In the Matter Of: JEFFERSON COUNTY **BOARD MEETING** April 19, 2022 ESQUIRE DEPOSITION SOLUTIONS

800.211.DEPO (3376) EsquireSolutions.com

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD MEETING
9	TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 2022, 4:00 P.M. *ITEM NOS. 15 AND 20 ONLY*
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Transcribed by: Christine Aiello
23	Ј9367573
24	
25	



1 PROCEEDINGS

 $2 \quad (58:08 - 01:48:40)$

CHAIR WEHMEIER: That takes us to public comment. And I have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven -- I have 11 folks signed up for public -- public comment -- comment, and all would like to speak. So we'll begin with Dale Konle. We have three minutes each.

MR. KONLE: Hello. My name is Dale Konle. I live at N6204 Stonewood Drive, Watertown, Wisconsin. I am the Concord town chair. This is in regards to the Brunsons' opposed proposal for building ten large storage sheds on Highway B in Concord near I-94 interchange. I'd like to talk a little about town board and the comprehensive plan that's in relation to proposals in rezoning.

The district -- the desired role of the town board, the structure of the town board is well-suited for administering services. They get roads plowed -- plowed, potholes fixed, parks mowed, et cetera. If they are not doing a good job in two years, you can just elect a new board, say to improve; but land use changes are forever. In two years, you cannot elect a new board to remove a Walmart. That's why we have long-term comprehensive plans, to provide more



stability over time, rather than having town zoning approaches change with each election.

The value of a comprehensive plan, comprehensive plans -- comprehensive plans take a while to make. They provide a very thoughtful long-range view of what residents would like their community to look like and be like. State comprehension plan laws require communities to be involved in the planning process. Plans must be updated every ten years, but changes can be made before then. The process on how to make changes is written into the plan.

For towns in Jefferson County, land use zoning is administered by the county. The county has its own plan, which it should follow. I believe the county plan refers to town plans, which means that county zoning decisions should follow town plans. The final word on that, I understand, is to be worked out by attorneys in the courts.

Jefferson County has been consistent in administering zoning in Concord up until this proposal for ten large storage buildings by Donald and Nancy Brunson on Highway B near I-94 Exchange. Two members of the county -- town board did approve this proposal, but they do not represent the town plan or the wishes of the citizens. At the County Zoning Committee



hearing, 40 people wrote or spoke at the hearing to oppose the storage buildings. One person spoke in favor, the Realtor.

In addition, we are in the process of updating our town plan. At those meetings, many more people have indicated that they oppose this barn proposal. I ask you to send this proposal of rezoning back to the zoning committee, table it, or just vote it down. There are several legal questions that would be easier to clarify before voting to approve this proposal.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you, Dale.

Kimberly Miller.

MS. MILLER: Thank you for this chance to speak. I'm here to speak about the Brunson proposal for rezoning for boat storage. I want to emphasize the abrupt change in county policy. On February 28, this proposal came before the zoning committee. They stated that they followed town plans and voted to postpone action, effectively sending this back to the town for us to work out the discrepancy between this proposal and our town plan. That seemed reasonable to us.

But then the proposal was put back on the next zoning committee agenda now for the March 28th



meeting. At that meeting, county staff claimed that the county would no longer follow town plans, but instead just the town board's vote. The committee, nonetheless, spent a lot of time discussing our plan and trying to justify this decision based on our plan, including one place where something was misread from how we -- how we have read it.

So it seemed puzzling to us that they spent a lot of time talking about our plan. It was also very puzzling to us that they, sometime in March, that they changed from saying that they followed town plans to saying that they would not follow town plans. So when you vote on this proposal, you are not just voting on this proposal, but on a substantial and abrupt change in county policy. This sets a precedent for every town in Jefferson County, and can even have statewide implications, for the legal status of town plans.

There's some unresolved questions about town plans. And we believe everyone should fully understand the reasons behind the policy change and the potential impacts of vote -- before voting on this specific proposal. Why are the county staff, you know, creating this change in policy? What are the implications of this change in policy? The county is required to follow its own comprehensive plan, which mentions town



plans in several places. Can the county simply change its interpretation of its comprehensive plan for this?

Also wanted to let you know, the Town of Concord does not currently have a town attorney. Citizens believed the town would hire an attorney at the April 12th board meeting to get legal advice on this, but the board did not hire an attorney, in part, because one member became very upset spending any money on an attorney. So now a group of citizens are working to hire an attorney, but neither of the attorneys we contacted were available before tonight's meeting, given the tight timeline from our board meeting, which was yeah, I guess just a week ago.

And finally, please note that those of us speaking today represent a wider body of concerned citizens. We know people who would have liked to attend and -- but and asked us to kind of convey their concerns, because -- and some of them, it's because of the 4:00 p.m. timeframe. This meeting being earlier, it makes it harder for people with jobs to be here. We also had some people who are have ill health but don't have computer access for Zoom, including one person with -- who is getting over COVID and so was not able to be here.

Thank you.



1 | CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you very much.

I believe our next would be Sally Williams.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. I'm also asking you to deny the petition by the Brunsons to rezone 7.4 acres to A-2. The proposal is inconsistent with town and county -- county comprehensive land use plans. The town plan states on page 56, quote, the town will limit the establishment of new businesses to areas within the Town of Concord rural hamlet, and the town will not support expansion of the current rural hamlet.

The proposal in question creates a significant new commercial development outside the hamlet, and, thus, is inconsistent with the plan. The Jefferson County agricultural preservation plan states on page 31, quote, whenever land is proposed for rezoning from a certified farmland preservation zoning district, such as A-1, to a non-certified zoning district, like A-2, require that the following criteria is met, B, the zoning is consistent applicable with the town and county comprehensive plan.

So the county plan does direct the county to follow town plans, however, we have been told that county zoning approvals would now be based on town board decisions, rather than town plans. If this reflects an assumption by the county that an approval



by the town board indicates consistency with the town
plan, that assumption is not valid. This petition
passed our town board by a two-to-one vote.

One of the supervisors who voted for the proposal, indicated ahead of the vote, that he should recuse himself due to his personal relationship with the petitioners. He spoke at length as to why the petition should be denied, because it was inconsistent with the Concord plan, and then he voted to approve. He later justified his decision by saying he felt he had to take the financial status of the petitioner into consideration.

So if the county is no longer going to recognize town plans, but defer -- defer to the decisions of changing town boards, this leaves future development to be guided by the subjective criteria of favoritism and personal relationships rather than the objective criteria thoughtfully set forth in long-range planning.

Regarding A-2 zoning, at the county zoning meeting, the fact that the town had approved some petitions to rezone -- rezone to A-2 in the past was used as an argument that the town supports A-2 zoning requests in general. Basically, if one A-2 zone was consistent with our plan, then all were; but there are



1 | 61 conditional uses in A-2 zoning. Some are consistent 2 | with our plan, and some are not.

We have approved six A-2 zoning requests since the passage of our plan. Two for small increases in size for commercial enterprise, which pre-existed our plan; two for the storage of contractors' equipment by homeowners for businesses operated offsite; and two for agricultural use. The town has consistently denied requests for new commercial enterprises outside the hamlet and A-2 zoning. Denials include a wedding barn, landscape business, kennel, disc golf course, and a wrestling camp.

Questions have also arisen about whether or not our plan is valid since it expired in 2019. At that time the town chose to delay updating the plan until after the census and after the new county plan was complete. We're currently in the process of updating. I would point out that prior to the decision on the Brunson proposal, the town has continued to operate as though the plan were in force. Two of the A-2 zoning requests, which were denied by the town because they set up new commercial enterprises outside the hamlet, were -- were decided in the last two years.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.



1 Ronald Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: Ronnie Brandt. I got some land adjoining the Brunson -- Brunson property where both units are supposed to go. It would be on my south side of my property. And I'm concerned about that, the units, they're going to be up in the air for -- it just wouldn't like right. I -- I oppose it. And I'm concerned about the watershed on there. Where is it going to go? It's going to go -- right now it's going on my land, but with the -- all the units, it's going to be a lot more problems. So I do oppose it.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.

This takes us to, I believe, it's Mike is the first name. I cannot read the last name, but it looks like it starts with a B. It looks -- okay. Thank you.

MR. BOUCHE: I'm a neighbor of Ronnie's, and I'm -- I'm much concerned about the water runoff, too. We talk about having ten buildings put on a seven-acre plat. They've already put five -- five buildings on a, I don't know how big that piece of property is. But by the time you consider what's under shed, the percentage of land for it to soak in to the cover, you're talking almost a third of the property -- a quarter of the property is going to be just building. That doesn't



include the -- if they put asphalt in for a driveway,
gravel in there, runoff.

We have not seen how big these buildings are going to be on this property. We have not seen any, you know, any type of engineering where there's going to be a retention pond put somewhere. Nothing. I -- I just, I -- I think there needs to be more thought put into what they want to do on that property before it goes forward, if it even goes forward, because that piece of property is not in the hamlet.

