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This plan updates and supersedes the 1992 Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan which is an element of the Water Quality Management Plan, Upper Fox River/Lake Winnebago, Wisconsin. This plan was prepared by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and was certified by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources on June 5th, 2001 as part of the State of Wisconsin Water Quality Management Plan. It provides population and land use projections and delineates future growth areas for the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area. Also identified are environmentally sensitive areas which should not be developed. This plan contains policy recommendations which encourage cost-effective and environmentally sound development patterns.
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PURPOSE

This report represents the third update of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan, a formal element of the State of Wisconsin's Water Quality Management Plan, which for this area includes the Upper Fox River Basin Water Quality Management Plan (WDNR, 1991 & Draft, 1996), the Manitowoc River Basin Water Quality Management Plan (WDNR, 1991), and the Sheboygan River Basin Water Quality Management Plan. In the nineteen years sewer service areas have been in effect, they have had significant impacts on urban development. Both communities and land developers are now more aware of sewer service areas and are using the plans and policies in planning of future growth.

This Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update amends the 1992 Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan. The update is part of a regularly scheduled re-evaluation of sewer service area plans. Water Quality Plan elements, including sewer service areas, are to be updated every five years as provided by Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-121.07(2)(a)1. However, this schedule is dependent upon available funds and priorities established within the WDNR.

Sewer service area plans serve as a basis for Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) approval of state and federal grants for the planning and construction of wastewater collection and treatment facilities. They also serve as a basis for WDNR approval of locally proposed sanitary sewer extensions and Department of Workforce Development (formerly Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations, or DILHR) approval of private sewer laterals. In addition, environmentally sensitive areas (ESAs) identified in the service area plans serve as a guide for environmental permit decisions by federal and state agencies.

Sewer service area plans are intended to be an important planning and development guide for local communities. The updated plans:

- Identify wastewater treatment and collection needs for sewer service areas through the year 2020.
- Forecast the amount and location of future urban development areas.
- Identify environmentally sensitive areas where development should be limited to protect water quality.
- Contain land use development forecasts and recommendations for implementing wastewater treatment and collection plans for individual sewer service areas.
- Establish "holding tank" service areas for isolated and rural special uses where appropriate.
SEWER SERVICE AREA PLANNING AUTHORITY

The passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendment (P.L. 92-500) in 1972 marked the beginning of a new approach to the planning, design and construction of municipal wastewater collection and treatment facilities. This law established Areawide Water Quality Management Planning under Section 208 and also the Facility Planning Grant Program under Section 201. The preparation of sewer service area plans for major urban areas was a significant part of this planning process.

In recent years, the State of Wisconsin has embodied many of the federal areawide and facility planning requirements in the Wisconsin Administrative Code. These administrative rules set forth clear procedures and standards regarding the preparation of these plans and their implementation. Specific sections of the code directly pertaining to these activities are NR-121, concerning areawide waste treatment management planning; and NR-110, concerning facility planning and sanitary sewer extensions.

In June 1977, East Central completed initial sewer service area plans for 23 communities within the Fox Valley area under contract with the Fox Valley Water Quality Planning Agency (FVWQPA). These plans delineated sewer service areas through the year 2000. The service area plans were adopted as part of the Point Source element of the Fox Valley Water Quality Management Plan in January, 1979. In 1985, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission entered into a memorandum of understanding with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to initiate sewer service area planning for the non-designated portions of the East Central ten county region. This memorandum sets out the responsibilities and relationships among the parties relative to the planning, management and implementation of sewer service area plans.

The contractual agreement provides that East Central will periodically review, revise and update the service area plans, and review proposed sewer extensions for conformance with the approved areawide water quality plan. As provided by Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-121, the WDNR’s role is to review and approve every sewer service area plan and plan amendment taking into account water quality impacts and cost effectiveness. The WDNR and East Central Planning also reviews and approves plans for wastewater treatment facilities and sewer extensions based upon conformance with the areawide plan. The contract agreement outlines rather broadly the responsibilities of each of the agencies involved in managing sewer service areas.

In order to address specific development proposals which impact sewer service area plans on a day-to-day basis, East Central has adopted an "Amendment Policy and Procedure for Sewer Service Areas." The amendment policies and procedures, initially adopted in 1978, were revised in 1984, 1990, with additional amendments regarding the urban areas (Fox-Cities/Oshkosh/Fond Du Lac) in late 1996 and early 1997. These policies and procedures established standards and criteria for amending sewer service area boundaries and also describes the procedure for amending sewer service area plans. The amendment policy (Chapter 5) provides a mechanism whereby communities can alter service area boundaries in response to changes in both the rate and direction of development.

The amendment process provides the flexibility for communities to adjust to short-term changes in development trends and thus provides a means of accommodating changing development trends between the five-year updates.
PLAN ADOPTION

The plan was developed in accordance with state and federal guidelines and involved public input and review. A total of twenty individual and group meetings were held with the affected communities and sanitary districts within the Fond du Lac SSA between 1997 and 2000. In addition, an evening public informational session and a public hearing were held in April, 2000. Documentation related to these meetings are contained in Appendix A.

The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan was adopted on April 19th, 2000 by East Central's Regional Development Committee and by its full Commission on April 28th, 2000. A modified plan was re-approved by the Commission in October, 2000 prior to submittal to the WDNR. The plan update was certified by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and became effective on June 5th, 2001 (Appendix A).

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

In the ten-county region of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, sewer service area plans are prepared within the context of the regional land use plan, New Directions for Growth and Development (ECWRPC, 1977). The process used for the 1977 land use plan established goals, objectives and policies formulated in response to citizens' desires and needs brought forth in East Central's public participation program. Appropriate goals, objectives and policies were referenced as the groundwork for the establishment of 104 urban service area plans and boundaries.

The initial goals, objectives and policies were re-evaluated and refined in 1985 and in 1990, with additional refinements regarding the urban areas (Fox-Cities/Oshkosh/Fond Du Lac) in late 1996 and early 1997. Two overall goals have been identified. The first goal and its related objectives and policies pertain to land use and urban development issues. The second goal addresses public facilities, specifically sanitary sewerage systems. Objectives and policies related to both goals point out the significant interrelationship between urban land use and sanitary sewerage planning and also provide a sound basis for determining a community's future development and sewerage system needs. The adopted goals, objectives and policies are listed in Appendix B.

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREAS

The Statewide Water Quality Management Plan identifies three designated (complex) water quality management planning areas within the State of Wisconsin with the remainder of the state identified as a "non-designated" area. Within the East Central region, the Fox Valley Designated Water Quality Management Area comprises major portions of the four urban counties surrounding Lake Winnebago. The 1,580 square mile area has been specially designated for water quality planning because of the concentration of industries and urbanization along the Fox River and Lake Winnebago. Within this overall area there are now 20 different sewer service areas that have been delineated and individual plans prepared within the “designated area”.

The remainder of the region is identified as a non-designated water quality management area. To date, East Central there are now six sewer service area plan elements within the “non-designated” area. The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area is located within the "designated" area and lies within portions of the Upper Fox River, Manitowoc River, and Sheboygan River basins.
REPORT FORMAT

This plan describes and delineates the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area. The following sections are formatted as follows and discuss the:

1. Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area characteristics, projected growth and service area plan map;
2. Service area delineation and planning process; and
3. Service area amendment process.

Additional information describing the sewer service area planning process and copies of supporting documentation (such as population and growth projection methodologies) is available at the Commission offices.
CHAPTER 3 - FOND DU LAC SEWER SERVICE AREA

PLANNING AREA DESCRIPTION

The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area has a defined Planning Area which encompasses areas beyond the Sewer Service Area. The Planning Area Boundary is defined by combining and assessing a number of factors such as: a crude approximation of the "ultimate service" area of the treatment plant based on capacity; the extent of service areas for individual lift stations or interceptor sewers; identified clusters of nearby development currently on on-site systems which may have long-term needs for sanitary sewer (more than 20 years), and; logical expansion areas for urbanized growth based on locally adopted land use plans. The Planning Area should also serve as the basis for information collection and assessment for the Sewer Service Area Plan and individual Facilities Plans and amendments conducted under Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-110 by the local units of government.

Prior to this update, the Planning Area encompassed approximately 75.36 square miles. Areas were added to it based on local sewer service agreements and ongoing facilities planning efforts in areas outside of the urbanized area. The recently formed St. Peter Sanitary District (T. Taycheedah) and the Johnsburg Sanitary District (T. Taycheedah, T. Calumet, and T. Marshfield) both contain significant areas of existing development which have failing on-site systems and may be in need of public sewer within the 20-year planning period. Due to these activities, approximately 18.92 square miles have been added to the Planning Area during this update. In general, the updated Fond du Lac SSA Planning Area now contains approximately 94 square miles and surrounds the southern one-third of Lake Winnebago, encompassing portions of three counties, 10 individual municipalities and 12 individual sanitary districts (Exhibit 1).

LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT

The southern one-third of Lake Winnebago is characterized as an urbanizing area with the City of Fond du Lac and adjacent Village of North Fond du Lac at its central core with less densely developed urbanizing town sanitary districts at its periphery. The individual communities which comprise the Planning Area (excluding the Town of Marshfield) totaled 58,001 persons according to the 1998 Wisconsin Department of Administration estimate. The Sewer Service Area population estimate was 54,946 persons and 21,745 housing units. For 1990, there were 2.73 people per dwelling unit compared to a Fond du Lac County average of 2.62 people. Total employment figures for 1990 for the Fond du Lac Sewer Area are estimated at 26,966 employees. The density of 5.0 employees per acre for new development is significantly less than the prevailing densities in the Oshkosh and Fox Cities urban areas.

Numerous sanitary districts spread out from the Fond du Lac urban area near the periphery of the City of Fond du Lac, along the shores of Lake Winnebago, and above the crest of the Niagara Escarpment. Almost all of these sanitary districts were formed at various times between the early 1960's and 1998 to address individual septic system problems with existing residential development. A brief description of each governmental entity with the Fond du Lac Planning Area follows:
City of Fond du Lac: Located at the southern end of Lake Winnebago, the City of Fond du Lac is the hub of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional activity for the region. It also serves as the nexus for wastewater treatment within the region. A central downtown business district coupled with industrial and commercial areas near the USH 41 corridor makes the City the center of employment and economic activity. The City of Fond du Lac covered approximately 9,673 total acres within the SSA in 1998 and had a 1998 population estimate of 41,105 persons. In 1998 there were approximately 3,237 acres of residential, 544 acres of industrial, 1,130 acres of commercial, and 1,998 acres of communications/utility, recreational and public / institutional land uses within the city.

Village of North Fond du Lac: Located just to the northwest of the City of Fond du Lac, the Village of North Fond du Lac serves as a “bedroom community” for many of the region’s industrial workers. The village has a small central business district and scattered commercial businesses on the periphery of the community. There is very little industry within the Village; however, a large railroad terminal is located between the community and Lake Winnebago, and plans are currently underway for an improved business park near the USH 41 corridor. Residential growth has historically been slow within the community and is comprised of a wide variety of housing styles, including one of the largest concentrations of mobile homes in the area. The Village covers approximately 1,299.72 total acres and had a 1998 population estimate of 4,626 persons and 1,694 households. In 1998 there were approximately 374 acres of residential, 15 acres of industrial, 92 acres of commercial, and 81 acres of communications/utility, recreational and public/institutional land uses within the Village’s portion of the SSA.

Town of Friendship Consolidated Sanitary District (No. 1 & 3): These two districts were formed in 1967 and 1983, respectively, and were subsequently combined to form a joint district which generally follows the Lake Winnebago shoreline and also encompasses the unincorporated community of Van Dyne. The Sanitary District covers approximately 1,015.14 acres, and consists primarily of residential development, this District had a 1998 estimated population of 1,335 persons and 530 dwelling units.

Town of Friendship Sanitary District No. 2: Also known as the Ashwood Mobile Home Park, the Town of Friendship Sanitary District No. 2 is located to the west of the Village of North Fond du Lac, north of USH 41, and totals approximately 227.15 acres. This district was formed to address sewage treatment problems for a mobile home park which had a 1998 estimated population of 1,128 persons.

Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary District No. 2: This District is located just to the north and east of the City of Fond du Lac along the shores Lake Winnebago and contains approximately 537.49 acres. The District is primarily residential in nature with some commercial development occurring along USH 151 corridor. The District had a 1998 population estimate of 807 persons and 308 housing units.
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**Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary District No. 3:** This district is located adjacent to the City of Fond du Lac and primarily west of USH 41, along the STH 23 corridor. When the District was formed it consisted almost entirely of undeveloped land, and was formed with the purpose of promoting industrial development within the Town of Fond du Lac. The District covers approximately 171.87 acres, and had a 1998 population estimate of 40 persons.

**Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary District No. 4:** This Sanitary District is located along the eastern edge of the City and encompasses 1,270.98 total acres. The District is primarily residential in nature and had a 1998 estimated population of 305 persons in 116 households. Portions of this district have been annexed to the City of Fond du Lac in past years.

**Town of Empire Sanitary District No. 1 (Lake DeNeveau):** This District is located southeast of the City of Fond du Lac along USH 45 and CTH K and was formed in 1967 and covers approximately 217.74 total acres. The District is primarily residential in nature, had a 1998 population estimate of 342 persons.

