters as to whether they would object to the Covenants being changed to allow gutters. Scholfield stated they have conducted an inventory of tenants with gutters and found them to be over doorways in response to a safety issue. He further stated that removing a condition of the Covenants is not an easy task. McKenna agreed, noting even though occasional waivers come before the Committee, he is reluctant to reopen the Covenants. Gifford felt developers could be told about the gutter possibility at the time of new construction. Schuler added that tenants are coming forward for waivers at the appropriate time. Radtke suggested if gutters are a question of aesthetics, then an inventory should be conducted of those who have been granted waivers to see how they look. Schuler stated conducting an inventory of waivers has been done all along. The inventory revealed gutters and/or downspouts have matched existing building materials. Scholfield complimented the County on a good job managing cumbersome deed restrictions.

At this time, the motion passed by voice vote.

5. Discussion/Possible Action on a License Agreement for the Rotary Club of Portage County Kite Festival
Schuler referred members to their agenda packet where the Rotary Club request is explained. He noted the kite festival had been conducted in the Business Park, without incident, for the last 7-8 years. The proposal is the same as previous and staff recommends approval. If approved, Schuler will work with Corporation Counsel on a license agreement.

With no further discussion, Pazdernik moved to approve a license agreement for the Rotary Club to conduct a kite festival in the Business Park and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

6. Discussion/Possible Action on Proposed Project for Lots 31 and 32 (Vacant Property Located at County Rd R and County Rd HH)

This item was pulled from the agenda; no discussion took place and action was taken.

7. Update on Portage County Business Park Issues

Scholfield stated the "phone is ringing again" after a quiet year 2009. One offer came up and then died. A large office complex of 18,000 square feet is in the works.

Schuler reported Travel Guard is very interested in moving forward on a bike/pedestrian path in the Business Park. A meeting was held regarding this project, with close to 20 people present from the Business Park, as well as representatives from Stevens Point, to discuss how a network could be put together.

Idsvoog asked who would be paying for the project and Schuler replied that is being worked on. Idsvoog stated a written agreement, drafted by the County's Corporation Counsel, regarding project construction and maintenance is necessary. Scholfield stated there is a pressing need for this project due to heavy vehicle and pedestrian traffic in the Business Park. He attended the meeting and felt it was good. Gifford asked if Stevens Point was involved in discussions and Schuler replied yes. Scholfield added the Village of Plover and Green Circle Trail representative are also discussing this project. Idsvoog asked the estimated project cost and Schuler replied no costs have been discussed yet. Discussions have included whether paths should be gravel or asphalt. Idsvoog felt asphalt should be used; not gravel. Schuler replied if the project entails a larger network it may be initially done using gravel, with asphalt to follow. Maslowski brought up a previous discussion regarding the possibility of grant dollars and Schuler replied that has been unsuccessful to date. Scholfield stated Green Circle representatives and corporate sponsors are behind the project. Patton felt construction cost and maintenance are large issues. He does not want to see the County "strong-armed"; developers built knowing there was no bike/pedestrian path in the Business Park. Gifford added that if the path were built wide enough to handle a pick-up truck with a blade, asphalt would be needed. Radtke felt if aesthetics were an issue, you would not want gravel.

8. Review of Bills

Committee reviewed approvals numbers 20090582 and 20090690 related to a survey of lot 14 and a Stevens Point Water Department bill.

9. Adjournment

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

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

MINUTES
Joint Meeting

Portage County Economic Development Committee
Portage County Finance Committee
Portage County Revolving Loan Fund Committee
January 7, 2010 – 7:00 am – Conference Rooms 1&2

Members Present: Idsvoog, Gifford, Patton, Pazdernik, Krems, Krogwold, Butkowski, Pies, Pomeroy, and Okray
Member Excused: Olson
Staff Present: Schuler and Cummings, Portage County Planning and Zoning Department
Others Present: Mark Maslowski, County Executive; Mike McKenna, Corporation Counsel; Doug Radtke, County Board; Jennifer Jossie, Finance Director; Eric and Hans Hofmeister, Spectra Print; Joyce Barge, Portage County Purchasing

1. Call to Order

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

2. 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 Resolution Regarding Portage County's Participation in the Wisconsin Community Development Block Grant for Economic Development Program Relating to Valley Sales Corporation (Spectra Print) (Economic Development Committee Action)

The agenda packet, previously mailed to members for this joint meeting, contained a Portage County Contract Summary form, describing the Community Development Block Grant. Cummings noted action is needed by the Economic Development Committee in order to participate in this grant process for Spectra Print. Gifford moved to approve the resolution regarding Portage County's participation in the Wisconsin Community Development Block Grant for Economic Development program relating to Valley Sales Corporation (Spectra Print), and Pazdernik seconded the motion. Patton inquired about the number of jobs related to this grant. E. Hofmeister explained Spectra Print had 91 current jobs at the time they purchased assets of Signature Press. Spectra Print hired 27 employees from Signature Press, with an average wage of \$15.50 per hour or approximately \$820,000 in salary. He described it as a tough time to be a printer, but this business transaction has allowed them to retain jobs at Spectra Print, hire 27 additional employees, and continue a successful business. Patton clarified the current number of employees as 116, and E. Hofmeister replied there are currently 118, beginning with a base of 91 jobs prior to acquiring Signature Press. With no further discussion necessary, the motion was passed by a voice vote.

4. Authorization for Acceptance of a Community Development Block Grant for Economic Development from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce Relating to Valley Sales Corporation (Spectra Print) (Finance Committee and Economic Development Committee Action)

Cummings explained this action is to be taken by both the Economic Development and Finance Committees in order to accept the Community Development Block Grant monies as an adjustment to the Planning and Zoning Department 2010 budget. With no discussion necessary, Patton moved to authorize acceptance of a Community Development Block Grant for Economic Development from the Wisconsin Department of Commerce relating to Valley Sales Corporation (Spectra Print) and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote.

5. Reconvene in Closed Session Under Sec. 19.85 (1)(g) Stats to Confer with Legal Counsel Regarding Advice of Legal Strategy for a County Revolving Loan to Signature Press

Gifford moved to reconvene in closed session and Pazdernik seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote of members present from all three Committees. Closed session began at 7:10 am.

6. Reconvene in Open Session Pursuant to Sec. 19.85 (2) Stats to Consider Action Regarding a County Revolving Loan to Signature Press

Krogwold moved to reconvene in open session and Patton seconded the motion, which passed by roll call vote of members present from all three Committees. Open session began at 7:47 am, with no action taken.

7. Adjournment

Butkowski moved to adjourn and Krems seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote. Meeting adjourned at 7:48 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

O. Philip Idsvoog, Chair
Economic Development and
Revolving Loan Fund Committees

Paula Cummings, Rec. Secretary

Date

James Gifford, Chair
Finance Committee