And as Sally talked about, you know, we must keep things in the hamlet if we're going to -- our hamlet isn't even barely touched with commercial property. So why would we want to go outside the hamlet? That's just going to set up a, you know, everyone that's on the edge of the hamlet being able to push out if this goes through.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.

Pete Gross.

MR. GROSS: I am Pete Gross, N5921 Jefferson Road, Johnson Creek, Wisconsin. I'm the real estate guy in this county. And I talk to a lot of people that come into this county. And I've been dealing with the zoning office in this county for over 18 years. In



fact, I was a planning commission member for the Town of Aztalan for nine, was involved in the Smart Growth Plan Committee for the county, and I was also the one that helped develop our comp plan in the Town of Aztalan.

And the bottom line is, comp plans are a plan, they're a guide, they are not law. An ordinance is what is law and they adopted the Jefferson County ordinance.

It's interesting how people can twist the truth, and that's been going on in this whole process. We've been through due process. They've been delayed an extra month by going out and getting a posse behind them with nonfactual information. I'm going to tell you right now, there is an engineered plan for the runoff. The zoning committee has analyzed that. They postponed it a month to come in here.

Everybody has been really good. This county has been awesome to work with, with the zoning committee. They are very well-trained. They know how to follow their ordinance. The attorney was there guiding them, and they did approve it. And I would hope in this case the county board would also approve it.

Thank you.



1 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you. 2 That takes us to, is it Daley or David Heckel? 3 FEMALE SPEAKER: (Indiscernible). 4 It's Dick, okay. I'm -- I'm CHAIR WEHMEIER: 5 just having difficulty reading the handwriting. 6 MR. HECKEL: I'm Dick Heckel. I'm part of 7 the Boat House, and we did put up the previous 8 buildings prior to it. All those buildings were 9 followed by an engineered plan thoroughly, and executed 10 by the planning board, as well. So that's all I want 11 to say. And the new -- and the new buildings in place 12 will be also engineered with engineered plans and 13 approved by the planning, as well. That's all. 14 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you. 15 I'm trying -- is it Don and Nancy Brunson? My name is Don Brunson, W1432 16 MR. BRUNSON: 17 County Road B. My wife and I have lived on that 18 property for 36 years. Our children were raised on the 19 property, and they reside in Jefferson County. We are both retired. Although my wife, she never retired 20 21 because she is a housewife. 22 But anyway, we -- we've been there. And when 23 I was approached by the Boat House to expand and talk 24 to me, I thought it was a pretty good idea, to be 25 honest with you, because it makes good sense for them



if they want to enlarge their -- their business. 1 2 of that property, three and a half acres, has never had a plow on it in 60 years. It's just land that just 3 4 sits there. It's never been agriculture -- agriculture 5 at all. 6 So I just want the -- it has passed the --7 the Town Board of Concord. I would hope it would pass 8 Jefferson's Board. We've had positive plus negative. 9 We had a meeting in Concord with the town board. 10 meeting was -- was a full gymnasium and we had probably 11 an hour discussion over this and it was passed by 12 Concord, as well as the zoning committee in Jefferson 13 County. 14 Thank you very much. Thank you. 15 CHAIR WEHMEIER: 16 And we have Becky Schuster. Good handwriting. 17 MS. SCHUSTER: My name is Rebecca Schuster. I 18 live at North 5236 Golden Lake Park Road. I've been a 19 resident of the Town of Concord since 1973. And my 20 grandparents developed one of the R-2 subdivisions over 21 at Rooters Circle (phonetic). I don't know if any of you know where that is. It's on the very east side. 22

The point of that being is I understand that

there's always the controversy of development and so on

and so forth, but the thing about this property is I



23

24

25

drive from one part of the Town of Concord to the other side of the Town of Concord every single day, drive through this intersection in the morning and in the afternoon, and I look at five red buildings that look just like the Mindeman Farm (phonetic) with their red barns and all the barns on Highway E.

I think they blend in nicely. They have landscaping in the front. I understand that there might be some trees that need to be replaced, but that can be taken care of. It's one of the cleanest sites that I drive by when I drive to work every day. I think it's very well-maintained. It's lit well. And you wouldn't even know there is a business there because there isn't any signage, either.

I am a taxpayer in the Town of Concord, and I would think that the tax base of this particular development might help us a little bit. I watched our roads be plowed this winter poorly, and I'm assuming that our budget is probably a little light. So I'm thinking a little extra tax dollars would not hurt.

I don't think it will negative impact our rural feel in any way, shape, or form, because I think the county zoning ordinance is well-written to make sure that we keep that rural feel throughout our county and through our towns.



I think the town has a guide for you to all follow, but it is being rewritten, and that was poorly notified, I think, for town members, as I got a teeny little yellow postcard saying that we are getting a new town plan or they're starting to plan one. So I understand that there's pieces to all the puzzle, but just being a town paying tax citizen, I just wanted to express my opinion that I think it's a good proposal being right adjacent to an existing business that's already in the Town of Concord.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.

Andy Ingarra.

MR. INGARRA: Thank you for the time, for giving us this opportunity to -- to speak. And we are -- I'm with the Boat House. My name is Andy Ingarra. In favor of the Brunson proposal. As it's been mentioned with the few people -- people prior to me, this has been a long process, about five months or so. We started well before that with conversations with the Brunsons. And they have been unbelievable neighbors. I believe most of, if not all, of the neighbors in that area would -- would agree with that, that statement, as well.

We do not operate in this business year



round. This is a very seasonal business. We are in and out. It is very, very, very seasonal, to the point where even during the day we don't have people going in and out. So it is not your normal business in terms of people flow, traffic flow, and all of that.

Beyond that, this property is approved from an engineer standpoint. We wouldn't go this far without that. So we definitely have the backing from an engineer saying that the runoff is proper, and it will be aligned accordingly. Beyond that, the buildings are offset from the road, so as much as the —— the initial five buildings do blend in, this will be even further set back and further away from any traffic flow that would be going through County Road —— County Road B.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.

And lastly, Rick Donner.

MR. DONNER: Good afternoon. My name is Rick Donner. I'm the attorney for the Boat House of Lake Country. Thank you. They're the applicant for -- to rezone a seven-acre portion of W1432 County Road B in the Town of Concord, otherwise known as the Brunson proposal. I thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today.



As Andy mentioned, it's taken us five months		
to get to today's hearing. The Boat House rezone		
petition was submitted before Thanksgiving last year.		
The concerns the opponents have raised today were		
previously raised at the Town of Concord Plan		
Commission hearing on December 22nd; at the Town of		
Concord Board hearing on January 10th, at which time		
the board voted to approve the rezone; at the public		
hearing before the Jefferson County Zoning Committee on		
February 17th; at the Jefferson County Zoning Committee		
hearing on February 28th, at which time the committee		
tabled the matter for one month to allow the opponents'		
concerns to be investigated; and at the zoning		
committee hearing on March 28th, at which time the		
zoning committees voted unanimously to recommend		
approval of the Boat House rezone application.		

No new information has been presented today by the opponents. These concerns have been thoroughly vetted over five months by the Town of Concord and Jefferson County zoning approval process. Today the opponents are asking the board to ignore the judgment of the elected Town of Concord Board and the Jefferson County Zoning Committee, who voted unanimously to approve -- to recommend approval. They seek to insert their own judgment over the judgment of the elected



representatives from the town and the Jefferson County
Zoning Commission.

The board has -- the -- the Boat House is asking this board to accept the recommendation of the elected Town of Concord Board and the Jefferson County Zoning Committee and approve the proposed rezoning.

Representatives from the Boat House are obviously here today and happy to answer any questions. The Boat House is proud of the proposed project and looks forward to furthering its investment in the Town of Concord and the Jefferson County community. Thank you for your time.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you.

That ends our portion of the meeting of public comment, which takes us to committee -- committee reports, resolutions, and ordinances. We have a change in the agenda. So we will be taking Item 20 first, which is a -- which is a planning and zoning committee approval of petitions.

Mr. Jaeckel.

SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, report to the honorable members of the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors.

Jefferson County Planning and Zoning Committee, having considered petitions to amend the official zoning map



of Jefferson County, filed for a public hearing on 1 2 February 17th and March 17th, 2022, as required 3 pursuant to Wisconsin statutes, and the onus there of 4 having been given and being duly advised of the wishes 5 of the town boards and persons in effect -- areas 6 effected hereby makes the following recommendations; 7 approval of petitions as listed, dated this 28th day of 8 March, 2022, Blane Poulson, secretary. Onto the ordinance, ordinance number --9 10 FEMALE SPEAKER: Two. 11 SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: -- 2022-2, amending the 12 official zoning map, whereas Jefferson Board of 13 Supervisors has heretofore been petitioned to amend the 14 official zoning map of Jefferson County and whereas 15 petition number -- is that the first one? I'm trying 16 to see -- 23 is -- as -- petitions as listed were 17 proposed -- and proposed amendments have been given due 18 consideration by the Board of Supervisors in open 19 session. Now, therefore, it be ordained that the 20 Jefferson County Board of Supervisors does amend the 21 official zoning map of Jefferson County as listed. CHAIR WEHMEIER: Do I have a second? Do I 22 23 have -- a second by Mr. Christensen? 24 SUPERVISOR CHRISTENSEN: Yeah. 25 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Discussion?