**Town of Empire Sanitary District No. 2 (Mary Hill Park):** This small District was formed in 1949 and is located east of the City of Fond du Lac, south of STH 23, covering approximately 23.62 total acres. A majority of this District was contained in the SSA prior to this update. The District is comprised entirely of single-family residential uses and had a 1998 population estimate of 54 persons contained in 19 households.

**Town of Empire Sanitary District No. 3:** This District was formed in 1993 and is located east of the City of Fond du Lac along CTH T. In 1998, the District comprised 247.42 total acres and was comprised primarily of residential land uses. The District had a 1998 estimated population of 490 persons and 168 households.

**Town of Taycheedah Sanitary District No. 1:** This District follows the shore of Lake Winnebago through the entire Town of Taycheedah. Formed in 1969, the District covers an area of 1,898.21 acres of which 1,324 acres were within the SSA prior to this update. A mixture of residential, commercial, and industrial development is present within the unincorporated communities of Taycheedah and Peebles. Most residential development consists of numerous seasonal structures along the shores of Lake Winnebago, however; the trend for conversion into permanent residences has been increasing. Commercial development is associated with the USH 151 corridor which is a major travel route used by Lake Winnebago recreationalists. The District had a 1998 estimated population of 1,724 persons in 613 housing units.

**Town of Taycheedah No. 2 (Johnsburg):** Known locally as the Johnsburg Sanitary District, and formed in December of 1996, this District encompasses approximately 546.65 acres of land centered on the unincorporated community of Johnsburg in northeastern Fond du Lac County. This District also covers portions of the Town of Calumet and the Town of Marshfield but is overseen mainly by the Town of Taycheedah. A majority of the development within the District is residential with few scattered commercial operations and one school facility. This area has had documented failing on-site systems for many years and has just recently been very active in facilities planning efforts.
**Town of Taycheedah No. 3 (St. Peter):** Known locally as the St. Peter Sanitary District, and formed in 1997, this District encompasses approximately 2,604.67 acres of land centered on the unincorporated community of St. Peter northeast of the City of Fond du Lac. None of the District's area is contained within the current SSA boundary. A majority of the development within the District is residential and has had documented failing on-site systems for some time. At the time of this document publication, the District was in the process of preparing a facilities plan with the outcome likely being service and treatment by the City of Fond du Lac.

**Town of Calumet Sanitary District No. 1:** This District was formed in 1989 and covers an area of approximately 1,101.65 acres, of which 558 acres were contained in the SSA prior to this update. The majority of the development within the district is residential with few scattered commercial operations in the unincorporated communities of Pipe and Calumetville. The District extends into a portion of the Town of Brothertown in Calumet County. Most of the dwelling units are seasonal in nature and located along the east shore of Lake Winnebago. A county park is also located within the sanitary district. This District had a 1998 estimated population of 1,046 persons in 361 dwelling units.

Future land uses and development will be determined by each unit of government, however, through the guise of a formal intergovernmental boundary / service agreement developed under Wisconsin State Statutes 66.30, the City of Fond du Lac and the neighboring towns of Fond du Lac, Empire and Taycheedah have identified future urban growth areas. This agreement spells out the specific areas in which urban growth will be allowed within the city and towns and how annexations to the City will be dealt with. This agreement will be a major determinant of future growth patterns within the urbanized area.

The balance of development within the Planning Area is serviced by private on-site wastewater treatment systems. Septage from these systems must be treated at the Fond du Lac wastewater treatment facility if it is within 20 miles of the wastewater treatment plant.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS**

Environmentally sensitive lands within the Planning Area are generally associated with wetlands and with a number of streams passing through the area. The most environmentally suitable lands for development appear to be to the south and west of the City of Fond du Lac. The following text describes these features in more detail. These environmental features are also illustrated on Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.

**Watersheds & Water Features**

The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area and its Planning Area fall within two major drainage basins of the State: the Fox-Wolf River Basin and the Lake Michigan Basin with all drainage eventually flowing directly or indirectly into Lake Michigan via existing ditches, wetland areas, and stream corridors. Three distinct sub-basins exist within these two areas: the Upper Fox River Basin, Manitowoc River Basin, and Sheboygan River Basin. Within these three sub-basins, four watersheds exist: the Fond du Lac River Watershed; Lake Winnebago East Watershed; South Branch Manitowoc River Watershed and; the Sheboygan River Watershed. The following texts generally describes the four watersheds and their major surface water features:
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• **The Fond du Lac River Watershed (UF-03):** This watershed covers the western portion of the Planning Area and is the second largest watershed within the Upper Fox River Basin. Encompassing approximately 225 square miles, it is located along the southern and southwestern shore of Lake Winnebago and includes all the streams flowing to the lake between Oshkosh and Fond du Lac. This watershed was selected as a Priority Watershed Project in 1995. Major surface water features within the Planning Area’s portion of the watershed include: Van Dyne Creek, Anderson Creek, Mosher Creek, East Branch Fond du Lac River, West Branch Fond du Lac River, and the Fond du Lac River (main branch).

• **The South Branch Manitowoc River Watershed (MA-05):** Only a small portion of this watershed is contained within the northeastern portion of the Planning Area. This watershed has as its main water feature, the South Branch Manitowoc River, who's headwaters start near the Johnsburg area.

• **The Sheboygan River Watershed:** A small portion of this watershed is present within northeast portion of the Planning Area near St. Peter (T. Taycheedah). The watershed covers about 245 square miles and was selected as a Priority Watershed in 1985. The Sheboygan River is the main surface water feature present within this portion of the Planning Area and is generally has good water quality near its headwaters.

• **The Lake Winnebago East Watershed (UF-02):** According to the draft Upper Fox River Basin Water Quality Management Plan (October, 1996) Lake Winnebago is an important year round recreational waterbody which experiences excessive weed growth during July and August which is likely associated with non-point source pollution (i.e., phosphorus from lawn fertilizers, etc.). The Lake Winnebago East Watershed was designated as a “Priority Watershed Project” by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources in 1989 in hopes of improving water quality within the watershed and Lake Winnebago. Named surface water features within the portion of the watershed contained within the Planning Area include: DeNeveau Creek, Taycheedah Creek and Pipe Creek.

**Wetlands**

Wetlands are essential environmental features for providing wildlife habitat, scenic open spaces, flood water retention, and groundwater discharge areas. Wetlands act as a natural filtering system for nutrients such as phosphorus and nitrates. They provide a buffer zone protecting shorelines and streambanks.

Wetland areas are dispersed throughout the Planning Area, however significant amounts have been either filled or altered as the City of Fond du Lac grew over time. Remaining wetlands within the Planning Area, as identified by the WDNR Wetland Inventory Maps, are located primarily along the southern shore of Lake Winnebago. This area is know as Supple Marsh, and is an extremely important environmentally sensitive area. This marsh is one of the few large wetlands remaining on Lake Winnebago. Additional wetland areas are located adjacent to the lake on both the east and west shores have also been designated environmentally sensitive areas.
**Floodplains**
Mapped FEMA Floodplains exist within various portions of the Planning Area. Areas susceptible to flooding are considered unsuitable for any type of development due to the potential health risks and property damage.

As revised in 1984, the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the unincorporated portions of Fond du Lac County identify numerous areas of floodplain along the Lake Winnebago shoreline, Fond du Lac River, Taycheedah Creek, and DeNeveau Creek. As revised in 1984, the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) for the incorporated portions of Fond du Lac County identify areas within the City of Fond du Lac and Village of North Fond du Lac subject to flooding within the 100-year floodplain along Lake Winnebago, the Fond du Lac River, Anderson Creek and Taycheedah Creek.

**Soils**
Soils support the physical base for development within the Planning Area. Knowledge of the limitations and potential difficulties of soil types is important in evaluating land use proposals such as residential development, utility installation and other various projects. Some soils exhibit characteristics such as slumping, compaction, erosion, and high water tables which place limits on development. Severe soil limitations do not necessarily indicate areas cannot be developed, but rather indicate more extensive construction measures must be taken to prevent environmental and property damage. These construction techniques generally increase the costs of development and the utilities needed to service that development. According to the Soil Survey of Fond du Lac County, Wisconsin and the Soil Survey of Calumet and Manitowoc Counties, Wisconsin prepared by the USDA in 1973 and 1980, respectively; three major soil associations are present within the Fond du Lac SSA Planning Area:

- **Kewaunee-Manawa-Poygan Association:** This soil association encompasses approximately 95 percent of the Planning Area and is located primarily along the shores of Lake Winnebago, from Calumet County to Winnebago County, generally on lands located below the Niagara Escarpment. This association consists of soils on undulating ground moraines made up of knolls, ridges, and plains that are dissected by drainageways and broad depressions. The soils are mostly nearly level to sloping, but along the sides of drainageways and on escarpments, they are steeper. These soils are well drained to poorly drained that have a dominantly clayey subsoils and substratum. They have good potential for cultivated crops but have severe limitations for use as septic tank absorption fields.

- **Theresa-Pella-Lamartine Association:** This soil association comprises about 5 percent of the total Planning Area and is present generally on lands located above the Niagara Escarpment in the eastern portion of the Planning Area. This association is mainly on a ground moraine consisting of calcareous loam glacial till. These soils can be well or poorly drained and are moderately to steeply sloped. These soils are easy to farm, however erosion and wetness are the main limitations.
• **Beecher-Elliott Association**: This soil association comprises approximately 5 percent of the Planning Area and is located southeast of the City of Fond du Lac primarily on lands below the Niagara Escarpment, surrounding the Lake DeNeveau area. Portion of the town in the area below the Niagara Escarpment. This association occupies a ground moraine of calcareous clay loam to silty clay glacial till that has a high shale content. The landscape is one of nearly level to moderately steep uplands, nearly level depressions, waterways, and broad lowlands. This association has no well-defined drainage pattern. These soils are somewhat poorly drained, silty and clayey, and moderately to slowly permeable. Most areas are used for crops, permanent pasture and woodlots.

Additionally, based on this soils information, steep slopes (12% or more) are identified in several portions of the Planning Area. Most of these areas of steep slope are associated with the face of the Niagara Escarpment. Bedrock located near the surface is of concern primarily eastern and northeastern portions of the Planning Area near the Niagara Escarpment. High bedrock may not only hinder development due to the cost of rock excavation, but it also coincides with a lack of soil which can filter pollutants before they reach groundwater; thus, the potential for groundwater contamination in high or exposed bedrock areas can be extremely high.

**Groundwater**
The groundwater resources of area are generally plentiful and of fair quality. Groundwater resources within the Planning Area are linked directly to the surficial glacial deposits and underlying bedrock structure. The eastern portion of the Planning Area covers the Niagara Dolomite bedrock, therefore; four aquifers exist in this area, while the balance of the Planning Area contains three aquifers. These aquifers can be generally described as follows:

• **The Water Table Aquifer**: Present in all areas of the Planning Area this aquifer, sometimes referred to as the “surficial aquifer” consists of sediments deposited by several glacial advances that covered all of the Planning Area. The thickness of this aquifer is variable, being greatest in pre-glacial bedrock valleys and least over topographic highs in the bedrock surface. Sand and gravel seams, present throughout the aquifer, typically can transmit adequate amounts of water for private well systems.

• **The Niagara Dolomite (Silurian) Aquifer**: Specific to the area underlying the Niagara Cuesta, this aquifer forms an important regional aquifer along the western side of Lake Michigan. The Niagara Aquifer is underlain by Mequoketa Shale which does not transmit water easily and, therefore, acts as a confining layer between the Niagara Aquifer and the much more expansive Sandstone Aquifer of Wisconsin. The Niagara Aquifer consists of water stored in cracks and fractures located randomly throughout the rock. Fractured rock aquifers are particularly susceptible to pollution. In such areas, human activities and land uses take place in close proximity to features that provide relatively direct point source input routes for aquifer recharge. Dissolved and suspended contaminants can be moved rapidly across the land and into the subsurface with little or nothing to inhibit them. Examples of affected water supply wells, springs, and surface water bodies are common in such geologic settings. The potential for groundwater contamination is classified as high throughout most of this area.
• **The Platteville-Galena Aquifer:** Located below the Water Table Aquifer and below the layer of Mequoketa Shale, this aquifer is comprised primarily of dolomite and acts as a leaky confining layer over the sandstone aquifer. It does not transmit water as readily as the underlying sandstone, but it is capable of supplying adequate amounts of water to private water systems due to secondary fractures.

• **The Cambrian (St. Peter's) Sandstone Aquifer:** The area's thickest and most important aquifer, it is the most widely used for sustained high capacity wells for municipal and industrial uses.

All City of Fond du Lac and Village of Fond du Lac residents are provided public drinking water from a municipal system drawing water from four individual wells. The surrounding towns and sanitary districts rely on individual private wells for drinking water.

Areas of high groundwater (less than five feet from the surface) are considered to be a limiting conditions for the installation of sanitary sewer. De-watering costs, pumping impacts, and contamination potential are some of the concerns when constructing in such areas. Within the Planning Area, numerous areas contain high groundwater. These areas are concentrated along the lakeshore areas and along the stream corridors of the Fond du Lac River and Taycheedah Creek. This characteristic will be a major limitation in the future development of the Fond du Lac urbanized area.

