

**DIVISION OF LAND MANAGEMENT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
REGULAR SESSION  
03-28-07  
1:00 P.M.  
COUNTY BOARD ROOM**

**Members Present: Larry Amundson, Dan Byom, Peter Fletcher, Dennis Frame, Dennis Deitelhoff, Danny Foote, Tim Geiger, Wally Geske, Eric Gullicksrud, Nan Horton, Chris Hovell, Sheree Nelson, Todd Quarne, Tom Schank, Willard Schank, Barb Semb, Larry Sonsalla and Jon Zander.**

**STAFF PRESENT: Kevin Lien, Dave Appleyard, Reed McRoberts, Paul Syverson.**

- 1. Chairman Fletcher called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.**
- 2. Chairman Fletcher announced the open meeting law had been complied with through notifications and postings.**
- 3. Tom Schank made a motion to approve the agenda, seconded by Horton. Motion carried.**
- 4. Horton made a motion to approve the previous session minutes as printed, seconded by Byom. Motion carried.**
- 5. Chairman Fletcher had the Committee members turn in their tier two priority rankings. Staff then tabulated the results. Fletcher read the results as follows:  
(Lowest priority to the highest priority-tier two)**
  - 9. Wildlife damage and claims (LCD) (lowest).**
  - 8. Information and education (LCD).**
  - 7. Shoreland ordinance (z/bi).**
  - 6. Metallic mining ordinance (LCD).**
  - 5. Floodplain ordinance (z/bi).**
  - 4. Wildlife tree and shrub sales (LCD).**
  - 3. WPDES/NR 243 investigations (LCD).**
  - 2. Well program (PI).**
  - 1 Animal waste ordinance (LCD) (highest)**
- 6. Chairman Fletcher opened the discussion on lapsing and non-lapsing funds within the Division. He clarified that money in lapsing funds reverts back to the general fund at the end of the year if it is not spent. Money in a non-lapsing fund stays in that fund at the end of the year and can be used in future years. Discussion was held on the use of non-lapsing funds within the division. The Land Conservation budget is a non-lapsing fund without a cap, the Building Inspection program is a non-lapsing fund with a fifty thousand dollar cap and there is a vehicle replacement non-lapsing fund without a cap. Appleyard questioned if the building**

inspection program should become a levied position in the plan as it has been identified as a tier one priority. Semb stated that she thought the County Board would be reluctant to place the position onto the tax levy as the position had been recently created as a fee supported non-levy position. A committee member felt that division programs that are tied to construction cycles should be non-lapsing to account for times when less fee money is generated. Semb indicated that she did not think there would be Board support for making the entire division budget non-lapsing. Appleyard discussed the need for non-lapsing funds where large fees are paid (Ag. Producers and Townships), these may be one time fees or yearly fees. He indicated that when these groups need technical services (planning and engineering staff) they expect the staff to be there. A non-lapsing fund is useful in a situation like this. A committee member brought up having non-lapsing funds be capped at a certain dollar amount with money above the cap being returned to offset the levy. Appleyard stated that establishing core priorities will be helpful in establishing a fee and fund strategy in order to deliver the core services. Semb indicated that the existing programs collect fees that help offset the levy request. Chairman Fletcher instructed Appleyard to use this discussion on funds as guidance when he develops the financial element of the land management plan.

7. Chairman Fletcher began a discussion on the policy for increasing fees. Appleyard pointed out that our fees are not as high as many of our comparable Counties. A committee member indicated that we should not raise fees to offset the tax levy requests of another department. A committee member wondered if the division should be supported totally by fees. Appleyard responded that we cannot protect core services if we are totally fee dependent. Appleyard provided a graph showing that the Land Management department accounts for around six percent of the Counties levy. The committee felt that the Division was providing a lot of services for its small percentage of the total levy. The consensus of the committee was that fees should be reviewed periodically as the land management plan is reviewed.

8. Chairman Fletcher called for a discussion on the role of the advisory committee in regard to future land management plan amendments. The committee discussed whether revisions should be sent out or if the committee should meet. The consensus of the committee was that it would be more valuable to have the group meet together every two years to review and comment upon proposed division of land management plan amendments..

9. Chairman Fletcher began a discussion on how to present the plan to the Board. Semb stated that the Board appreciated hearing from the public and that a power point presentation may work well. The committee decided to have a subcommittee of Horton, Frame, Nelson, Gullicksrud, Quarne and Amundson develop and give a presentation to the Board. Appleyard stated that members of this subcommittee should keep track of their meeting attendance and mileage for reimbursement purposes.

**10. Chairman Fletcher asked if there were any committee concerns. Appleyard stated that the future land management committee would get more public participation by having day meeting times. A committee member agreed that day meetings would create more participation but the decision should be left up to the next land management committee.**

**11. The next meeting will be held in July, 2007.**

**12. Chairman Fletcher adjourned the meeting at 3:00 P.M.**

**Recording Secretary**

**Reed McRoberts**