1	SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: Mr. Chair, may I ask to
2	divide the question to vote on all the other ones first
3	and and do the Brunson one second?
4	CHAIR WEHMEIER: So you
5	SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: I would make that motion.
6	CHAIR WEHMEIER: The the one on your sheet,
7	that would be from A-1 exclusive agriculture to A-2
8	agriculture and rural business, that would be the very
9	first petition there that we would divide?
10	SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: Correct. That that's
11	my motion, to divide the question.
12	SUPERVISOR POULSON: Second.
13	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Second for Mr. Poulson.
14	Discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of dividing
15	Supervisor Martin.
16	SUPERVISOR MARTIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17	From what I understand, a number of legal questions
18	have come up
19	CHAIR WEHMEIER: First of all, this is just a
20	question on whether we're dividing the
21	SUPERVISOR MARTIN: Oh.
22	CHAIR WEHMEIER: question.
23	SUPERVISOR MARTIN: I'm sorry.
24	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Yeah.
25	SUPERVISOR MARTIN: I'll table it.



Anyone, any discussion on 1 CHAIR WEHMEIER: 2 whether or not to divide this question? If not, all in 3 favor? 4 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 5 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 6 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Aye. 7 Opposed? Hearing none, okay. Now, the 8 question is divided. And what our -- and what 9 Supervisor Jaeckel suggested, we will pass -- we will 10 set that one aside, and we will vote on the remaining 11 one, two -- seven petitions. Any discussion on the --12 the last of seven petitions, the remaining seven 13 petitions? 14 Mr. Kannard. SUPERVISOR KANNARD: I will abstain for 15 16 potential conflicts of interest. 17 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you. 18 Any discussion? Anything else? All in favor? 19 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 20 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 21 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Aye. 22 Opposed? Hearing none, those are passed. 23 Now we will entertain discussion on the petition of A-1 24 exclusive agricultural A-2 to agricultural rural 25 business to grade a 7.4-acre to an A-2 zone near



1 W-41832 County Road B. Discussion? 2 Mr. Christensen. 3 SUPERVISOR CHRISTENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 4 I was notified of this here petition and a few problems that it presents. So what I would like to say is I 5 6 think there's a real need to clarify, for more 7 examination, and improvement of the decision-making process when there's a conflict between town board and 8 9 that town's land use plan. I'll say a major benefit of 10 county zoning has been, especially for me as a 11 long-time county -- or town board supervisor, is that 12 it has -- it has some distance from the local 13 considerations. 14 When you're on a town board, you often are 15 presented with a need to rule in favor or opposed to 16 something that will affect your neighbors, your 17 friends, your coworkers, and so on. That's a difficult 18 situation to be in. It's always more comfortable if 19 you make that decision, but then you have it -- you 20 have that decision either ratified or -- or the -- the 21 tough decision, anyway, made by the county. 22 My concern here is the devaluing -- devaluing 23 of town land use plans. I think that we should

probably favor supporting land use plans because they

have a standing from long term; they've been passed by



24

25

the town, they've been ratified by the people, and they've been employed over years, whereas towns can come and go, and it is -- it is unfortunate to have things change more or less on a whim.

So what I would like to have happen, for -for my interest, is in the coming years, so that the
new zoning committee, whenever it's formed, spend some
time considering how to improve and clarify this
process of deciding between either the town land -- or
yeah, town land use plan or comprehensive plan or the
town board, who would take precedence, so that you can
avoid this difficulty that we're seeing here tonight.

Thank you.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Other discussion?
Supervisor Martin.

SUPERVISOR MARTIN: Okay. Thank you. I agree with the comments from Supervisor Christensen regarding the need to look at this more closely. However, we do have a decision on the table here.

From what I understand, a number of legal questions have come up regarding this situation. I was able to attend the decision meeting on March 28th, and things just weren't quite as clear as I think some folks wanted. The state statutes do govern community -- county comprehensive plans and also town



1	comprehensive plans.
2	It would seem better to postpone a decision
3	tonight on this until our May meeting so there can be
4	more legal clarity. This way, we are not voting on
5	something which potentially could cost Jefferson County
6	a lot in legal fees, and, also, we wouldn't be
7	unintentionally setting a precedent that we that we
8	may not actually want. So I move to postpone this
9	decision until the May meeting.
10	Thank you.
11	CHAIR WEHMEIER: There's a motion on the floor
12	to postpone this until the May meeting. Is there a
13	second?
14	SUPERVISOR JOHNS: Second.
15	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Who was the second?
16	SUPERVISOR JOHNS: Yeah.
17	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Second, Mr. Johns.
18	Discussion on the postponement? Hearing none, all in
19	favor of postponement say aye.
20	SUPERVISOR MARTIN: Aye.
21	SUPERVISOR JOHNS: Aye.
22	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Opposed?
23	SUPERVISOR: No.
24	SUPERVISOR: No.
25	CHAIR WEHMEIER: No.



1	So we'll take a roll call vote.
2	MS. MCGRAW: I have to add it, so just give me
3	one second. Okay. You can go ahead and vote.
4	MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, would you just
5	clarify the response is yes and no?
6	CHAIR WEHMEIER: Oh, the the yeses would be
7	to postpone. No would be to not postpone.
8	MS. MCGRAW: I have several who are not it
9	doesn't show as voting. Are you do you have
10	connection issues?
11	FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.
12	MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Richardson, Supervisor
13	Preuss.
14	CHAIR WEHMEIER: It didn't register.
15	SUPERVISOR: I'm trying.
16	MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Mielke.
17	CHAIR WEHMEIER: It's not registering, so you
18	can verbally tell us.
19	MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Degner.
20	CHAIR WEHMEIER: That was a yes, I believe he
21	said.
22	MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Groose.
23	SUPERVISOR GROOSE: Yes.
24	MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Smith.
25	SUPERVISOR SMITH: Yes.



1 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Martin. 2 SUPERVISOR MARTIN: Yes. 3 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Turville-Heitz. 4 SUPERVISOR TURVILLE-HEITZ: 5 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Callan. 6 SUPERVISOR CALLAN: Yes. 7 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Gulia. 8 SUPERVISOR GULIG: Yes. 9 MS. MCGRAW: We have 10 yes, 18 no, and two 10 absent. 11 That motion fails. So it is CHAIR WEHMEIER: 12 back to the floor to -- to the original motion to 13 approve or disapprove of these -- this particular 14 petition. Any further discussion on the petition? 15 Mr. Wineke. SUPERVISOR WINEKE: Yeah, I'm wondering if, 16 like, Matt Zanql could take a few minutes to summarize 17 18 exactly what the issues are here. I've heard people 19 that have indicated that the county had -- was not 20 following their own rules, that kind of thing. And so 21 if -- if that could all be clarified as -- as what the 22 quick process was, and -- and I'm interested in why the 23 -- the board voted unanimously to approve this and 24 whether or not it's consistent with the county's plans. 25 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Is Matt here? Oh, okay.



1 | Matt.

MR. ZANGL: Mr. Supervisor Wineke, good question. So I'll start by saying, I'm trying to think of where to start, it would be my opinion if this proposal was offered anywhere else in the county, that it would be approved. The planning zoning committee approved it at the last meeting on a five-to-zero -- four-to-zero vote, and I think that shows that they would approve this in any area.

I agree with the committees determination that it meets the county's comprehensive plan and the county's zoning ordinances. The confusion, or the -- the struggle, comes into play that the town planning commission voted to deny the petition. The town board, the one who makes the formal decision on behalf of the board, voted to approve it. So you're seeing here today the -- the conflict, or the struggle, between the question of, did the town follow their comprehensive plan.

Am I the one to offer that suggestion? I don't know. I didn't create the plan. I don't read the plan on a daily basis. I -- I don't know. I can't speak on behalf of that.

You've heard comments today that the town did not follow that comprehensive plan; however, the town



board did approve the petition, the formal decision or
recommendation to the planning zoning committee, of
which they review, was to approve the petition.

Does that answer it in a short statement?

SUPERVISOR WINEKE: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR WEHMEIER: I think Buck had his hand up first. Mr. Supervisor Smith.

SUPERVISOR SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My concern with this, I was contacted by several people, and as this went to the town, they were unaware that it was there, so they were not able to oppose it. And at the point it had passed, now they're arguing that that's the reason why we should support it. That I personally think this is like the property in Palmyra where it should get sent back to the town and then should figure it out.

And if they send it back, you know, pass it or not, but I think the town should -- this should go back to the town and let them decide more if they're in favor of it or not so people have more of an option to disagree -- agree or disagree with it.