**EXISTING SEWERAGE TREATMENT AND COLLECTION SYSTEM**

The first wastewater treatment plant for the City of Fond du Lac was constructed in the 1940's. Completed in 1977, a regional wastewater treatment facility for the Fond du Lac area replaced the original plant. Within a year, the Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary District No. 2 and the Taycheedah Sanitary District No. 1 connected to the plant. The Taycheedah Correctional Institute also connected to the system. In 1979 the North Fond du Lac treatment facility was abandoned and an interceptor sewer was constructed connecting the Village of North Fond du Lac to the new regional plant. During 1989 the Town of Friendship Sanitary District and the Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary Districts No's 3 and 4 also connected to the treatment facility. In the 1990's the Town of Empire's three sanitary districts had built infrastructure to connect to this system.

The City and outlying Sanitary Districts (collectively known as the “outlying sewer users group”) had recently completed a re-negotiation of their sewer contract with the City. This process took several years and was considered a major effort. The new agreement not only spells out the capacity allocations and charges for each District, but also has provisions for joint reviews of new interceptor infrastructure and amending the agreement for new users. A copy of the final agreement is available at the Commission's offices or by contacting any of the affected municipalities or sanitary districts.
**Wastewater Treatment Plant**

The Fond du Lac regional treatment facility has performed superbly in complying with discharge permit limits. The designed loadings for biological oxygen demand (BOD) are 25,000 lbs/day. The removal efficiencies of the activated sludge treatment plant are 92.6 percent (annual average) for BOD. Total suspended solids (TSS) levels in the effluent averaged 13.6 mg/l, well below the 30 mg/l permit limit. A pre-treatment program is in place for industrial users and implemented through the City’s sewer use ordinance.

According to the 1998 Compliance Maintenance Annual Report (CMAR), the plant was designed for a maximum average daily flow of 11,000,000 gallons per day (11 mgd). The annual average monthly flow for 1998 was 5.94 mgd; therefore, the plant is running at approximately 54 percent of capacity. One bypass was reported due to rain or snowmelt during 1998. Ongoing inspections and replacement/rehabilitation projects are planned to control inflow and infiltration throughout the planning period. The facility should be able to handle projected wastewater flows beyond the year 2020.

According to the 1998 CMAR, the Fond du Lac WWTF had a total rating of 26 points (voluntary action range). Twenty-one of these points were attributed to the age of the plant while 5 points were assessed for the single by-pass incident.

In summary, the permit and design information for the Fond du Lac treatment plant is as follows:

- **WPDES Permit Number:** WI-0023990
- **Receiving Water:** Lake Winnebago
- **Design Flow:** 11.0 mgd
- **Average Flow (Jan.-Dec., 1998):** 5.94 mgd
- **Design BOD (lb./day):** 25,000
- **Average BOD Inflow (lb./day, Jan.-Dec., 1998):** 12,052
- **Average BOD Effluent (lb./day, Jan.-Dec., 1998):** 18
- **Treatment Type:** Secondary treatment by activated sludge with effluent limits for BOD, TSS, pH, Residual Chlorine, and TP
- **Sludge Treatment:** Thermal stabilization with vacuum filtering
- **Sludge Disposal:** Sanitary Landfilling

**Wastewater Collection System**

They City's existing wastewater collection system consists mainly of eight inch gravity sewers with some six-inch gravity sewers located in the northern portion of the City, although 18 lift stations exist as part of forcemain systems to pump waste from various gravity-fed sub-systems. Additional lift stations will be required to service the St. Peter and Johnsburg areas according to current system proposals.
A major 48-inch interceptor sewer handles all flows from the collection system. A 42-inch interceptor, which follows the Fond du Lac River from its mouth at the wastewater treatment plant, services a major portion of the City of Fond du Lac. Another major 36 inch interceptor runs to the east to serve the east portions of the city as well as the Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary District No. 2 and Taycheedah Sanitary District. A 30-inch interceptor serves the west portion of the service area including the Village of North Fond du Lac, which was constructed when the Village's wastewater treatment facility was abandoned. Smaller interceptors also serve the Town of Friendship sanitary districts. An upgraded, 24-inch interceptor sewer is being planned in the northeastern portion of the City to service areas near the new Fond du Lac High School, Prairie Road, and the Town of Empire's growth area.

**FORECAST GROWTH & ALLOCATION AREAS**

**Summary of SSA Allocations**
The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area is forecast to have a moderate level of growth in the planning period. The area is projected to have a peak population increase of 4,122 people between 1998 and the year 2020. The population growth, coupled with a declining household size, indicates a need for 5,756 dwelling units. Factoring in local residential density trends, a forecast of 1,556 acres of residential development will be required by the year 2020. Population and housing projections for the individual communities and sanitary districts are contained Exhibit 3. The amount of industrial and commercial growth for the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area is based upon future employment estimates. The employment base is estimated to increase by 5,773 by the year 2020, bringing the total to 37,523. Carrying forward the existing commercial/industrial densities of 1.6 to 14.5 employees per acre, there is a forecast need for 563.02 acres of additional commercial and industrial development land. Exhibit 4 contains information of the employment projections for the SSA. Combined, these two projections illustrate a need for 2,119.93 total acres of vacant land to accommodate development (excluding public/institutional uses) during the planning period.

The year 2020 Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area, as updated, contains a total of 23,125.46 acres, an increase of 6,938.26 acres from the 1992 plan (which included amendments made after that date). Within the proposed SSA, 522.21 acres have been identified as environmentally sensitive; 15,229.25 acres as being currently developed, and; 57.36 acres as being vacant but undevelopable (due to ownership or other restrictions). This leaves approximately 7,038.48 acres of land available for future development, compared to a total forecasted need of 2,119.93 acres (which includes a 20 percent “market factor” increase, but does not include public/institutional needs). The 7,038.48 acres represents an increase of 4,244.63 acres in developable acreage from the current plan. The proposed SSA therefore contains approximately 4,910.55 “excess acres”.
### Fond du Lac Urbanized Area Historic and Projected Population & Households by MCD and Sanitary District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minor Civil Division</th>
<th>Historic</th>
<th>Estimates</th>
<th>ECWRPC Projection</th>
<th># Change</th>
<th>Peak Pop. Increase (x'98)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Fond du Lac</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>35,515</td>
<td>35,863</td>
<td>37,755</td>
<td>39,875</td>
<td>40,804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14,637</td>
<td>15,793</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Village of North Fond du Lac</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>4,302</td>
<td>4,484</td>
<td>4,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1,717</td>
<td>1,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Black Wolf (included in T. Friendship Consolidated S.D.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>2,318</td>
<td>2,154</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>1,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Brothertown (included in T. Calumet S.D. #1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>1,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Friendship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Friendship Cons. S.D. (#1/3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,321</td>
<td>2,210</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>2,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>1,355</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td><strong>1,366</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Friendship S.D. #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td><strong>1,155</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Fond du Lac</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Fond du Lac S.D. #2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>3,001</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>2,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Fond du Lac S.D. #3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Fond du Lac S.D. #4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
### Exhibit 3: Fond du Lac Urbanized Area Historic and Projected Population & Households by MCD and Sanitary District, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Empire</strong></td>
<td>1,730</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>2,568</td>
<td>2,608</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,718</td>
<td>2,767</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td><strong>2,829</strong></td>
<td>221</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Empire S.D. #1 (L. DeNeveau)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>135</td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Empire S.D. #2 (Mary Hill Park)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Empire S.D. #3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>194</td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Taycheedah</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Taycheedah S.D. #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,754</td>
<td>1,775</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td><strong>1,805</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>686</td>
<td><strong>758</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Taycheedah S.D. #3 (St. Peter)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>1,607</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td><strong>1,683</strong></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>640</td>
<td><strong>707</strong></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Taycheedah S.D. #2 (Johnsburg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>352</td>
<td><strong>352</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>134</td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town of Calumet</strong></td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,446</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td><strong>1,483</strong></td>
<td>1,459</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,398</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>-117</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T. Calumet S.D. #1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>1,017</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>-85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>366</td>
<td><strong>391</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total for Planning Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCD &amp; S.D Population</td>
<td>54,491</td>
<td>56,036</td>
<td>57,452</td>
<td>59,802</td>
<td>61,133</td>
<td>61,656</td>
<td><strong>62,758</strong></td>
<td>63,466</td>
<td>64,071</td>
<td>64,419</td>
<td>64,400</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>4,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCD &amp; S.D Total Households</td>
<td>21,745</td>
<td>22,233</td>
<td>23,130</td>
<td>24,031</td>
<td>24,770</td>
<td>27,405</td>
<td><strong>27,405</strong></td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fond du Lac County</strong></td>
<td>84,567</td>
<td>88,964</td>
<td>90,083</td>
<td>93,338</td>
<td>95,435</td>
<td>96,151</td>
<td>97,814</td>
<td>98,837</td>
<td>99,661</td>
<td>100,099</td>
<td>99,964</td>
<td>3,813</td>
<td>3,948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Does not include Taycheedah Prison population (695 persons). S.D. Pop/Housing projections based on projected MCD rate of growth & PPH. Shaded area indicates peak population year for MCD or S.D.
### Year 2020 Employment Projections by Employment Sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>1999 Total</th>
<th>2020 Projected Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRADE (Ag/Forestry/Fishing, Mining, Construction)</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING</td>
<td>8,682</td>
<td>9,892</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (Transp./Comm./Public Utility)</td>
<td>2,094</td>
<td>2,373</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLESALEx</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL (Retail Trade)</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>7,937</td>
<td>1,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE (Private/Public Service Trades)</td>
<td>10,890</td>
<td>12,638</td>
<td>1,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE (Public Admin.)</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,523</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,773</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECWRPC, 1998-99

### 1998-99 Employee Densities by Land Use Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generalized Land Use Type</th>
<th>Total 1998 Land Use Acres</th>
<th>1999 Total Employees</th>
<th>Overall Density (Empl. / Acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>699.46</td>
<td>10,117</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,403.86</td>
<td>16,798</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation / Communication / Utility</td>
<td>296.83</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional/Park &amp; Rec.</td>
<td>2,279.81</td>
<td>3,630</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,679.96</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,750</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECWRPC, 1998-99

### Year 2020 SSA Commercial / Industrial Acreage Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>2020 Emp. Change</th>
<th>Year 2020 Acreage Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRADE (Commercial Density - 12.0 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>-65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURING (Industrial Density - 14.5 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>83.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (Transp/Comm/Util. Density - 4.1 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>68.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHOLESALEx (Industrial Density - 14.5 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>45.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMERCIAL (Commercial Density - 12.0 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>126.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE [Private/Public] (Commercial Density - 12.0 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>145.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE [Public Admin] (Public/Instit/Park &amp; Rec Density - 1.6 Emp./Acre)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>by request only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,773</strong></td>
<td><strong>469.18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECWRPC, 1998-99
Exhibit 5 contains more detailed information regarding the projections of acreage for the Fond du Lac SSA, while Exhibit 6 contains a detailed listing of acreages which were proposed to be added to the SSA. Exhibit 7 contains a summary of the final acreages associated with the proposed Fond du Lac SSA as a whole. In addition, this update attempted to more accurately describe the underlying reasons for each acreage allocation or deletion by categorizing the allocation as one of five types:

- **SSA Deletions:** These areas were removed from the existing SSA for one of three reasons: 1) to delete vacant acreage which would not be utilized and place it elsewhere in the SSA; 2) remove acreage which was recently approved for development on on-site systems and will not need sewer within the 20-year planning period, or 3) to improve the location of the SSA for administrative purposes. These areas encompass a total of 273.56 acres.

- **Administrative Allocations:** These areas were added to the SSA mainly based East Central's boundary configuration policies, which state that both sides of a right-of-way which contains (may contain) public sewer should be included in the SSA. This category of allocations comprises 633.31 acres, of which 498.02 acres are considered to be “developable”.

- **Existing Development Allocations:** These areas were identified as clusters of existing development which may be in need of sewer service during the planning period. Areas added to the SSA for this purpose should be cost-effective to service in the future. Significant amounts of vacant, developable land are often brought in with the developed areas when the SSA boundary is configured to accommodate them. These vacant acres, although significant, do not count against the community's total allocation for new planned growth. This category of allocations comprises a total of 3,019.92 acres, of which 1,281.13 acres are considered to be “developable”.

- **Public/Institutional Allocation:** These areas were allocated only at the request of communities to allow for the inclusion of existing, or planned public and institutional uses. These areas of vacant lands are not considered to “count against” the allocations for future residential or commercial/industrial growth. This category of allocations comprises approximately 199.58 acres, of which 19.79 are considered developable.

- **Future Growth Area Allocations:** These areas contain a bulk of the acreage which will accommodate new planned residential, commercial, and industrial growth within the SSA. This category of allocations comprises 3,358.71 acres, of which 2,668.83 acres are considered to be “developable”.