CHAIR WEHMEIER: Supervisor Morris.

SUPERVISOR MORRIS: Without trying to put our corp counsel in a difficult position, I wondered if we could get an opinion from the corporation counsel.



MR. WARD: Thank you. Rezoning is presented -- the petition is presented to the county board.

State statutes contemplate that it's a joint endeavor.

The -- a rezoning doesn't happen unless the town and the county want it to happen. That's why state statutes give each government the authority to rezone. Specifically with a rezoning request, the county has the ability to approve a rezoning petition, which is what's on the floor right now before the county board, and the town has the authority to veto it. So 40 days after it's passed, if the county does approve the rezoning, the town can veto it.

So do we want to get into town politics? As a -- as a matter of doing business, the county asks the town before acting on a zoning petition, does the town support the rezoning petition? In this case, the town said, yes, it does support the rezoning petition, and the planning and zoning committee voted to rezone or grant the rezoning petition. Now we have the county board asked -- being asked to make that decision.

We have a number of people who are opposing the rezoning, but legally, we -- we have a petition before the board, and there is nothing preventing, or if -- if we do choose to deny the rezoning petition, I know that's not on the floor right now, there was --



there was a request to return it or postpone it, but what -- what basis does the county have to deny it? There have been some statements made that it's inconsistent with town county -- town -- town comprehensive plan.

Now, it -- it -- the town comprehensive plan is three years out of date, it's expired. So what relevance do you want to give that? Focus on the county's comprehensive plan, the county's zoning ordinance, the recommendation of the planning and zoning committee. And my opinion is that this is a petition to rezone that should be granted. There's -- there's nothing inappropriate about granting this petition. I -- I see no issues.

Issues have been raised by the public, but these aren't issues that concern me where I would advise the county board to postpone the rezoning petition or deny it, but of course the -- the committee certainly -- or the county board has its option, I've -- I've addressed this with other supervisors, the county board can take action, as it would with any other matter before it, it can approve the rezoning and it can deny it, it can refer it back to committee, or -- or postpone it or amend the zoning petition.

I don't know what amendments would be made,



1 but those are the options that state law gives the 2 county board in a situation like this. 3 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Further discussion? 4 Mr. Backlund. 5 SUPERVISOR BACKLUND: Yeah, I think corp 6 counsel answered it, but he was asked -- Mr. Smith was 7 asking about, you know, can we send it back, but the 8 reality is they have the veto power. So even if we 9 approved it, sending it back would only take time, but 10 they still -- if we approve it, they can still veto it 11 and stop the project. 12 MR. WARD: If the town chose to, the town 13 could, yes. 14 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Mr. -- Mr. Kannard. 15 SUPERVISOR KANNARD: I will abstain for 16 potential conflict of interest. 17 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Thank you. 18 Mr. Jaeckel. 19 SUPERVISOR JAECKEL: Thank you again, 20 Mr. Chairman. A few of the things Mr. -- corporation 21 counsel stated it very well. The way things have --22 are laid out, at least from what I understand, a lot 23 after sitting through several hours with him at the 24 Fair Park in the middle of winter for a We Energies

thing. I -- I know there's -- there was lots of



25

1 | questions going on that way.

I think if everybody actually has met, you know, us on the zoning committee, I would think you would realize we actually do thoughtfully think this stuff through. We do ask corporation counsel lots of times for guidance to it. A few of the points I will bring up, like (indiscernible) town plan is out of date three years. Most -- most places can get business done within three years. If they wanted to update it, amend it, or continue it, they could have done stuff like that pretty easily.

Second thing would be, everyone around here either lives in a town or a city, and I think you vote for new town board members, city board councils, and stuff like that every couple of years, regardless. So, you know, when -- when a board overrides committee, because technically, I think that's what a planning commission is, is a committee, they are not elected to that, at least not on any of the town boards I know of; they're all appointed. It would be like us, you know, just going off on one of our appointed administration -- administration people and leaving them have the full range of everything we do. That's why we do it here, you know, so we can oversee it.

But I think, you know, when the town had



1 approved it, and we said we would approve it and even 2 thought back to say, you know, postponed it another 3 time to -- to just see if the town came back within a 4 month and said they had some major change, I don't see 5 a reason for us not to go forward with approving this. 6 Thank you. 7 CHAIR WEHMEIER: I saw another hand up here 8 earlier. Any other -- Mr. Johns hasn't spoken yet. 9 SUPERVISOR JOHNS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. 10 CHAIR WEHMEIER: And then we can go back to 11 you, Supervisor Martin. 12 SUPERVISOR JOHNS: This project is in my 13 district over in -- outside of Farmington, so I -- I've 14 been weighing this back and forth for the last couple 15 It's become quite an issue in my -- in my 16 district there and certainly on that side of it. 17 But I think corporate counsel helped us out 18 here a little bit with the possibility of the -- of the 19 town board vetoing this if, in fact, they chose to do 20 It's a town board and the town planning group. 21 It gives them 40 days. It's an off-ramp. It's an

that's what their constituents or that town board wants
to do. I'm not advocating for that, but I'm just
saying there is an off-ramp, in fact, if it's -- if

opportunity for an off-ramp for them, if, in fact,



22

it's -- if it's -- if it's taken up by the town. 1 2 So I just want to thank you corporate counsel 3 for pointing that out. It -- it does -- it is a 4 Thank you. factor. 5 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Supervisor Martin. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 6 SUPERVISOR MARTIN: 7 Just one question for clarification from corporate 8 counsel. 9 Is it my understanding that we do not really 10 have clarity on -- as to whether a town plan, which is 11 technically outdated, still is legally binding? 12 you. 13 MR. WARD: No, that's a good question. 14 found -- through my research, I found no guidance on whether or not -- what -- what the effect of an 15 16 outdated town plan would be; but it is my opinion that 17 it would not be appropriate to say, just because the 18 town plan is outdated, therefore, there can never be 19 any rezoning petitions granted in that town. assuming it has an -- an effect, well, what is that 20 21 effect? And in my opinion that effect isn't a basis to 22 deny the rezoning request. 23 Thank you. SUPERVISOR MARTIN: 24 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Mr. Poulson. 25 SUPERVISOR POULSON: I would make a motion to



1 call the vote. 2 MALE SPEAKER: He's just calling for the 3 question. CHAIR WEHMEIER: He's calling for the 4 5 question. 6 Is there a second to that? This can only be 7 approved by a majority -- majority vote, because 8 basically what you're doing is -- is ending discussion. 9 And so the motion is on the floor to -- it's a 10 two-thirds vote, yes, it is a two-thirds vote. 11 motion on the floor to -- to call a question. This is 12 not for the question, just whether or not to call it 13 and end debate. So we'll take a roll call vote. 14 MS. MCGRAW: I have to add this. 15 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Okay, okay. The motion on 16 the floor right now is to end debate. It is not for or 17 against this petition. It is to end debate. That's 18 all it is. If you vote yes, you want to end the 19 debate. No, you want to allow people to have their say 20 any further. 21 Mr. Kannard. 22 SUPERVISOR KANNARD: I would like to ask, 23 Blair, do I need to abstain from this, or should I 24 vote?

MR. WARD: My -- my advice is since you



25

abstained from the main motion, that you would abstain 1 2 from any secondary or subsidiary motions, so yes. 3 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Let us know when you're 4 ready, madam clerk. 5 MS. MCGRAW: I'm ready. 6 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Madam clerk, you're ready, 7 okay. 8 We can vote. 9 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Richardson. 10 Supervisor Preuss. Supervisor Mielke. Supervisor 11 Degner. 12 SUPERVISOR DEGNER: Yeah. 13 Supervisor Groose. MS. MCGRAW: 14 SUPERVISOR GROOSE: Yeah. 15 Supervisor Smith. MS. MCGRAW: 16 SUPERVISOR SMITH: 17 Supervisor Martin. MS. MCGRAW: 18 SUPERVISOR MARTIN: No. 19 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Turville-Heitz. 20 SUPERVISOR TURVILLE-HEITZ: Yes. 21 MS. MCGRAW: Supervisor Callan. Supervisor 22 Gulig. Twenty-one yes, six no, one abstain, two 23 absent. 24 CHAIR WEHMEIER: So now the original motion is 25 on the floor for approval or disapproval of -- of this



petition. Any further discussion? 1 2 Mr. Smith. 3 SUPERVISOR SMITH: I just had a question, is 4 this going to be sent back to the same board that sent 5 it here that has already approved it? Is that the 6 same --7 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Yes. 8 SUPERVISOR SMITH: -- board? 9 CHAIR WEHMEIER: It's the same board. It 10 hasn't changed. 11 SUPERVISOR SMITH: Okay. Thanks. 12 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Yeah. 13 SUPERVISOR SMITH: Thank you. 14 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Yeah. Okay. All in favor? 15 Oh, wait, wait. 16 Do you have -- do you have a question, Anita? 17 No, okay. 18 So now we'll do a voice vote on whether to 19 approve or disapprove. If I -- if I can't discern, we 20 will have a roll call vote. All in favor of this 21 petition say aye. 22 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 23 SUPERVISOR: Aye. 24 CHAIR WEHMEIER: Aye. 25 Opposed?