Although the amount of vacant, developable land added to the SSA is well beyond the projected needs for the area, one needs to consider the underlying reasons for the allocations as well as local and regional externalities which are likely to increase the demand for development beyond the projected conditions. Only 2,669.33 acres out of 4,244.63 acres (63%) which were newly allocated “developable” lands were attributed to major community growth areas. The a balance was attributed to the “administrative”, “existing development”, and “public/institutional” allocations. If one includes the vacant, developable land within the existing SSA, the actual “growth areas” contain 5,454.68 acres which results in a true excess of 3,334 acres versus 4,910 acres when including all allocation types. Additionally, of the 2,785.85 acres which were considered developable in the existing (non-updated) SSA, approximately 1,200 acres is comprised of individual areas which are 10 acres or less in size (in fact, over 500 acres are less than 5 acres in size) and could reasonably be considered as “infill” areas along the periphery of the urbanized area.
## EXHIBIT 5  
Fond du Lac SSA Plan Update - 2020 Acreage Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Year 2020 Residential Acreage Needs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>99.00</td>
<td>126.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>886.39</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>117.61</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,297.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Percent Allocation for Residential &quot;Market Factor&quot;</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>177.28</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>259.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL 2020 RESIDENTIAL ACREAGE NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.80</td>
<td>151.90</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,063.67</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>141.13</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,556.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calculated Year 2020 Commercial / Industrial Acreage Needs</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>127.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>227.18</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>469.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Percent Allocation for Commercial/Industrial &quot;Market Factor&quot;</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL 2020 COMM./INDUSTRIAL NEEDS</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>152.40</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>272.62</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>563.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested Year 2020 Public/Institutional Acreage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Determined by Community Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Justified Year 2020 SSA Acreage</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>166.80</td>
<td>304.30</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>1,336.28</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>165.13</td>
<td>38.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,119.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Excess or (Shortage) of Developable Acreage from Existing SSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T. Black Wolf</th>
<th>T. Friendship</th>
<th>V. N. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>C. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Empire</th>
<th>T. Taycheedah</th>
<th>T. Calumet</th>
<th>T. Brothertown**</th>
<th>Total SSA Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.98</td>
<td>384.30</td>
<td>(84.94)</td>
<td>403.72</td>
<td>(74.62)</td>
<td>247.00</td>
<td>447.08</td>
<td>159.54</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>1,572.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T. Black Wolf allocations included as part of T. Friendship figures.  
* *T. Brothertown allocations included as part of T. Calumet figures  
Source: ECWRPC, 1999
The policy basis for allocating acreage for future development is outlined on page 45. These policies take into account a broad range of land use and environmental concerns directed toward encouraging orderly, cost-effective and environmentally sound development. Working within the broad policy base, the sewer service area plan also considers sewer system capacities, land development market trends, and development plans and preferences of individual communities. A number of additional factors have been assessed during this plan update process which will likely increase the need for acreage beyond that which is forecasted in Exhibit 5:

- **USH 151 Bypass:** The Wisconsin Department of Transportation has been actively planning a bypass of USH 151 around the southern and eastern portions of the Fond du Lac urban area. This project is expected to be constructed in 2003 and the new route, as well as planned interchanges, are illustrated on Exhibit 1. This bypass will significantly affect growth by providing increased accessibility to the U.S. and State highway system. The new bypass will also allow residents who live on the east side of the urban to easily access businesses and services located on the west side of the urban area. The demand for residential lots in and around the more scenic east side may increase even more due to this bypass.

- **Fond du Lac High School:** The Fond du Lac School District has a new high school building and campus planned for the City's northeast side, immediately north of the existing UW Fond du Lac campus. This new school, located within the current SSA, will likely increase demand for residential development in this portion of the City and adjacent lands which were not part of the previous SSA.

- **Fond du Lac Area Growth Agreement:** Approved in 1996, the City of Fond du Lac and the Towns of Fond du Lac, Empire and Taycheedah prepared a 20-year growth area agreement under Wisconsin State Statutes 66.30. This agreement outlines areas on the periphery of the city's boundaries that would ultimately be part of the City of Fond du Lac (5,100 acres) as well as allowing for certain lands to be developed by the three Towns (2800 acres) which would not be subject to annexation. (Exhibit 2). In addition, a larger Town Planning Area boundary was approved (5,900 acres) to allow for some future flexibility in growth area adjustments.

The towns have agreed to keep the City's growth areas primarily undeveloped through zoning, subdivision and review procedures. Each entity is allowed to freely request amendments to the SSA boundary and provide sanitary sewer within their respective growth areas as long as the request is consistent with the recently adopted 2000 Fond du Lac Area Waste Water Agreement. Additionally, the town's growth areas may have unsewered development within them as long as it is consistent with the locally adopted comprehensive plan (which was reviewed and commented upon by the City). This agreement does not supersede the NR-121 Sewer Service Area Plan or its boundaries.
### Exhibit 6
Fond du Lac SSA Update - Acreage Allocation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA Characteristic</th>
<th>T. Black Wolf</th>
<th>T. Friendship</th>
<th>V. N. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>C. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Empire</th>
<th>T. Taycheedah</th>
<th>T. Marshfield</th>
<th>T. Calumet</th>
<th>T. Brothertown</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SSA DELETIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(18.92)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(20.84)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(42.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(10.87)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(11.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(18.92)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(9.97)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(31.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(18.93)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(12.83)</td>
<td>(48.80)</td>
<td>(6.99)</td>
<td>(135.14)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(8.68)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(231.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(16.35)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(12.83)</td>
<td>(48.80)</td>
<td>(6.99)</td>
<td>(130.60)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(7.57)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(223.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(2.58)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(4.51)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(8.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: SSA Deletions</strong></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(37.85)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(12.83)</td>
<td>(49.73)</td>
<td>(6.99)</td>
<td>(155.98)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(8.90)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>(273.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.23</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>31.89</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>126.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>32.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>33.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>59.71</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>173.60</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>507.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>59.61</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>86.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>79.40</td>
<td>168.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>94.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>498.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Administrative Allocations</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>76.94</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>119.55</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>111.43</td>
<td>192.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>115.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>633.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 6
Fond du Lac SSA Update - Acreage Allocation Summary, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA Characteristic</th>
<th>T. Black Wolf</th>
<th>T. Friendship</th>
<th>V. N. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>C. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Empire</th>
<th>T. Taycheedah</th>
<th>T. Marshfield</th>
<th>T. Calumet</th>
<th>T. Brothertown</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>261.73</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>286.46</td>
<td>997.35</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,673.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>29.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>204.23</td>
<td>76.74</td>
<td>237.57</td>
<td>811.14</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,364.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>186.21</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>309.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>79.50</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>295.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>213.08</td>
<td>741.36</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,345.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.57</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>294.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>200.96</td>
<td>731.52</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1,281.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: Existing Development Allocations</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.81</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>557.48</td>
<td>81.25</td>
<td>499.54</td>
<td>1,738.71</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,019.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL ALLOCATIONS |              |              |                  |                |               |           |              |               |            |                |        |
| Total Developed Acres | 0.00         | 0.00         | 0.00             | 50.47          | 28.66         | 0.00       | 0.00         | 0.00          | 96.86      | 0.00           | 175.99 |
| Developed Land      | 0.00         | 0.00         | 0.00             | 50.47          | 28.46         | 0.00       | 0.00         | 0.00          | 94.24      | 0.00           | 173.17 |
| Road / Railroad R.O.W. | 0.00         | 0.00         | 0.00             | 0.00          | 0.20          | 0.00         | 0.00          | 0.00          | 2.62       | 0.00           | 2.82   |
| Total Undeveloped Acres | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.26 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 20.79 | 0.00 | 23.59 |
| Vacant (developable) | 0.00         | 0.00         | 2.26             | 0.00           | 0.00         | 0.00       | 0.00         | 0.00          | 17.53      | 0.00           | 19.79  |
| Vacant (undevelopable) | 0.00         | 0.00         | 0.00             | 0.00           | 0.00         | 0.00       | 0.00         | 0.00          | 0.00       | 0.00           | 0.00   |
| Water               | 0.00         | 0.00         | 0.00             | 0.00           | 0.54          | 0.00       | 0.00         | 0.00          | 0.51       | 0.00           | 1.05   |
| Environmentally Sensitive Area | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.75 | 0.00 | 2.75 |
| Total: Public/Institutional Allocations | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.26 | 50.47 | 29.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 117.65 | 0.00 | 199.58 |
### Exhibit 6
Fond du Lac SSA Update - Acreage Allocation Summary, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA Characteristic</th>
<th>T. Black Wolf</th>
<th>T. Friendship</th>
<th>V. N. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>C. Fond du Lac</th>
<th>T. Empire</th>
<th>T. Taycheedah</th>
<th>T. Marshfield</th>
<th>T. Calumet</th>
<th>T. Brothertown</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE GROWTH AREA ALLOCATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91.74</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>153.65</td>
<td>165.05</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>138.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>586.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>92.46</td>
<td>147.00</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>123.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>462.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>61.19</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>15.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>124.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>294.65</td>
<td>15.66</td>
<td>1,111.06</td>
<td>388.94</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>583.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>114.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,772.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>267.75</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1,092.78</td>
<td>368.38</td>
<td>249.60</td>
<td>565.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>110.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,668.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>65.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: Future Growth Area Allocations</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>386.39</td>
<td>15.88</td>
<td>1,264.71</td>
<td>553.99</td>
<td>297.94</td>
<td>721.75</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>118.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,358.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ALLOCATIONS (NET)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>129.36</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>498.41</td>
<td>277.99</td>
<td>351.87</td>
<td>1,134.08</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>119.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,520.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>109.73</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>379.20</td>
<td>256.16</td>
<td>288.93</td>
<td>931.43</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>108.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2,082.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>19.63</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>119.21</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>62.94</td>
<td>202.65</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>438.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>414.93</td>
<td>26.40</td>
<td>1,480.97</td>
<td>343.51</td>
<td>550.05</td>
<td>1,363.23</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>222.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,417.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>348.58</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>1,461.86</td>
<td>321.06</td>
<td>522.97</td>
<td>1,334.80</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>215.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,244.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>6.99</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>57.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>91.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total (All Allocation Types)</strong></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>544.29</td>
<td>29.60</td>
<td>1,979.38</td>
<td>621.50</td>
<td>901.92</td>
<td>2,497.31</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>342.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>6,938.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Developable Land (All Allocation Types)</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>348.58</td>
<td>24.24</td>
<td>1,461.86</td>
<td>321.06</td>
<td>522.97</td>
<td>1,334.80</td>
<td>15.74</td>
<td>215.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4,244.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 7
Summary of Updated Year 2020 Fond du Lac SSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSA Characteristic</th>
<th>Existing SSA</th>
<th>SSA Additions</th>
<th>SSA Deletions</th>
<th>Total SSA</th>
<th>Total Increase/ Decrease</th>
<th>Total Proj. Acreage Needs</th>
<th>Excess SSA Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total SSA Acreage</td>
<td>16,187.20</td>
<td>7,211.82</td>
<td>(273.56)</td>
<td>23,125.46</td>
<td>6,938.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developed Acres (incl. R.O.W.)</td>
<td>12,708.69</td>
<td>2,562.75</td>
<td>(42.19)</td>
<td>15,229.25</td>
<td>2,520.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Land</td>
<td>10,186.90</td>
<td>2,093.15</td>
<td>(11.09)</td>
<td>12,268.96</td>
<td>2,082.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road / Railroad R.O.W.</td>
<td>2,521.79</td>
<td>469.60</td>
<td>(31.10)</td>
<td>2,960.29</td>
<td>438.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undeveloped Acres</td>
<td>3,431.24</td>
<td>4,649.07</td>
<td>(231.37)</td>
<td>7,848.94</td>
<td>4,417.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (developable)</td>
<td>2,785.85</td>
<td>4,467.77</td>
<td>(223.14)</td>
<td>7,030.48</td>
<td>4,244.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (undevelopable)</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>57.39</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>81.43</td>
<td>57.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>237.13</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>261.79</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA)</td>
<td>431.46</td>
<td>99.25</td>
<td>(8.20)</td>
<td>522.51</td>
<td>91.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Developable Acreage</td>
<td>2,785.85</td>
<td>4,467.77</td>
<td>(223.14)</td>
<td>7,030.48</td>
<td>4,244.63</td>
<td>2,119.93</td>
<td>4,910.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ECWRPC, 2000
• **Fond du Lac Area 2000 Wastewater Agreement:** In 1999, the City of Fond du Lac and the Outlying Sewer Users Group (OSG), consisting of the surrounding towns and sanitary districts, approved their re-negotiated 1977 agreement. The agreement, which was effective January 1, 2000 and extends for 20 years, was an effort that took several years to complete. The agreement addresses issues such as a locally defined “Regional Service Area” (RSA), capacity allocations, cost and cost-sharing. Although the Sewer Service Area update was coordinated with this effort, the defined boundaries do not always coincide with one another. These two efforts utilized differing criteria for boundary determination and locally and/or regionally approved amendments may be requested (or needed) in the future to provide sewer service to areas identified by these two documents. The 2000 Wastewater Agreement did not require ECWRPC or WDNR approval but does not supersede planning requirements spelled out in NR-110 or NR-121; however, the provisions of this agreement, should be considered when making future adjustments to the SSA or its Planning Area boundary.

• **Local Land Use Planning Efforts:** Almost every incorporated and unincorporated community within the Fond du Lac SSA has in place an adopted or draft Land Use Plan. The City and Village of Fond du Lac have had plans in place for many years, while the Towns of Empire, Taycheedah, and Friendship have prepared and adopted plans within the last three years. These local planning efforts outlined future priority growth areas and were invaluable to the preparation of this plan update.