1	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
2) SS COUNTY OF WHATCOM)
3	
4	
5	I, CHRISTINE AIELLO, do hereby certify
6	that I transcribed the audio, and that the foregoing is
7	a true and complete transcription of the audio
8	transcribed under my personal direction.
9	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I do hereunto set my
10	hand at Blaine, Washington, this 28th day of March,
11	2023.
12	
13	
14	(i - i)
15	
16	
17	Christine Aiello
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	



	– 28		acting	agenda
0	4:18	7	30:15	4:25
	_ 28th		action	19:17
01:48:40	4:25	7.4	4:21	agree
2:2	18:11,14	7:4	31:21	16:23
2.2	20:7	7 • 1	31.21	24:16
	_ 24:22	7.4-acre	add	28:10
1	24.22	22:25	26:2	29:21
			36:14	29.21
10	3		addition	agricultura
27:9		A	4:4	1
27.9	31		1.1	7:14 9:8
10th		A-1	addressed	22:24
18:7	7:15	7:17 21:7	31:20	
11	36	22:23	adjacent	agriculture
2:5	13:18	A-2	16:9	14:4
∠•5			エロ・ソ	21:7,8
12th		7:5,18	adjoining	ahead
6:6	4	8:20,22,	10:3	8:5 26:3
4		23,24		
17th	40	9:1,3,10,	administere	air
18:10	4:1 30:10	21 21:7	d	10:6
20:2	34:21	22:24,25	3:13	aligned
18		ability	administeri	17:10
11:25	4:00	30:8	ng	17-10
27:9	6:19	30.0	2:19 3:20	amend
21.9		abrupt	2.17 3.20	19:25
1973		4:18 5:14	administrat	20:13,20
14:19	5	-1 1	ion	31:24
		absent	33:21,22	33:9
_	5236	27:10	adambad	
2	14:18	37:23	adopted	amending
	_	abstain	12:8	20:11
20	56	22:15	advice	amendments
19:17	7:7	32:15	6:6 36:25	20:17
	58:08	36:23		31:25
2019	2:2	37:1,22	advise	
9:14			31:17	analyzed
2022		abstained	advised	12:16
20:2,8	6	37:1	20:4	Andy
		aggent		16:13,16
2022-2	60	accept	advocating	18:1
20:11	14:3	19:4	34:24	⊥0.1
22nd	14.3	access	affect	Anita
18:6	61	6:22	23:16	38:16
ΤΟ·Ω	9:1		∠3·±0	
23		acres	afternoon	applicable
20:16		7:4 14:2	15:4	7:19
			17:19	



applicant	6:6	25:19,20,	Becky	28:14,16
17:21	area	21 38:21,	14:16	29:1
		22,23,24	boain	30:2,9,
application	16:23		begin	20,23
18:16	28:9	ayes	2:7	31:17,19,
appointed	areas	39:2	behalf	21 32:2
33:20,21	7:8 20:5	Aztalan	28:15,23	33:14,16
approached	arguing	12:2,5	believed	34:19,20,
13:23	29:12		6:5	23 38:4,
		ъ		8,9
approaches	argument	B	benefit	board's
3:2	8:23		23:9	5:3
approval	arisen	back	big	5.5
7:25	9:13	4:8,21,24	10:21	boards
18:16,20,		17:13	11:3	8:15 20:5
24 19:19	asks	27:12		33:19
20:7	30:14	29:15,17,	binding	boat
37:25	asphalt	18 31:23	35:11	4:17
	11:1	32:7,9	bit	13:7,23
approvals		34:2,3,	15:17	16:16
7:23	assuming	10,14	34:18	17:20
approve	15:18	38:4		18:2,16
3:23 4:10	35:20	backing	Blair	19:3,7,9
8:9	assumption	17:8	36:23	17.3,7,7
12:22,23	7:25 8:2		Blane	body
18:8,24	attend	Backlund	20:8	6:15
19:6	6:17	32:4,5	blend	bottom
27:13,23	24:22	barely	15:7	12:6
28:9,16	24.22	11:13	17:12	
29:1,3	attorney	1	17.12	BOUCHE
30:8,11	6:4,5,7,	barn	board	10:17
31:22	9,10	4:6 9:10	2:15,18,	Brandt
32:10	12:21	barns	22,24	10:1,2
34:1	17:20	15:6	3:23 6:6,	
38:19	attorneys	bago	7,12 7:24	bring
	3:18 6:10	base 15:16	8:1,3	33:7
approved		13.10	12:23	Brunson
8:21 9:3	authority	based	13:10	3:22 4:16
13:13	30:6,10	5:5 7:23	14:7,8,9	9:19 10:3
17:6	avoid	basically	18:7,8,	13:15,16
28:6,7	24:12	8:24 36:8	21,22	16:17
32:9 34:1			19:3,4,5,	17:23
36:7 38:5	awesome	basis	23 20:12,	21:3
approving	12:19	28:22	18,20	Brunsons
24.5	aye	31:2	23:8,11,	7:4 16:21
34:5		25.01		/ • ' ± 0 • ∠]
34.5 April	22:4,5,6,	35:21	14 24:11	



JEFFERSON CC			ilidex. D	runsonsconcerr
Brunsons'	care	39:2	clarificati	18:9,10,
2:12	15:10	Chairman	on	11,14,23
Buck	case	19:21	35:7	19:6,15,
29:6	12:23	32:20	clarified	18,24
	30:16		27:21	24:7 28:6
budget	30.10	chance		29:2
15:19	census	4:15	clarify	30:18
building	9:16	change	4:10 23:6	31:11,18,
2:12	certified	3:2 4:18	24:8 26:5	23 33:3,
10:25	7:16	5:14,20,	clarity	16,18
1. 12.01		23,24 6:1	25:4	committees
buildings	cetera	19:16	35:10	18:15
3:21 4:2	2:20	24:4 34:4		28:10
10:19,20	chair	, ,	cleanest	
11:3	2:3,11	changed	15:10	communities
13:8,11	4:13 7:1	5:11	clear	3:8
15:4	9:25	38:10	24:23	community
17:11,12	10:13	changing	clerk	3:6 19:11
business	11:19	8:15	37:4,6	24:24
9:11 14:1	13:1,4,14	children	3/.4,0	
15:13	14:15	13:18	closely	comp
16:9,25	16:12	13.18	24:18	12:4,6
17:1,4	17:17	choose	comfortable	complete
21:8	19:13	30:24	23:18	9:17
22:25	20:22,25	chose	23.10	
30:14	21:1,4,6,	9:15	comment	comprehensi
33:8	13,16,19,	32:12	2:4,6	on
businesses	22,24	34:19	19:15	3:7
7:8 9:7	22:1,6,		comments	comprehensi
7.0 9.7	17,21	Christensen	24:17	ve
	23:3	20:23,24	28:24	2:15,25
C	24:14	23:2,3		3:3,4
	25:11,15,	24:17	commercial	5:25 6:2
call	17,22,25	Circle	7:12 9:5,	7:6,20
26:1	26:4,6,	14:21	9,22	24:10,25
36:1,11,	14,17,20		11:13	25:1
12,13	27:11,25	citizen	commission	28:11,18,
38:20	29:6,8,22	16:7	12:1 18:6	25 31:5,
	32:3,14,	citizens	19:2	6,9
Callan	17 34:7,	3:25 6:5,	28:14	computer
27:5,6	9,10	9,16	33:18	6:22
37:21	35:5,6,24			0-22
calling	36:4,15	city	committee	concern
36:2,4	37:3,6,24	33:13,14	3:25 4:8,	23:22
	38:7,9,	claimed	19,25 5:3	29:9
camp	12,14,24	5:1	12:3,16,	31:16
9:12			20 14:12	