Based on the current and projected conditions for the Fond du Lac urbanized area, coupled with the above listed “externalities”, East Central staff feels that the proposed SSA is configured in a sensible manner which allows for additional planned growth as well as changes in market conditions. The City has a good track record of infilling vacant parcels over time and newly developing areas have been done so in a planned manner. A certain level of “comfort” is felt by staff on these allocations due to the amount of planning which has already taken place either at the local or regional level.

Major future growth areas have been identified for the west, south, east, and northeast portions of the urbanized area while minor allocations have been made in some of the sanitary district areas bordering Lake Winnebago as follows:

**Environmentally Sensitive Areas**
Approximately 91.05 total acres of ESA have been added to the SSA during the update process. Although these lands are within the proposed SSA, they are not technically part of it and cannot be developed with sanitary sewer.

**Residential Development**
Land projected for residential development is scattered throughout the existing and proposed SSA. Single lot and small scale infill development opportunities exist within and near the edge of the urbanizing area. Additional lands have been allocated for both single-family and multi-family development based on the previously discussed projections as well as locally derived land use plans and other information.
• **South:** Land projected for development in the southern portion of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area is located primarily north and south of Reinhardt Road and within lands adjacent to STH 45/CH K and CH H in the Town of Empire. Approximately 450 acres are available for primarily traditional single-family and duplex residential uses in these areas, although some larger lot development or conservation subdivisions may be developed in the Town of Empire.

• **East & Northeast:** Several opportunities exist for infill development along the eastern portion of the existing SSA boundary. New lands allocated for single family, duplex, and multi-family development include approximately 200 acres north and south of CH T; approximately 100 acres immediately east of the proposed high school site, and; approximately 200 acres located both to the south and northeast of CH K.

Infilling of undeveloped parcels which have existing or potential sewer access could realistically fulfill the growth needs for the majority of the sanitary districts in this part of the service area based on the development projections. However, many of the Districts are limited in terms of offering serviceable lands which can be developed in a planned subdivision fashion. Therefore, additional acreage has been allocated to several of the urbanizing sanitary districts along the eastern shores of Lake Winnebago, including lands within the southern and northern portions of the Taycheedah Sanitary District No. 1; the southern and central portions of the St. Peter Sanitary District, and the central and northern portions of the Town of Calumet Sanitary District No. 1.

• **West & Northwest:** A majority of lands within the western portion of the existing SSA are developed with commercial, industrial, and multi-family uses. This area has experienced rapid growth in the recent past and is expected to continue its function as a major economic corridor. Such uses will require a need for additional higher density developments in an area which is quite limited by the current SSA configuration. Some lands were added near the STH 23 corridor to accommodate future needs. Additional lands were added near the Village of North Fond du Lac’s northeastern border with the Town of Friendship.

The infilling of undeveloped parcels which have existing or potential sewer access should fulfill the growth needs for the majority of the sanitary district portions of the service area along Lake Winnebago’s western shore based on the development projections. However, many of the Districts still have limited areas offering serviceable lands which can be developed in a planned subdivision fashion.

**Commercial Development**

Commercial development has been primarily allocated within and adjacent to the urbanized areas of the City and Town of Fond du Lac as well as the Village of North Fond du Lac. Major areas for commercial development include:

• **Northgate Business Park:** Located near USH 41 and CH 00 in the Village of North Fond du Lac. This newly planned commercial area consists of approximately 128 total acres. This park will house a mixture of businesses/light industry, retail, and multi-family residential uses.
• **STH 23/USH 151 Bypass:** The City of Fond du Lac plans on allowing expansion of commercial uses along the STH 23 corridor near the new USH 151 bypass route after construction is completed. This area has remained relatively undeveloped in anticipation of the bypass. Once completed, this area will be considered prime for commercial and retail development. Approximately 280 acres have been allocated in this area for commercial uses.

• **USH 41/STH 23/CTH 000:** Lands along the STH 23 and CTH 000 corridors near USH 41 in the Town of Fond du Lac have been added to accommodate future commercial and industrial development. This area is a major entrance from the west into the City of Fond du Lac and has had a high level of growth historically. Future development within the Town is now limited by the current configuration of the SSA boundary, and therefore; approximately 230 acres have been added in this area to accommodate these uses.

**Industrial Development**

Major areas allocated for future industrial development are located throughout the periphery of the proposed SSA. In addition to the previously mentioned areas located in the Village of North Fond du Lac (Northgate Business Park) and the Town of Fond du Lac (STH 23/CTH 000/USH 41), two additional areas have been allocated as follows:

• **USH 41/STH 175:** This area is located immediately south of the City of Fond du Lac and near the new USH 151 bypass. Approximately 485 total acres have been allocated to accommodate the future expansion of the City’s industrial park addition as well as accommodating some commercial development. Most of the lands are located within the Town of Fond du Lac and negotiations have been ongoing between the two entities to establish city/town growth areas (these lands were not included as part of the original growth area agreement).

• **USH 41 / CTH 00:** Approximately 120 acres in the northwest quadrant of USH 41 and CTH 00 within the Town of Friendship may develop in an industrial nature during the planning period. A series of meeting regarding intergovernmental agreements have occurred between the Town of Friendship and the Village of North Fond du Lac to address such issues as annexation, land use, and service provision. This area would likely be included in the agreement and has been discussed by the town for potential industrial use.

**Public / Institutional Development**

The only major public/institutional use planned for over the next twenty years is the new Fond du Lac High School facility, located immediately north of the UW-Fond du Lac Campus. This school is scheduled for construction in 2000 and will likely increase the residential development pressure on adjacent vacant lands. Approximately 115 acres of land within the existing SSA have been redesignated to accommodate this institutional use. Additionally, portions of the Fond du Lac Regional Airport and St. Agnes Convent have been added to the SSA as “existing development” which may be in need of sanitary sewer during the planning period. The airport’s facilities are currently using onsite systems for wastewater treatment.

New allocations for public/institutional uses include: 96.86 acres of developed land and 17.53 acres of developable land to accommodate the existing Columbia County Park north of CTH W in the Town of Calumet, and; the addition of approximately 2.3 vacant acres to the Village of North Fond du Lac for a portion of a proposed public park located south of Anderson Creek near USH 175.
FUTURE WASTEWATER FLOWS

The approximate increase in wastewater flows have been calculated for future growth areas to determine the potential impacts on the Fond du Lac wastewater plant. These flows have been applied to the acreage allocations for different land uses (assuming full development of the allocation areas) and then compared to the existing flows and design capacity of the treatment plant. The anticipated future development flows are 1.28 mgd for residential development, and 2.486 mgd for commercial and industrial development. Based upon these forecast growth rates the design capacity of the treatment plant (11.0 mgd with 5.94 mgd average flow) is adequate through the year 2020.

Holding Tank Service Areas
An inventory of existing holding tanks and private septic systems was completed in the summer of 1990 for Fond du Lac County. The study determined the proximity of septic systems to sewer service areas within the county. The inventory revealed that there are 323 holding tanks, 653 conventional systems and 450 alternate systems consisting of 227 mound systems, 4 at-grade systems and 8 in-ground pressure systems. Within the Fond du Lac Planning Area there were approximately 64 holding tanks and 77 alternate septic systems. This inventory has not been updated since 1990, however; it is known that no large holding tanks (3,000 gallons or more) existing within the planning area.

WATER QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Continued urbanization of the Fond du Lac area will impact surface and groundwater resources. Surface water runoff and pollutant loadings are likely to increase, and groundwater recharge is likely to decrease. The scope of these impacts cannot be precisely determined because specific development characteristics (location, type, density) are unknown. However, it is possible to generally estimate water quality impacts by applying assumptions concerning the nature of future development.

Point Source Water Quality Impacts
Population growth and commercial/industrial development will increase loadings to the Fond du Lac wastewater treatment plant, and ultimately to Lake Winnebago. Based on the various land uses proposed within the allocation areas projected growth will result in the discharge of an approximately 3614.4 additional pounds of BOD, 3,388.4 pounds of suspended solids, and 95.98 pounds of phosphorus to Lake Winnebago. Impacts of increased discharge levels will be periodically evaluated by the Department of Natural Resources in conjunction with WPDES permit renewals. Assimilative capacity of the receiving water will be used to establish discharge limits if existing categorical limits are inadequate to maintain water quality standards.
Non-point Source Water Quality Impacts

The 2000 sewer service area update includes an additional 4,244.63 acres of undeveloped land within the Fond du Lac sewer service area boundary. As this land comes under development, surface water runoff and pollutant loadings are likely to increase. The placement of buildings, roads and parking areas increase the amount of impervious area, and hence, more water runs off the land surface, carrying organic and inorganic pollutants associated with more intensive urban uses. Utilization of stormwater detention facilities, site development controls, preservation of green space and other measures can help mitigate urban non-point source impacts on water quality.

The City of Fond du Lac, as well as other adjacent units of government, have adopted land use plans which recognize the importance of preserving greenways and stormwater detention and retention areas. While the specific impacts of future development measures are unknown, locally adopted policies should help reduce pollutant loadings and stormwater peak flows.

Based on the full development of the newly allocated acreage, the conversion from rural/agricultural to urban uses is estimated to increase pollutant yields by 1,119.23 tons for suspended solids, 1.8 tons for phosphorus, and 4.22 tons for zinc and lead. On a watershed basis, conversion of these lands will result in less than a one percent increase in pollutant loadings. However, localized impacts on receiving waters may be significant.

Groundwater Impacts

Conversion of rural/agricultural lands to urban uses may impact the quality and quantity of groundwater. Groundwater recharge will decrease as areas are paved over or built upon. At the same time, withdrawal of groundwater is likely to increase for domestic, commercial and industrial use. The City of Fond du Lac, Village of North Fond du Lac and the surrounding urbanized towns all rely on groundwater for their domestic needs. Increases in withdrawals have been occurring as evidenced by new municipal well construction. Insufficient data exists to evaluate the scope of groundwater impacts associated with urban development in the Fond du Lac area, although the possibility exists for a more detailed regional study of groundwater impacts/needs in the near future.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION & RECOMMENDATIONS

Although sewer service area planning was initiated at the state and federal levels, successful implementation of each plan rests primarily at the local level with some guidance provided by East Central Planning.

Designated Agency Management Status & Recommendations

In the state-approved Areawide Water Quality Management Plan, certain local units of government were assigned water quality-related management functions. Entities with adequate authority to plan, construct, operate and maintain wastewater collection and treatment facilities were designated as management agencies (DMA's) for portions of the planning area within their jurisdictions.
The following entities and their respective DMA status are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Unit</th>
<th>Designated Management Agency Status</th>
<th>Management Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Fond du Lac</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection &amp; Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of North Fond du Lac</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Empire S.D. 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Fond du Lac S.D. 2, 3, 4,</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Friendship S.D. 1&amp;3, 2</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Taycheedah S.D. 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Calumet S.D. 1</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>Wastewater Collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a Designated Management Agencies for wastewater treatment and collection the previously listed entities should do the following:

1. Adopt the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan;

2. Review and update development policies and regulations in light of the sewer service plan and recommendations;

3. Submit preliminary land subdivision plats which are proposed to be sewered to the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission for review for consistency with sewer service area plans for the area;

4. Submit sanitary sewer extension requests to the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission for review for consistency with sewer service area plans prior to being submitted to the WDNR for approval;

5. Submit wastewater facilities plan elements and amended plan elements to the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission for review for consistency with sewer service area plans prior to submittal to the WDNR for approval; and

6. Carry out their management responsibilities for treatment facilities and collection systems as specified by state and federal requirements.
**Water Quality Protection Recommendations**

Where sanitary sewer extensions are proposed in mapped environmentally sensitive areas or on other lands whose physical characteristics indicate susceptibility to erosion or flooding, or where development of such lands is likely to impair surface or groundwater quality or uses, East Central may identify mitigating conditions to be incorporated into the development proposal, and request the WDNR to attach such conditions to any sewer extension approval for the proposed development.

The City of Fond du Lac together with Fond du Lac County are participating in the Lake Winnebago East and Fond du Lac River Priority Watershed Projects. These programs are addressing non-point source pollution and other water quality issues in the Fond du Lac area and Lake Winnebago. Various water quality protection and improvement measures are being implemented through this project effort.

Additional recommendations are as follows:

1. The Johnsburg and St. Peter Sanitary District’s should continue their Facilities Planning efforts and construct a sewer system as time and funding permits.

2. Continue to implement existing plans and programs to control infiltration and inflow to the wastewater treatment plant so as to increase capacity for new developments.

3. Monitor new development and loadings to the WWTF in order to determine the appropriate time for the City to initiate facility planning efforts to address potential capacity deficiencies.

4. Close coordination for the planning of any sewered development in the transitional areas should be undertaken by the City of Fond du Lac, Village of North Fond du Lac and adjacent Towns.

5. Efforts should be made to direct development to areas where sewers are already in place before extending new sewers into undeveloped areas. Efforts should also be made to maximize use of gravity sewers as well as capacity of existing wastewater pumping stations to avoid the capital, operating and maintenance costs associated with constructing new pumping facilities.

6. Environmental conditions in the planning area warrants concern with regard to construction site erosion, destruction of wetlands and impacts on ground and surface water quality. Development should either be directed away from wetlands and areas of steep slopes or appropriate erosion control measures should be applied to minimize the erosion hazard.
Implementation of the SSA Plan relies mainly on local government actions which use the plan recommendations as a guide for the extensions of new sewers to service development. However, ECWRPC plays an advisory role in these decisions in two distinct ways:

1. ECWRPC requests that communities within the region require developers to submit "preliminary" subdivision plats for staff review and comment (advisory only). Staff not only checks the proposed plat (whether sewered or using on-site treatment) for conformance with the municipality's SSA Plan, but also reviews the subdivision's overall design and, more specifically, check the following items: potential water quality impacts to environmental corridors; groundwater aquifer / private well concerns; impacts to other natural and cultural features; construction site erosion control methods; storm-water management methods and concerns; internal vehicle/bicycle/pedestrian transportation system design; and other social / service provision impacts (i.e., parks, adjacent land use conflicts, police and fire protection, etc.), and;

2. Sewer extension requests are required to be submitted to ECWRPC for review and comment. Hopefully, staff has reviewed the preliminary plat prior to the extension request which can reduce conflicts at this point. However, staff normally requests that a copy of the final plat be submitted with the extension request. ECWRPC then issues a "208 Water Quality" letter if the extension request is in conformance with the municipality's current SSA Plan. In general, if the extension request is within the designated SSA and does not have negative impacts to defined environmental corridors, a letter will be issued. Sometimes, requests fall outside of the SSA Boundary and thereby, usually initiates an SSA Amendment Request for continued consideration. If negative water quality impacts will occur to designated environmental corridors, a denial of the extension will occur, or recommended mitigation measures (i.e., stormwater management / erosion control devices, etc.) will be attached to the approval.

Utilizing these two methods, a majority of the water quality concerns relating to construction and development can be effectively monitored by ECWRPC for individual projects; thereby, assisting to attain the water quality objectives outlined within the plan's goals. In addition to ECWRPC's role in implementing sewer service area plans, local units of government may exercise other authority conferred upon them by state statute to preserve and protect water quality.

Local units may use this authority to plan and manage land use and development through subdivision, zoning and other development ordinances. Criteria can be written into existing ordinances or new ordinances can be adopted which promote orderly development and address water quality concerns. Additional actions by local units of government which are recommended for water quality protection include the adoption of construction site erosion and stormwater management ordinances and the preservation of greenways along existing drainage corridors.
CHAPTER 4 - SEWER SERVICE AREA PLANNING PROCESS

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

A sewer service area is a geographic area which is currently served or anticipated to be served with sanitary sewers within a 20-year planning period. Sewer service areas, sometimes called "urban service areas," were first delineated for the East Central region in 1978 in the plan New Directions for Growth and Development. In the initial plan, a generalized methodology was used for the estimation and allocation of growth which led to the identification of service area boundaries. Various state and federal guidelines, as well as regional policies, were utilized in the planning process. Since the initial delineation of service areas, the planning and management process has become much more complex and multi-faceted, thus greater detail in the explanation of the updating process is required.

The process of updating and refining sewer service area plans consists of the following major steps:

1. Identification of planning area limits;
2. Delineation of environmentally sensitive areas;
3. Identification and quantification of existing conditions;
4. Refinement of goals, objectives and policies;
5. Forecast of urban growth and re-delineation of service area limits;
6. Public and community input; and
7. Adoption and publication of final plans.

IDENTIFICATION OF PLANNING AREA LIMITS

The first step in delineating sewer service areas is the outlining of broad planning areas which include all feasible options for where urban growth might occur within a 40 to 50 year planning period (through the year 2040). Planning Area boundaries generally include all areas within existing city, village or sanitary district limits. These areas may also include clusters of development and adjacent areas where there is potential for the installation of a sanitary sewerage system in the foreseeable future. Areas which could be serviced by the existing infrastructure (lift station service areas or gravity sewers) are generally included within this boundary. Planning Areas generally extend beyond the existing or potential development areas to the nearest quarter section line or to the edge of a water feature or watershed/drainage basin boundary. Planning areas serve as the study areas for wastewater facilities planning efforts.

DELINEATION OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

Environmentally sensitive areas are geographic areas consisting of all lakes and streams shown on the USGS quadrangle maps and adjacent shoreland buffer areas as defined in Exhibit 8. All wetlands shown on the state Wisconsin Wetland Inventory Maps and floodways as delineated on the official Federal Emergency Management Administration Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps are also designated environmentally sensitive. The environmentally sensitive areas are mapped on the Commission's GIS system and are also shown on the maps contained in this plan.
EXHIBIT 8

ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREA STANDARDS

NAVIGABLE STREAMS & WETLANDS

STREAMS
75' MIN. BUFFER EACH SIDE
100-YEAR FLOODWAY IF WIDER

WETLANDS
WETLAND BOUNDARY

NON-NAVIGABLE STREAMS & DRAINAGEWAYS
DRAINAGE AREA GREATER THAN APPROXIMATELY 2000 ACRES

30' MIN. BUFFER EACH SIDE
120' MIN. TOTAL WIDTH

NON-NAVIGABLE STREAMS & DRAINAGEWAYS
DRAINAGE AREA APPROXIMATELY 300-2000 ACRES

20' MIN. BUFFER EACH SIDE
80' MIN. TOTAL WIDTH

NON-NAVIGABLE STREAMS & DRAINAGEWAYS
DRAINAGE AREA LESS THAN APPROXIMATELY 300 ACRES

15' MIN. BUFFER EACH SIDE
60' MIN. TOTAL WIDTH
The purpose of designating environmentally sensitive areas is to preserve significant environmental features from encroachment by sewered development. Environmentally sensitive areas perform a variety of important environmental functions including stormwater drainage, flood water storage, pollutant entrapment, and the provision of wildlife habitat. They can also provide desirable green space to enhance urban aesthetics.

In the 1978 sewer service area plans only major wetlands as shown on the USGS quadrangle maps were considered environmentally sensitive. Since that time, the Department of Natural Resources through Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-121.05(g)(2)(c), has developed guidelines which serve as minimum criteria for the identification and delineation of environmentally sensitive areas. Department of Natural Resource guidance states, "Environmentally sensitive areas will be used for all environmental features that should be excluded from sanitary sewer service areas."

East Central, after deliberations with technical and policy advisory committees, defined environmentally sensitive areas in a manner that complements existing local, state and federal regulations which protect various environmental amenities. While NR-121 authorizes sewer service area plans to identify a broad array of natural features as environmentally sensitive areas, only those features which were believed vital in the East Central Wisconsin Region to preserve environmental quality were so designated.

Although the delineation of environmentally sensitive areas is intended to provide adequate long term and uniform environmental protection for all sewer service areas within the East Central Wisconsin Region, the environmentally sensitive area classification may be changed in two ways in response to specific local development proposals.

First, the classification can be removed provided that the conditions outlined in Section (E) of the Sewer Service Area Amendment Process are met. This re-designation is considered a major change. Major changes have the potential for significant impacts on water quality and would require the concurrence of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and the Department of Natural Resources before these changes would become effective for the purpose of reviewing sanitary sewer extensions. Examples include:

1. Removal of any mapped wetland area for sewered development, unless resulting from an activity exempted by state administrative rules governing wetland protection [NR-117.05(2)] or state approved rezoning of wetlands;

2. Reduction of a delineated floodway of any navigable stream or river, or removal of any area below the ordinary high water mark of a navigable stream, pond, or lake;

3. Total removal or change in the continuity of any corridor segment including floodways, wetlands, shoreland buffer strips or steep slopes adjacent to water bodies. The water quality benefit that was associated with the portion of the corridor removed must be provided in the development proposal.

In the second instance, the environmentally sensitive areas may be modified by a minor change. Refinements and minor changes would not require prior approval of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission or the Department of Natural Resources. However, East Central would have to be informed of the change before it would be effective for the purposes of reviewing sanitary sewer extensions. East Central would then be responsible for informing the Department of Natural Resources of the change.
Refinements and minor changes are generally of two types. The first type involves changes resulting from revised, improved or more detailed background resource information to include:

a) Improved or revised WDNR certified floodway delineations resulting from revised flood studies;

b) Revised wetland boundaries on the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory Maps resulting from field inspections by WDNR personnel or resulting from an approved rezoning.

c) The second type involves changes which would not seriously affect water quality and are the result of specific development proposals to include:

d) Relocation of a non-navigable stream or drainageway as long as the environmental integrity of the stream or drainageway is preserved;

e) Shortening of a non-navigable stream or drainageway based upon field determination of its point of origin;

f) Adjustments to the widths of shoreland buffer strips along non-navigable streams and drainageways within the guidelines established in Exhibit 4;

g) Changes which would reduce the width of shoreland buffer strips below the minimum guidelines provided there are locally adopted stormwater drainage criteria that establish corridor widths for drainageway preservation. Locally adopted criteria must be based upon sound engineering and environmental protection criteria; and

h) Changes which result from utility or roadway maintenance or construction which meet the criteria set forth in NR-115 or NR-117. It is not the intent of the environmental corridors to prevent or obstruct maintenance, expansion or construction of transportation or utility facilities intended to serve areas outside of the corridors, needed to maintain or improve continuity of those systems, or designed to serve compatible uses in the corridors, such as park shelters or facilities. Facilities intended to serve new sewered residential, commercial or industrial development in the corridors would not be permitted.

It should be noted, that as of the date of this plan, ECWRPC and WDNR staff are considering a revision of the regional definition of Environmentally Sensitive Areas which may include additional features based on water quality concerns. Communities with existing SSAs will be notified and offered an opportunity to give input during this process.

IDENTIFICATION AND QUANTIFICATION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

The ability to inventory existing conditions both quantitatively and qualitatively are paramount to evaluating land use and development trends and impacts. Aerial photos are the basis for conducting land use inventories for the individual SSAs. Comparing aerial photos (land use inventories) at different time intervals can establish trends in types and magnitude of land uses. East Central's 1990 land use inventory had been updated in 1997 and 1998 utilizing more recent photos (where available) or spot field surveys for this purpose.
Acreages for major land use categories have been computer digitized in the Commission’s Geographic Information System. Totals were calculated for each unit of government within the planning area. In conjunction with the land use mapping program, all city and village municipal boundaries, as well as sanitary district limits, were identified and transferred to the sewer service area maps.

Sanitary sewerage systems for all communities have also been identified and mapped in the GIS. The location and size of all sewer collectors, mains, interceptors and forcemains are mapped in detail. In addition, the locations of all lift stations, pump stations and wastewater treatment facilities are shown. These maps are continually updated as new sewer extensions are reviewed by East Central.

Important for analyzing the planning areas, existing urban development areas were delineated as part of the original land use inventory. Urban development areas consist of all concentrations of development within the planning area, together with undeveloped lands which are either sewered or otherwise committed for development. These urban development areas are, in most instances, the minimal land areas which should be designated as sewer service areas.

The urban development areas have been further broken down into areas which are (1) both developed and sewered, (2) developed and unsewered, (3) undeveloped and sewered and (4) undeveloped and unsewered. In order to be classified as sewered, areas must be adjacent to public sewer lines, with the ability to connect either through private laterals or, in certain instances, private sewers. In general, lands within 200 feet of a public sewer are assumed to connect via a private sewer lateral. The existing sewer service area boundaries were also identified and mapped to determine the location and amount of land currently available for development outside of the urban development areas.

In addition to the designations of environmental sensitive areas (shorelands, wetlands and floodways), other areas with natural characteristics that could impact environmental quality or development potential have been identified. These areas have been termed areas with "limiting environmental conditions" and include areas with seasonal high groundwater (within one foot of the surface), floodplain areas, lands with shallow bedrock (within five feet of the surface) and areas with steep slopes (12 percent or greater). Unlike the environmentally sensitive areas, development is not excluded from land with limiting environmental conditions. The primary purpose of identifying these areas is to alert communities and potential developers of environmental conditions which should be considered prior to the development of such an area.

Complementing this information, additional data was collected on existing population, numbers of dwelling units, mixes and densities of residential development, existing employment by type and amount, and densities of industrial and commercial development. Much of this information was available from the 1990 and later census materials; other information was gathered from state and local sources. This data is contained in East Central's information files for each sewer service area.
REFINEMENT OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The conceptual and philosophical bases for sewer service area planning are the goals, objectives and policies. As stated earlier, the service area planning process has become much more complex since it was first initiated. In response to changing conditions, minor refinements have been made over time to the 1985 goals, objectives and policies (Appendix B). This effort was done in order to give direction to decisions involving the amount of growth in a given service area, especially the allocation and location of future growth.

FORECAST OF URBAN GROWTH

The forecasting of urban growth and development within the East Central region involves two primary analytical processes. These are 1) population projections and related dwelling unit and employment estimates, and 2) allocation of land use acreage. This process answers the question of the quantity and location of new growth. The process utilizes the sewer service area policies and various planning and development standards as a technical basis.

Population Projections
Population projections are the key factor in forecasting urban growth. The projections used are the 1990-2020 Department of Administration (DOA) population projections by five year increments for individual counties. DOA utilizes the cohort component method of population projection. These are the official state projections, consistent with U.S. Bureau of Census State of Wisconsin projections. The DOA county projections are required to be used as control totals in accordance with Wis. Admin. Code. NR-121 for the development of sewer service area plans. A detailed description of the population projection process is included in the East Central report Population Characteristics of the East Central Region, April 1994 which is currently being updated by staff. The official DOA projections, first received in 1992, have been updated annually using the DOA annual population estimates for the counties and individual MCD's.