EFFERSON CC	ZOINT I			ncerneaaecisio
concerned	consistent	cost	4,17,19,	date
6:15	3:19 7:19	25:5	21 32:2	31:7 33:7
10:5,8,18	8:25 9:1	councils	county's	dated
concerns	27:24	33:14	27:24	20:7
6:18	consistentl	33.14	28:11,12	
18:4,13,		counsel	31:9	David
18	y 9:8	29:24,25	31.9	13:2
10	9.0	32:6,21	couple	day
Concord	constituent	33:5	33:15	15:2,11
2:11,13	s	34:17	34:14	17:3 20:7
3:20 6:4	34:23	35:2,8	a a u m h a	17.3 20.7
7:9 8:9		G	courts	days
14:7,9,	contacted	Country	3:18	30:10
12,19	6:11 29:9	17:21	cover	34:15,21
15:1,2,15	contemplate	county	10:23	33
16:10	30:3	3:12,13,		dealing
17:23		15,16,19,	COVID	11:24
18:5,7,	continue	23,25	6:23	debate
19,22	33:10	4:18 5:1,	coworkers	36:13,16,
19:5,11	continued	2,15,16,	23:17	17,19
19.3,11	9:19	22,24 6:1		
conditional		7:6,14,	create	December
9:1	contractors	20,21,23,	28:21	18:6
conflict	1	25 8:13,	creates	decide
23:8	9:6	20 9:16	7:11	29:19
28:17	controversy	11:23,24,		
	14:24		creating	decided
32:16		25 12:3,	5:22	9:23
conflicts	conversatio	8,18,23	Creek	deciding
22:16	ns	13:17,19	11:22	24:9
<i>.</i>	16:20	14:13		
confusion	convey	15:23,24	criteria	decision
28:12	6:17	17:14,22	7:18	5:5 8:10
connection	0.17	18:9,10,	8:16,18	9:18
26:10	corp	20,23	current	23:19,20,
	29:24	19:1,5,	7:10	21 24:19,
considerati	32:5	11,23,24	7.10	22 25:2,9
on	gornorato	20:1,14,		28:15
8:12	corporate	20,21	D	29:1
20:18	34:17	23:1,10,		30:20
considerati	35:2,7	11,21	dailu	A a a d a d a d a d
ons	corporation	24:25	daily	decision-
23:13	29:25	25:5	28:22	making
	32:20	27:19	Dale	23:7
considered	33:5	28:5	2:7,9	decisions
19:25		30:2,5,7,	4:13	3:16 7:24
consistency	Correct	9,11,14,		8:15
	21:10	~ , , ,	Daley	5 - 15
8:1	21.10	19 31:2,	13:2	



JEFFERSON CC	JUNIT			index: deleria
defer	13:5	22:8	effected	9:9,22
8:14	24:12	dividing	20:6	entertain
Degner	direct	21:14,20	effectively	22:23
26:19	7:21	dollars	4:21	
37:11,12	disagree	15:20	elect	equipment 9:6
delay	29:21		2:22,23	
9:15		Don		establishme
	disapproval	13:15,16	elected	nt
delayed 12:12	37:25	Donald	18:22,25 19:5	7:8
	disapprove	3:21	33:18	estate
Denials	27:13	Donner		11:22
9:10	38:19	17:18,19,	election	examination
denied	disc	20	3:2	23:7
8:8 9:8,	9:11	drive	emphasize	Exchange
21	discern	2:10	4:17	3:22
deny	38:19	15:1,2,11	employed	
7:4 28:14			24:2	exclusive
30:24	discrepancy	driveway		21:7
31:2,18,	4:22	11:1	end	22:24
23 35:22	discussing	due	36:13,16, 17,18	executed
desired	5:4	8:6 12:12		13:9
2:17	discussion	20:17	endeavor	existing
	14:11	duly	30:3	16:9
determinati	20:25	20:4	ending	expand
on 28:10	21:14		36:8	13:23
	22:1,11,	E	ends	
devaluing	18,23		19:14	expansion
23:22	23:1			7:10
develop	24:14	earlier 6:19 34:8	Energies 32:24	expired
12:4	25:18 27:14	0.19 34.0	32.24	9:14 31:7
developed	32:3 36:8	easier	engineer	express
14:20	38:1	4:10	17:7,9	16:8
		easily	engineered	extra
development 7:12 8:16	distance	33:11	12:15	12:13
14:24	23:12	east	13:9,12	15:20
15:17	district	14:22	engineering	13.20
	2:17		11:5	
Dick	7:17,18	edge		F
13:4,6	34:13,16	11:16	enlarge	
difficult	divide	effect	14:1	fact
23:17	21:2,9,11	20:5	enterprise	8:21 12:1
29:24	22:2	35:15,20,	9:5	34:19,22,
difficulty	divided	21	enterprises	25
difficulty	divided	21	enterprises	25



EFFERSON CC			III G	ex. factorneam
factor	final	24:7	13:24,25	guided
35:4	3:17	forward	14:16	8:16
fails	finally	11:9	16:8	guiding
27:11	6:14	19:10	17:19	12:22
27.11	0.14	34:5	28:2	12.22
Fair	financial	34.3	35:13	Gulig
32:24	8:11	found	GOTTOWN	27:7,8
Farm	five-to-	35:14	govern 24:24	37:22
15:5	zero	four-to-	24.24	guy
	28:7	zero	government	11:23
Farmington		28:8	30:6	
34:13	fixed		grade	gymnasium
farmland	2:20	friends	22:25	14:10
7:16	floor	23:17	22.23	
	25:11	front	grandparent	77
favor	27:12	15:8	s	H
4:3 16:17	30:9,25		14:20	
21:14	36:9,23	full	grant	half
22:3,18	16 37:25	14:10	30:19	14:1,2
23:15,24	10 37.25	33:22	30.19	hamlet
25:19	flow	fully	granted	7:9,10,13
29:20	17:5,14	5:19	31:12	9:10,23
38:14,20	Focus		35:19	11:10,12,
favoritism	31:8	furthering	granting	13,15,16
8:17	31.0	19:10	31:13	13,13,10
0 - 1 /	folks	future	31,13	hand
February	2:5 24:24	8:15	gravel	29:6 34:7
4:18	follow		11:2	handwriting
18:10,11	3:14,16		Groose	13:5
20:2	5:2,12,25	G	26:22,23	14:16
feel	7:22	-	37:13,14	
15:22,24	12:21	general	3, 13,11	happen
	16:2	8:24	Gross	24:5
fees	28:18,25		11:20,21	30:4,5
25:6	·	give	group	happy
felt	force	26:2 30:6	6:9 34:20	19:8
8:10	9:20	31:8		
	forever	giving	Growth	harder
FEMALE	2:23	16:15	12:2	6:20
13:3		G . 1 . 1	guess	health
20:10	form	Golden	6:13	6:21
26:11	15:22	14:18		hans 5
figure	formal	golf	guidance	heard
29:16	28:15	9:11	33:6	27:18
	29:1		35:14	28:24
filed		good	guide	hearing
20:1	formed	2:21	12:7 16:1	
		12:18	12.1	1 4 1 10 4 2 .



6,7,9,11,		information	Item	judgment
14 20:1	I	12:14	19:17	18:21,25
22:7,22		18:17		justified
25:18	I-94	Ingarra	J	8:10
Ieckel	2:13 3:22	16:13,14,		
13:2,6		16		justify
	idea		Jaeckel	5:5
nelped	13:24	initial	19:20,21	
12:4	ignore	17:12	20:11	K
34:17	18:21	insert	21:1,5,10	
neretofore		18:24	22:9	_
20:13	i 11		32:18,19	Kannard
	6:21	interchange	January	22:14,15
Iighway	impact	2:14	18:7	32:14,15
2:13 3:22	15:21	interest		36:21,22
15:6		22:16	Jefferson	kennel
nire	impacts	24:6	3:12,19	9:11
6:5,7,10	5:21	32:16	5:16 7:14	
0.3,7,10	implication	27.10	11:21	Kimberly
nomeowners	s	interested	12:8	4:14
9:7	5:17,23	27:22	13:19	kind
nonest	5.17,25	interesting	14:12	6:17
13:25	improve	12:10	18:9,10,	
13.25	2:22 24:8	12.10	20,22	27:20
nonorable	improvement	interpretat	19:1,5,	Konle
19:22	23:7	ion	11,23,24	2:7,9
ana	23 • 1	6:2	20:1,12,	
n ope 12:23	inappropria	:	14,20,21	
	te	intersectio	25:5	L
14:7	31:13	n	25.5	
nour		15:3	Jefferson's	laid
14:11	include	investigate	14:8	32:22
	9:10 11:1	d	job	
nours	including	18:13	2:21	Lake
32:23	5:6 6:22		∠•∠⊥	14:18
Iouse		investment	jobs	17:20
13:7,23	inconsisten	19:10	6:20	land
16:16	t	involved	Johns	2:22 3:12
17:20	7:5,13	3:8 12:2	25:14,16,	7:6,15
18:2,16	8:8 31:4			10:2,10,
19:3,7,9	increases	issue	17,21	23 14:3
	9:4	34:15	34:8,9,12	23:9,23,
nousewife		issues	Johnson	24 24:9,
13:21	indiscernib	26:10	11:22	
nurt	le	27:18		10
	13:3 29:5	31:14,15,	joint	landscape
15:20		$3 \pm \cdot \pm 4 \cdot \pm 3 \cdot$	30:3	9:11