East Central has developed a process for breaking down the county population projections to the minor civil division (MCD) level. This estimating process uses the "share-of-the-county trending methodology." This methodology was used for all communities within the East Central region, with the exception of the Fox Cities, Sherwood and Fond du Lac. In these areas, a special procedure was used which established "urban area" control totals. These control totals were then broken down into Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's) in the Fox Cities and Sherwood areas and Special Analysis Zones (SAZ's) in the Fond du Lac area. This special projection process was needed because of the complex jurisdictional interrelationships of cities, villages and sanitary districts within these areas.

Residential Development
In addition to population projections, household size and housing densities are required to determine residential land needs. Household formation rates were estimated and translated into household size. The household size thus represents a typical dwelling unit which can be compared to population projections for estimating future dwelling units. The household size for the East Central region has been steadily declining and is anticipated to continue to decline. Thus, an anomaly occurs in which a community may not be increasing in population, but still is forming new households which require new housing construction.
Once household size was established, residential development densities and the mixture of single-family/multifamily uses was determined. The number of dwelling units per acre were determined from existing residential development densities for the three major urban areas. These densities were also used for larger outlying urban communities. Several smaller communities in the outlying areas were found to have less dense development and therefore a somewhat lower density was used.

The mix of residential development was determined from development and construction records from various communities as well as census materials for the urbanized area. The residential mix was found to vary greatly from community to community. Community specific mixes were used for freestanding communities; however, standardized splits for the Fox Cities, Sherwood and Fond du Lac areas were developed and applied within the growth forecast method.

Population projections divided by household size established the number of dwelling units. The number of dwelling units by type (single or multifamily) divided by the density per acre resulted in the number of acres of residential land required. The resultant acreage was allocated as residential growth for land areas within each planning area.

**Non-Residential Development**

Forecasts of nonresidential development were also based upon population projections for sewer service area planning. There is, however, a significant difference between the methodology used for the three urban areas and the outlying planning areas. Within the urban areas the population projections served as a basis for estimating future employment. These employment estimates were used in conjunction with documented employment densities (number of employees per acre) for various land use types and employment categories to determine acreage needs for future nonresidential employment. Similar to the household participation rates for calculating dwelling units, labor force participation rates were used to calculate employment for various employment categories. These employment categories were broken down into two types of nonresidential development consisting of commercial and industrial land uses. After future employment was estimated for commercial and industrial uses, densities were applied (employees per acre) and total acres of the land needs were calculated. This acreage was then allocated within particular planning areas.

In the outlying areas, a much simpler process for forecasting nonresidential growth was required because of deficiencies in labor force and employment data available for small communities. Furthermore, because of the small commercial and industrial base of these communities, a refined process for estimating future employment could be subject to extreme error.

Local initiative for promoting development is a greater factor in future growth than statistical trends. A simple forecast method was used which calculated the existing amount of nonresidential development per capita within the area then multiplying this amount by the population growth for the planning period resulting in the amount of non-residential acreage required.

**Growth Allocation**

After the amount of growth is calculated for residential and non-residential uses within each planning area, the process of allocating this growth acreage is undertaken. The allocation process (where growth should occur) is complex, and must integrate service area growth policies, planning standards and criteria as well as historical and market growth trends for a particular planning area. The allocation process establishes the future growth areas within each sewer service area.
A major product of the allocation process is the mapping of growth areas. Again, the Commission's GIS system was used to designate these growth areas. The following criteria and standards were utilized in the designation of growth areas:

1. All areas within a planning area which are currently served with public sanitary sewers shall be designated sewer service areas. Areas along existing and proposed (WDNR approved) sewer collector or interceptor lines (force mains excluded) shall be designated sewer service areas. The depth of the sewer service area boundary line shall be to the average lot depth (maximum 400 feet) bordering the sewer or where average lot depths cannot be distinguished to line 200 feet from the sewer line. Development within this area is generally considered to be serviceable by a private sewer lateral.

2. Unsewered areas of development within close proximity to existing sanitary sewer lines where the cost-effectiveness of the extension of sewers is not questionable shall be included in the service area. These areas have generally been designated as an urban development area.

3. Areas of existing development with approved wastewater facility plans shall be designated sewer service areas. (Note: Various areas of existing development previously designated may have been dropped because of lack of approved wastewater facilities plans.)

4. The acreage allocations of future development areas should approximate residential, commercial and industrial growth projections.

5. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be excluded from the sewer service area.

6. Holding tank service areas shall be designated for existing large holding tanks defined in NR-113 and for areas of existing development where no cost-effective alternative to the installation of a large holding tank is available. The cost-effective analysis is to be prepared by the owner. All large and individual holding tank wastes are to disposed of in accordance with NR-113.

The standards and criteria for allocating future growth areas are policy based. These considerations are:

1. Urban development patterns should incorporate planned areas of mixed use and density that are clustered and compatible with adjacent uses.

2. The allocation of future urban development should maximize the use of existing urban facilities and services.

3. Future urban development should be encouraged to infill vacant developable lands within communities and then staged outward adjacent to existing development limits.

4. Future commercial and industrial development should expand upon existing areas and be readily accessible to major transportation systems.

5. The boundaries of urban development should consider natural and man-made features such as ridge lines, streams and major highways.

6. Residential land use patterns should maximize their accessibility to public and private supporting facilities.
7. Urban development should be directed to land suitable for development and discouraged on unsuitable land, such as floodplains, areas of high bedrock, and areas of high groundwater.

8. Environmentally sensitive areas shall be excluded from the sewer service area to protect water quality.

9. Future urban development should pose no significant adverse impacts to surface or groundwater.

10. Urban development should be located in areas which can be conveniently and economically served by public facilities.

11. The waiver of acreage allocations based on density standards for large lot developments will be considered if the installation of sewers is cost-effective, the community adopts a development plan and subdivision plat for the area specifying no smaller subdivision of parcels will be allowed.

Combined with the policy-based criteria for allocating future development areas were various considerations involving the direction of growth trends and short term "market" factors. These considerations primarily involved experienced judgments by planning staff and consultations with local planning officials.

Early in the planning process, a policy decision was made that the total allocated growth acreage for individual sewer service areas delineated in the 1985 adopted plans and subsequent amendments, would not be reduced in quantity. This policy was applied to all sewer service areas which have a sewerage system or which have WDNR approved wastewater facilities plans for a sewerage system. The impact of this policy is that the areas available for future growth in various sewer service areas sometimes were greater than the updated forecast growth which was to be allocated. The result of this policy is that there were fewer service areas where the existing service area boundaries needed to be expanded.

PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation during the update of the service area plans was encouraged throughout the process. An ad hoc Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed during the initial stages of policy development for the Designated Sewer Service Areas (urban areas) in 1985. This committee met three times at critical stages in the process and provided a significant contribution to the refinement of the goals, objectives and policies.

General public participation from the Fond du Lac urbanized area was sought during and after the process as proposed 2000 Sewer Service Area Plan and boundary maps were completed. Public information meetings were held with local officials within the planning areas and associated sewer service areas. The purpose of sewer service area planning, the planning process, existing conditions of the service area and growth forecasts were explained. In response to any comments received from these meetings, the boundaries of various sewer service areas were modified in accordance with the technical and policy criteria and standards described earlier.
After the preliminary changes were incorporated on the GIS maps, letters and draft maps showing the updated service areas were sent to all communities within the sewer service areas. Communities were notified to respond to East Central before the service areas were addressed by the Regional Development Committee for approval. A final round of these public information meetings was also held prior to adoption by East Central's full Commission.

**ADOPTION AND PUBLICATION OF FINAL PLANS**

Each individual sewer service area is adopted by the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission as an element of the Commission's regional land use plan. After adoption, the plans are submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources for certification as an element of the Water Quality Management Plan. After WDNR certification the plan becomes effective and copies of the final plans are distributed to the affected communities.
The East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has adopted "An Amendment Policy and Procedure For Sewer Service Areas" to enable sewer service area plans to be amended in response to changing conditions and community plans. This procedure provides a flexible, yet equitable and uniform basis for revising sewer service area boundaries. This chapter was updated, with input from the Land Use Advisory Committee, during 1999/2000 as part of addressing policy issues related to the Long-Range Fox Cities, Oshkosh, and Fond du Lac Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum and will apply to the communities illustrated in Exhibit 9. The modified amendment and update procedures were approved by the WDNR in February of 2001.

When an amendment is requested, East Central recommends that a representative from the government entity with Designated Management Agency (DMA) status meet with East Central staff to discuss the proposal prior to submission. Most documentation and questions needed for the evaluation of the amendment can be addressed at that time.

**EAST CENTRAL REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION**

East Central's Regional Development Committee will review the proposed amendment within approximately 30 days of receipt of the request. The review will include a staff evaluation of the consistency of the proposal with East Central's amendment policies and criteria. The review will also include an evaluation of comments and recommendations received from local units of government and agencies notified of the proposal by East Central. The applicant may be requested to appear at the Regional Development Committee meeting if there are significant issues involved. The Regional Development Committee shall recommend approval or disapproval of the amendment. Upon approval, the amendment request and Commission recommendation(s) shall be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to request revision of the applicable Water Quality Management Plan.

**WDNR REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources will review the East Central recommendations for the service area amendment. If the service area amendment does not involve an area greater than 1,000 acres or greater than 5 percent of the total service area the Department should approve the amendment and certify the applicable Water Quality Management Plan within approximately 45 days after submittal. If the proposal is over 1,000 acres or 5 percent of the total service area, and/or if the project involves the development of an Environmentally Sensitive Area the Department may require the preparation of an environmental assessment statement under NR-150 with public comment period on Type 2 Actions. This may lengthen the approval period to three months or greater. Once WDNR decision is made, and if approved, East Central can review sewer extensions and submit comments to the WDNR for sewer extension plan approval.
Exhibit 9 - Sewer Service Area Amendment Standards & Update Procedures Application Area
The formal Sewer Service Area amendment process includes the following elements:

Section I: Amendment Policies

A. Sewer service area boundaries may be modified (acreage swap) provided no increase in the total acreage of the specific sewer service area occurs. Newly added area will have Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) delineated prior to the amendment approval. The land comprised of an ESA will not require a swap for and equal amount of acreage. Acreage swaps may occur on a regional basis within the same sewer service area. (i.e., added and deleted acreage does not have to be within the same community).

B. Sewer service area boundaries may be swapped on an acre for acre basis (vacant, developable lands only) provided a documented need for a sanitary sewer collection system exists for areas of existing urban development. Newly added area will have Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) delineated prior to the amendment approval. The land comprised of an ESA will not require a swap for and equal amount of acreage. Acreage swaps may occur on a regional basis within the same sewer service area (i.e., added and deleted acreage does not have to be within the same community).

C. Sewer service area boundaries may be expanded (overall increase in net developable acreage) provided a documented need for sanitary sewers to serve a proposed unique facility or development exists.

D. Sewer service areas may be expanded (overall increase in net developable acreage) to provide the flexibility to accommodate unanticipated short-term development based upon accelerated growth which exceeds the forecasted total service area growth rate in the plan. The requesting DMA shall have the community(ies) certify that the proposed amendment area is required for reasonable community growth and is consistent with locally adopted land use plans.

E. Sewer service area boundaries may be modified by the re-designation of previously identified environmentally sensitive areas consistent with all the following standards:

1. The environmentally sensitive area is immediately adjacent to an existing sewer service area.

2. Appropriate local, state and federal environmental permits are granted for the proposed development prior to the final approval of the amendment request.

3. Major re-designations shall pose no significant adverse water quality impacts. Major re-designations include:

   a. Removal of any mapped wetland area for sewered development unless resulting from an activity exempted by state administrative rules governing wetland protection [NR 117.05(2)] or state approved rezoning of wetlands.
b. any change which would reduce a delineated floodway of any navigable stream or river, or which would remove any area below the ordinary high water mark of a navigable stream, pond or lake.

c. any change resulting in the total removal or in the continuity of any corridor segment including floodways, wetlands, shoreland buffer strips or steep slopes adjacent to water bodies. The water quality benefit that was associated with the portion of the corridor removed must be provided for in the development.

4. The re-designated acreage will be added to the Sewer Service Area’s total acreage.

F. Sewer service area boundaries may be modified or expanded to correct an error in the maps, data, projections or allocations of the adopted Sewer Service Area Plan.

Section II: Amendment Criteria

Any proposed amendment shall be reviewed according to the following criteria:

A. The cost-effectiveness of the proposed amendment will be compared to other alternatives. East Central may require this determination from the applicant. Amendments submitted under Policy B shall require such a determination from the applicant, and;

B. The environmental impacts of the proposed amendment shall be assessed in accordance with the criteria established in the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources environmental assessment checklist. The Commission will evaluate the ability of the existing sewerage facilities to transport and treat the projected flows and will provide a water quality evaluation statement. East Central may also prescribe safeguards or impose additional conditions deemed necessary to protect the water quality in the area.