landscaping	lives	3:5,11	7,9 36:14	Mindeman
15:8	33:13	15:23	37:5,9,	15:5
		21:5	13,15,17,	
large	local	23:19	19,21	minutes
2:12 3:21	23:12	30:20		2:7 27:17
lastly	long	35:25	means	misread
17:18	16:19		3:15	5:6
1	23:25	makes	meeting	
law	1	6:20	5:1 6:6,	money
12:7,8	long-range	13:25	11,12,19	6:8
32:1	3:5 8:18	20:6	8:21	month
laws	long-term	28:15	14:9,10	12:13,17
3:7	2:25	MALE	19:14	18:12
1	1 +:	26:4 36:2		34:4
leaves	long-time		25:3,9,12	
8:15	23:11	map	28:7	months
leaving	longer	19:25		16:19
33:22	5:2 8:13	20:12,14,		18:1,19
1	1.4	21	4:5	morning
legal	lot	March	meets	15:3
4:9 5:17	5:4,9	4:25 5:10	28:11	
6:6 21:17	10:11	18:14		Morris
24:20	11:23	20:2,8	member	29:22,23
25:4,6	25:6	24:22	6:8 12:1	motion
legally	32:22		members	21:5,11
30:22	lots	Martin	3:22 16:3	25:11
35:11	32:25	21:15,16,	19:22	27:11,12
length	33:5	21,23,25	33:14	35:25
8:7		24:15,16		36:9,11,
8 • /		25:20	mentioned	15 37:1,
light	M	27:1,2	16:18	24
15:19		34:11	18:1	
133.	madam	35:5,6,23	mentions	motions
limit	37:4,6	37:17,18	5:25	37:2
7:7		Matt		move
listed	made	27:17,25	met	25:8
20:7,16,	3:10	28:1	7:19 33:2	<i>3</i>
21	23:21		middle	mowed
1:+	31:3,25	matter	32:24	2:20
lit 15:12	main	18:12		
15:12	37:1	30:14	Mielke	N
live		31:22	26:16	
2:10	major	MCGRAW	37:10	NEO 0.5
14:18	23:9 34:4	26:2,8,	Mike	N5921
1:	majority	12,16,19,	10:14	11:21
lived	36:7			N6204
13:17		22,24	Miller	2:10
	make	27:1,3,5,	4:14,15	=



Nancy	25	10:7,11	Palmyra	personal
3:21	offer	29:11	29:14	8:6,17
13:15	28:20	opposed	Park	personally
negative		2:12	14:18	29:14
14:8	offered	22:7,22	32:24	27.11
15:21	28:5	23:15		persons
	office	25:22	parks	20:5
neighbor	11:25	38:25	2:20	Pete
10:17			part	11:20,21
neighbors	official	opposing	6:7 13:6	
16:21,22	19:25	30:21	15:1	petition
23:16	20:12,14,	option	10 1	7:4 8:2,8
	21	29:20	pass	18:3
nicely	offset	31:19	14:7 22:9	20:15
15:7	17:11		29:17	21:9
non-		options	passage	22:23
certified	offsite	32:1	9:4	23:4
7:17	9:7	ordained		27:14
	onus	20:19	passed	28:14
nonetheless	20:3		8:3 14:6,	29:1,3
5:4	20 3	ordinance	11 22:22	30:2,8,
nonfactual	open	12:7,9,21	23:25	15,16,17,
12:14	20:18	15:23	29:12	19,22,24
12.11	operate	20:9	30:11	31:12,14,
normal	9:20	31:10	past	18,24
17:4	16:25	ordinances	8:22	36:17
North		19:16	0 • 22	38:1,21
14:18	operated	28:12	paying	
11.10	9:7	20.12	16:7	petitioned
note	opinion	original	people	20:13
6:14	16:8 28:4	27:12	4:1,6	petitioner
notified	29:25	37:24		8:11
16:3 23:4	31:11	outdated	6:16,20, 21 11:23	
	35:16,21			petitioners
number	33.10,21	35:11,16,	12:10	8:7
20:9,15	opponents	18	16:18	petitions
21:17	18:4,18,	overrides	17:3,5	8:22
24:20	21	33:16	24:1	19:19,25
30:21	opponents'	01107555	27:18	20:7,16
	18:12	oversee	29:9,20	22:11,12,
	TO•T∇	33:24	30:21	13 35:19
<u> </u>	opportunity		33:22	
	16:15	P	36:19	phonetic
objective	17:24		percentage	14:21
8:18	34:22		10:22	15:5
off-ramp	oppose	p.m.		piece
34:21,22,	4:2,6	6:19	person	10:21
37.41,44,	ਾ ∠ , ∪		4:2 6:22	-



OEI I EIROON OC				acx. picocopablic
11:10	4:20 5:2,	19:14	24:11	project
pieces	11,12,17,	position	precedent	19:9
16:6	19 6:1	29:24	5:15 25:7	32:11
	7:6,22,24			34:12
place	8:14 12:6	positive	presented	proper
5:6 13:11	13:12	14:8	18:17	17:9
places	23:23,24	posse	23:15	17.9
6:1 33:8	24:25	12:13	30:1,2	property
	25:1		presents	10:3,5,
plan	27:24	possibility	23:5	21,24,25
2:15 3:3,	-1	34:18	25.5	11:4,8,
7,11,14,	plat	postcard	preservatio	10,14
15,24	10:20	16:4	n	13:18,19
4:5,23	play		7:14,16	14:2,25
5:4,5,9,	28:13	postpone	pretty	17:6
25 6:2	n1 a	4:20	13:24	29:14
7:7,13,	plow 14:3	25:2,8,12	33:11	nwanaga 1
14,20,21	14.3	26:7	33.11	proposal
8:2,9,25	plowed	31:1,17,	Preuss	2:12
9:2,4,6,	2:19,20	24	26:13	3:20,23
14,15,16,	15:18	postponed	37:10	4:7,11,
20 12:3,	point	12:17	preventing	16,19,22,
4,7,15	9:18	34:2	30:23	24 5:13,
13:9 16:5		54.2	30.23	14,22
18:5 23:9	14:23	postponemen	previous	7:5,11
24:10	17:2 29:12	t	13:7	8:5 9:19
28:11,19,	29.12	25:18,19	previously	16:8,17
21,22,25	pointing	potential	18:5	17:24
31:5,6,9	35:3	5:20		28:5
33:7	points	22:16	prior	proposals
35:10,16,	33:6	32:16	9:18 13:8	2:16
18	33.0		16:18	
	policy	potentially	problems	proposed
planning	4:18	25:5	10:11	7:15
3:8 8:19	5:15,20,	potholes	23:4	19:6,9
12:1	23,24	2:20		20:17
13:10,13	politics		PROCEEDINGS	proud
19:18,24	30:13	Poulson	2:1	19:9
28:6,13	30.13	20:8	process	
29:2	pond	21:12,13	3:9,10	provide
30:18	11:6	35:24,25	4:4 9:17	2:25 3:5
31:10	poorly	power	12:11,12	public
33:17	15:18	32:8	16:19	2:3,5
34:20	16:2		18:20	18:8
plans		pre-existed	23:8 24:9	19:14
2:25 3:4,	portion	9:5	27:22	20:1
9,15,16	17:22	precedence	_ · 	31:15



pursuant		recognize	replaced	review
20:3	R	8:14	15:9	29:3
push		recommend	report	rewritten
11:17	R-2	18:15,24	19:22	16:2
put	14:20	recommendat	reports	rezone
4:24	raised	ion	19:16	7:4 8:22
10:19,20	13:18	19:4 29:2		17:22
11:1,6,7		31:10	represent	18:2,8,16
13:7	18:4,5	31.10	3:24 6:15	30:6,18
	31:15	recommendat	representat	31:12
29:23	range	ions	ives	31.12
puzzle	33:23	20:6	19:1,7	rezoning
16:6		moguao	19.1,7	2:16 4:7,
	ratified	recuse 8:6	request	17 7:16
puzzling	23:20	8.0	30:7 31:1	19:6
5:8,10	24:1	red	35:22	30:1,4,7
	read	15:4,5		8,12,16,
Q	5:7 10:15		requests	17,19,22
	28:21	refer	8:24 9:3,	24 31:17
		31:23	9,21	22 35:19
quarter	reading	refers	require	22
10:24	13:5	3:15	3:8 7:18	22
question	ready			Richardson
7:11	37:4,5,6	reflects	required	26:12
21:2,11,		7:25	5:24 20:2	37:9
20,22	real	register	research	Rick
22:2,8	11:22	26:14	35:14	17:18,19
28:3,18	23:6			17.10,19
35:7,13	reality	registering	reside	road
36:3,5,	32:8	26:17	13:19	11:22
		relation	resident	13:17
11,12	realize	2:15	14:19	14:18
38:3,16	33:4			17:11,14,
questions	Realtor	relationshi	residents	15,22
4:9 5:18	4:3	p	3:6	23:1
9:13 19:8	4.3	8:6	resolutions	_
21:17	reason	relationshi	19:16	roads
24:21	29:13	ps		2:19
33:1	34:5	8:17	response	15:18
	reasonable	0.1/	26:5	role
quick	4:23	relevance	retention	2:17
27:22	T·43	31:8	11:6	
quote	reasons	remaining		roll
7:7,15	5:20	22:10,12	retired	26:1
,	Doboges	∠∠·⊥∪,⊥∠	13:20	36:13
	Rebecca 14:17	remove	return	38:20



EFFERSON CC	JUNIY		Index: Ro	nniesubdivision
10:1	32:7	signage	17:24	10:16
Ronnie	sending	15:14	28:23	state
10:2	4:21 32:9	signed	SPEAKER	3:7 24:24
	1 11 01 7	2:5	13:3	30:3,5
Ronnie's	sense		20:10	32:1
10:17	13:25	significant	26:4,11	52.1
Rooters	services	7:12	36:2	stated
14:21	2:19	simply	30.2	4:19
14.71	2.19	6:1	speaking	32:21
round	session	0.1	6:15	# L a L a m a m L
17:1	20:19	single		statement
1 a	a.h	15:2	specific	16:23
rule	set	• .	5:21	29:4
23:15	8:18 9:22	sites	Specificall	statements
rules	11:15	15:10	У	31:3
27:20	17:13	sits	30:7	31 3
-	22:10	14:4	30 - 7	states
runoff	sets		spend	7:7,14
10:18	5:15	sitting	24:7	statewide
11:2	5.15	32:23		
12:16	setting	situation	spending	5:16
17:9	25:7		6:8	status
-		23:18	spent	5:17 8:11
rural	seven-acre	24:21	5:4,8	
7:9,10	10:19	32:2		statutes
15:22,24	17:22	size	spoke	20:3
21:8	shape	9:5	4:1,2 8:7	24:24
22:24	15:22		spoken	30:3,6
	13.22	small	34:8	Stonewood
_	shed	9:4	34.0	2:10
S	10:22	Smart	stability	2.10
	sheds	12:2	3:1	stop
Sally		12.2	ata	32:11
7:2 11:11	2:13	Smith	staff	
	sheet	26:24,25	5:1,22	storage
Schuster	21:6	29:7,8	standing	2:13 3:21
14:16,17	_	32:6	23:25	4:2,17
seasonal	short	37:15,16		9:6
17:1,2	29:4	38:2,3,8,	standpoint	structure
•	show	11,13	17:7	2:18
secondary	26:9	11,13	start	2.10
37:2	20.9	soak	28:3,4	struggle
gografarii	shows	10:23	20.3,4	28:13,17
secretary	28:8	gouth	started	atuff
20.0		south	16:20	stuff
20:8	aide	1 0 - 4		, , • 1 -1 ()
20:8 seek	side	10:4	and a second of the	33:5,10,
seek	10:4		starting	33.5,10, 15
seek 18:24	10:4 14:22	speak	starting 16:5	15
seek	10:4		_	



JEFFERSON CC	JUNIT		index:	subjectivetown s
14:20	37:9,10,	talked	3:5	town
subjective	12,13,14,	11:11	thoughtfull	2:11,14,
8:16	15,16,17,	talking	y	17,18
	18,19,20,	5:9 10:23	8:18 33:4	3:1,15,
submitted	21 38:3,	3.7 10.23	0.10 33.4	16,23,24
18:3	8,11,13,	tax	tight	4:5,20,
subsidiary	22,23	15:16,20	6:12	21,23
37:2	39:1	16:7	time	5:2,3,11,
	supervisors	taxpayer	3:1 5:4,9	12,15,17,
substantial	8:4 19:23	15:15	9:15	18,25
5:14			10:22	6:3,4,5
suggested	20:13,18, 20 31:20	technically	16:14	7:5,7,9,
22:9	20 31.20	33:17	17:16	20,22,23,
	support	35:11	18:7,11,	24 8:1,3,
suggestion	7:10	teeny	14 19:12	14,15,21,
28:20	29:13	16:3	24:8 32:9	23 9:8,
summarize	30:16,17		34:3	15,19,21
27:17	aumnomt i	ten	34.3	12:1,4
	supporting 23:24	2:12 3:9,	timeframe	14:7,9,19
supervisor	23.24	21 10:19	6:19	15:1,2,15
19:21	supports	term	timeline	16:1,3,5,
20:11,24	8:23	23:25	6:12	7,10
21:1,5,	bosoggus	25.25	0.12	17:23
10,12,15,	supposed 10:4	terms	times	18:5,6,
16,21,23,	10.4	17:4	33:6	19,22
25 22:4,		Thanksgivin	today	19:1,5,10
5,9,15,	T	g	6:15	20:5
19,20		18:3	17:25	23:8,11,
23:3,11	table		18:4,17,	14,23
24:15,16,	4:8 21:25	thing	20 19:8	24:1,9,
17 25:14,	24:19	14:25	28:17,24	10,11,25
16,20,21,	24.19	27:20	20.17,24	28:13,14,
23,24	tabled	32:25	today's	18,24,25
26:12,15,	18:12	33:12	18:2	29:10,15,
16,19,22,	takes	things	told	18,19
23,24,25	2:3 10:14	11:12	7:22	30:4,10,
27:1,2,3,	13:2	24:4,23		12,13,15,
4,5,6,7,	19:15	32:20,21	tonight	16 31:4,6
8,16 28:2		·	24:12	32:12
29:5,7,8,	taking	thinking	25:3	33:7,13,
22,23	19:17	15:20	tonight's	14,19,25
32:5,15,	talk	thought	6:11	34:3,19,
19 34:9,	2:14	11:7		
11,12	10:19	13:24	touched	20,23
35:5,6,	11:23	34:2	11:13	35:1,10,
23,25	13:23		tough	16,18,19
36:22	13.73	thoughtful	23:21	town's
				



JEFFERSON CO	JEFFERSON COUNTY			townswondering
23:9	21:17	voice	WARD	6,24
towns	24:20	38:18	30:1	38:7,9,
3:12	32:22	vote	32:12	12,14,24
15:25	understandi	4:8 5:3,	35:13	39:2
24:2	ng	13,21	36:25	weighing
	35:9	8:3,5	watched	34:14
traffic		21:2	15:17	
17:5,13	unfortunate	22:10		well-
trees	24:3	26:1,3	water	maintained
15:9	unintention	28:8	10:18	15:12
truth	ally	33:13	watershed	well-suited
12:11	25:7	36:1,7,	10:8	2:18
	units	10,13,18,	Watertown	well-
Turville-	10:4,6,10	24 37:8	2:10	trained
heitz		38:18,20		12:20
27:3,4	unresolved	voted	wedding	-
37:19,20	5:18	4:20 8:4,	9:10	well-
Twenty-one	update	4·20 8·4, 9 18:8,	week	written
37:22	33:9	15,23	6:13	15:23
twist		27:23	WEHMEIER	whim
12:10	updated 3:9	28:14,16	2:3 4:13	24:4
12.10		30:18	7:1 9:25	wider
two-thirds	updating		10:13	6:15
36:10	4:5 9:15,	voting	11:19	0.13
two-to-one	18	4:10	13:1,4,14	wife
8:3	upset	5:13,21	14:15	13:17,20
	6:8	25:4 26:9	16:12	Williams
type			17:17	7:2,3
11:5		W	19:13	
	v		20:22,25	Wineke 27:15,16
U		W-41832	21:4,6,	28:2 29:5
	valid	23:1	13,19,22,	40.4 49.5
unanimously	8:2 9:14		24 22:1,	winter
18:15,23	verbally	W1432	6,17,21	15:18
27:23	26:18	13:16	24:14	32:24
		17:22	25:11,15,	Wisconsin
unaware	veto	wait	17,22,25	2:10
29:10	30:10,12	38:15	26:6,14,	11:22
unbelievabl	32:8,10	Walmart	17,20	20:3
е	vetoing	2:24	27:11,25	wishes
16:21	34:19		29:6,22	3:24 20:4
understand	vetted	wanted	32:3,14,	
3:17 5:19	18:19	6:3 16:7	17 34:7,	wondered
14:23		24:24	10 35:5,	29:24
15:8 16:6	view	33:9	24 36:4,	wondering
	3:6		15 37:3,	J



ELLI EKOON OC		index. Word2001
27:16	27:17	
word	28:2	
3:17	zone	
work	8:24	
4:22	22:25	
12:19	zoning	
15:11	3:1,13,	
	16,20,25	
worked	4:8,19,25	
3:17	7:16,17,	
working	19,23	
6:9	8:20,23	
	9:1,3,10,	
wrestling	21 11:25	
9:12	12:16,19	
written	14:12	
3:11	15:23	
wrote	18:9,10,	
4:1	13,15,20,	
1 - 1	23 19:2,	
	6,18,24,	
Y	25 20:12,	
	14,21	
year	23:10	
16:25	24:7	
18:3	28:6,12	
years	29:2	
2:21,23	30:15,18	
3:9 9:23	31:9,11,	
11:25	24 33:3	
13:18	Zoom	
14:3	6:22	
24:2,6		
31:7		
33:8,9,15		
yellow		
16:4		
yeses		
26:6		
z		
70mm ¹		
Zangl		