C. Amendments within the Urbanized Area SSA's should be consistent with East Central’s Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum’s goals, objectives and policies, particularly for density standards, as follows:

Policy 1.3 conformance:

a) The average net residential density of the buildable plat area is more than or equal to 1 unit per acre, or;

b) The community has illustrated that development proposal meets the density requirements by being part of an overall “mixed density” concept documented in its local land use plan which meets the policy intent. (Note: Should amendments occur over time primarily for low density development which does not meet the one acre requirement, and no higher density development occurs, Section V, Urbanized Area Standard (1)(d) will apply at the next scheduled plan update), and;

c) If an amendment takes place which includes lands planned for residential development, without being platted prior to the amendment, ECWRPC will require an assurance from the community in the form of a resolution stating that the
development will meet these requirements. At the time of platting, ECWRPC will require that a copy of the preliminary plat be submitted for review.

D. Amendment areas under Section I Policy A & D shall have a common boundary with the current sewer service area and shall not create a void within the service area.

E. Policy B (existing development) amendments must be contained within an approved SSA Planning Area. This boundary can be reviewed and considered for modification as a separate process if necessary.

F. Amendment areas under Section I Policy A and B involving the "swap" of land acreage shall, to the extent possible, utilize consistent land use areas on an acre for acre basis, based on the community’s locally adopted and Commission certified Comprehensive Plan. Should the community not have enough of a particular type of land designated in its locally adopted Comprehensive Plan to allow for a swap, the community should consider utilizing the “regional swap” policy prior to submitting the amendment under Policy D. Any community affected by a “regional swap” shall be notified and given an opportunity to comment prior to Commission approval of the amendment.

G. Amendments submitted under Policy C – Unique Facilities, not only fit the definition contained in this plan, but the applicant must also submit additional information which illustrates that all impacts, including secondary land use impacts, and their effects on water quality, transportation, and public service provision be addressed prior to the Commission recommending approval of the amendment. Such amendment requests must also be consistent with locally adopted Comprehensive Plans. Amendments under this policy may be approved conditionally by the Commission so that other necessary approvals can occur concurrently.

Section III: Amendment Procedures

Proposed sewer service area amendments shall be reviewed according to the following procedure:

A. Requests for sewer service area amendments should be made by the governmental entity that has received Designated Management Agency (DMA) status and that will be expected to serve the area. Units of government seeking an amendment to the sewer service area boundary should transmit a letter requesting the amendment to East Central along with the following documentation:

1. A map of the proposed expansion area and, if required, any area to be deleted (swapped) which affects the boundary modification;

2. Estimates of existing and anticipated population, wastewater generation and means of collection from the area;

3. A description of the type of existing development and/or the type of future development expected to occur;
4. Ability of the treatment facility to treat the anticipated wastewater;

5. Methods of stormwater management and regulation for the added service area and surrounding areas which may be impacted; and

6. documentation that all property owners in areas proposed to be deleted (swapped) were notified of this request by the unit of government seeking the amendment.

7. Plan Commission or Board action as required under Section I - Policy D.

8. Amendments submitted under Section 1 - Policy B will require that additional information be submitted and criteria be met as follows:

   a) Documentation that the community’s locally adopted Comprehensive Plan illustrates the area as a future urban growth area which will be provided a full range of services as spelled out in the Urbanized Area Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum’s density standards, and;

   b) A determination of the cost-effectiveness of providing public sanitary sewer versus on-site system replacement. This determination should be consistent with NR-110 requirements, and;

   c) Documentation that at approximately 30% of the existing on-site systems within the proposed amendment area be considered failing (direct need), and;

   d) Documentation that approximately 30% or more of the balance of existing on-site systems within the proposed amendment area are subject to failure based on the physical condition of the on-site system itself and / or the physical characteristics of the subject site (indirect need);

   Documentation for c) and d) above can be in the form of: copies of County or State orders for on-site system replacement; copies of existing on-site system inspection reports; letters from the County Sanitarian indicating that the systems are failing or have the potential to fail; or documentation of recent private well tests which show bacterial contamination likely resulting from on-site system failure.

B. Based on this information the Regional Development Committee, designated as the review committee by the East Central's bylaws, will review the proposed amendment to determine whether it meets the standards set forth in the Sewer Service Area Amendment Process. If no significant adverse water quality impacts are involved, the East Central shall recommend approval of the Plan amendment and submit it to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources for State plan certification.
Section IV: Appeal

If an applicant feels that a hardship exists in the strict interpretation and application of the amendment standards and criteria, consideration may be given to providing relief through a variance subject to the following requirements:

A. The hardship to the community is significant and widespread owing to substantial pre-existing financial or legal commitments for sanitary sewer service.

B. The major objectives of the sewer service area plans can be met.

C. The appeal shall be submitted to the Chairman of East Central for action at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Commission. Further appeals may be submitted to Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Section V: SSA Plan Update Procedures and Standards

Even though local, regional, and state levels of government engage in planning activities to direct their future, individual or multiple conditions can change over time. Some can be predicted and handled proactively (Comm. 83, demographics, etc.), while some occur rapidly and generally without much warning (economic conditions, regional growth patterns and rates, market demands, etc.). Sewer Service Area Plans are meant to be a proactive type of plan which identifies future sewer growth areas based on cost-effectiveness service provision, water quality, and regional cooperation/coordination. When conditions change, these plans need to be updated to reflect those changes. This section describes the conditions under which Sewer Service Area Plans are updated and how previously developed and approved regional goals, objectives, and policies (i.e. Urbanized Area Long Range Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum) will apply prior to, during, or after the Update process.

Minimum Update Procedures and Standards (for all Sewer Service Areas)

SSA Plans will be updated on an approximate 5-year interval. Funding, staff availability, urban growth demands, and regional/state policy changes/proposals may alter this time interval. When updated, the following items will be addressed:

1) A review and update of population, housing, and employment trends and projections;

2) A review and update of land use demands based on socio-economic conditions and projections;

3) A review and update of existing physical conditions, including:
   (a) Existing land uses
   (b) Proposed land uses (based on local, county, regional, and state plans)
   (c) Water quality and natural resource (ESA) characteristics, changes, and issues;

4) A description of relevant events since the last plan update pertaining to sanitary sewer or having an impact on future sewer service, including:
   (a) Major WWTF improvements or changes;
   (b) Major collection system improvements or changes;
Local governmental changes (i.e., sanitary district formations, intergovernmental boundary / service agreements, Comprehensive Plan updates, regulations and requirements, etc.)
SSA Plan amendments and acreage consumption since the last plan update

5) A review and modification of mapping elements, if necessary, to accommodate future sewered growth and development, including:
   (a) Proposed major sewer system improvements and/or regional connections
   (b) A revised twenty-year Sewer Service Area Boundary;
   (c) A revised forty-fifty year Planning Area Boundary;
   (d) Environmentally Sensitive Areas

6) A review of local governmental actions and regulations which have implemented the Sewer Service Area Plan;

7) An update of citizen information/education and participation efforts;

8) A review of the institutional structure for plan update and amendment review and approval and for plan implementation;

9) A review / revision of goals, objectives, and policies, if necessary;

10) The development of recommendations and strategies for plan implementation.

Urbanized Area Procedures & Standards
The Urbanized Area Procedures and Standards will apply to the following communities: City of Appleton, City of Kaukauna, Village of Combined Locks, Village of Kimberly, Village of Little Chute, Town of Buchanan, Town of Grand Chute, Town of Greenville, Town of Kaukauna, Town of Vandenbroek, City of Menasha, Village of Sherwood, Town of Harrison, City of Fond du Lac, Village of North Fond du Lac, Town of Calumet, Town of Empire, Town of Fond du Lac, Town of Friendship, Town of Taycheedah, City of Neenah, City of Oshkosh, Town of Algoma, Town of Black Wolf, Town of Menasha, Town of Neenah, Town of Nekimi, Town of Oshkosh, Town of Vinland.

The Urbanized Area Standards and Procedures include the above listed “Minimum” items, plus the following reviews of local conformance with policies and requirements as spelled out in the Urbanized Area Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum, including:

1) Addendum Policy 1.3 Conformance - A review of local development densities within the SSA occurring between plan updates and their conformance with the minimum residential density requirement will need to be met as follows:

   (a) Areas within the SSA prior to WDNR certification date of the 1997 (or subsequent) Sewer Service Area Plan Update are not required to meet this policy, however; ECWRPC staff will consider new residential developments which have occurred after this date as part of the overall density calculation (therefore this will not penalize communities for recent development meeting the criteria and being “banked” for lower densities elsewhere within the SSA).

   (b) Areas allocated and approved as part of the 1997 (or subsequent) Plan Update are required to meet policy
Areas amended to SSA after 1997 update are **required** to meet policy (see SSA Plan Amendment Policies and Procedures section for additional information).

If an individual community does not meet the density requirements spelled out in the Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum it will not be eligible for additional Sewer Service Area acreage allocations in subsequent plan updates.

2) **Addendum** Policy 1.4 – A review of local unsewered development patterns and locations and advisory recommendations pertaining to such information;


Section VI: Definitions

Sewer Service Area: An area defined and approved by the WDNR under Wisconsin Administrative Code, NR-121 with the assistance, and recommendation from, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and input from the communities involved and the general public. This boundary delineates areas which can be provided public sanitary sewer more cost-effectively than on-site treatment methods over a 20-year period. ECWRPC determines this boundary based on the following information (all of which are not necessarily listed in NR-121):

1. Definition and mapping of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs);

2. Justified acreage allocations based on projected 20-year growth and development using ECWRPC accepted methodologies;

3. Projected available 20-year capacity of wastewater treatment plant from publicly sewered development and established holding tank receiving areas;

4. Facilities Plan listed projects and improvements;

5. Projected available 20-year capacity of interceptor sewers, force-mains, and lift stations;

6. Location of existing sanitary sewer lines;

7. Existing and projected 20-year development patterns (based on local land use plan and zoning maps);

8. Proximity to development with known failing privately owned treatment works (POTWs) (also referred to as on-site wastewater treatment systems)

9. Ability to provide recommended levels of urban service per the Addendum matrices. (This would be addressed further as criteria for future allocations and amendments to the SSA).

10. Intergovernmental growth / service agreements (advisory only)
11. The SSA boundary itself is located, for administrative use, on the location of:

   a) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs);
   b) Watershed, sub-watershed, and drainage basin boundaries;
   c) One lot depth (200-foot) buffer from existing sewer line locations;
   d) Quarter-section lines based on the Public Land Survey System (PLSS);
   e) MCD and Sanitary District Boundaries
   f) Road centerlines;
   g) Lift station service areas (topography and depth)
   h) Gravity and interceptor sewer service areas (topography and depth)

Sewer Service Area Planning Area: An area defined and approved by the WDNR under Wisconsin Administrative Code, NR-121 with the assistance, and recommendation from, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission and input from the communities involved and the general public. This is an area where urban growth is anticipated to occur over a longer period of time (40 to 50 years) where short-term conflicting land use development should be discouraged. This boundary serves the purpose of delineating long-term (40-50 year), cost-effective, urban growth areas. ECWRPC determines this boundary based on the following information (all of which are not necessarily listed in NR-121):

1. Definition and mapping of Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs);

2. Justified acreage allocations based on projected 50-year growth and development using ECWRPC accepted methodologies;

3. Projected available 50-year capacity of wastewater treatment plant from publicly sewered development and establish holding tank receiving areas;

4. Projected available 50-year capacity of interceptor sewers, force-mains, and lift stations;

5. Existing and projected 20-year development patterns (based on local land use plan and zoning maps);

6. Location of existing development with known problems, or potential risk for on-site system failures;

7. Intergovernmental growth / service agreements

8. The boundary itself is located, for administrative use, on the location of:

   a) Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs)
   b) Watershed, sub-watershed, and drainage area boundaries,
   c) Nearest quarter-section line of the Public Land Survey System (PLSS);
   d) MCD and Sanitary District boundaries;
   e) Wastewater treatment plant service areas (when multiple plants available);
   f) Road centerlines;
   g) Lift station service areas (topography and depth)
   h) Interceptor sewer service areas (topography and depth)
i) Extraterritorial review jurisdiction of involved incorporated communities (this would be utilized only at the discretion of all affected communities.)

Existing Urban Development: A geographic area with densities of development suitable for the efficient and economic provision of urban services such as sanitary sewer, water, transportation and storm drainage. (e.g. single family residential development greater than two units per gross acre)

Unique Facility: A proposed facility that, regardless of location, is considered to be “unanticipated”; and is of “regional importance”. “Unanticipated” is defined as not being illustrated in a local community’s or county’s Comprehensive Plan, and was not anticipated or projected in the Sewer Service Area Plan during the previous update. “Regional importance” is defined as facility which, if constructed, will provide a widespread benefit to multiple local governmental jurisdictions within the Sewer Service Area. Examples of facilities fitting this criteria include state prisons, county landfills, regional public specialty facilities such as EAA, public museums or performing arts centers, churches, private (commercial) specialty facilities such as the Kaukauna dog track, opportunistic park/recreation/open space acquisitions, public golf courses, other state or federal facilities as deemed appropriate. Not eligible are any type of school facility, local government administrative office or facility, residential golf course developments, local parks, private campgrounds, local airports or related facilities. These types and locations of future facilities should be addressed, and their needs quantified, in the communities local land use plans and the sewer service area plan update process. These listings may be added to from time to time based on individual SSA Plan Amendment proposals. Those specific facilities not listed above would be reviewed based on their merits and conformance with the intent of this definition.

Expansion Area: The geographic area proposed to be added to the existing sewer service area through the amendment process.

Cost-effectiveness: Analysis of the long term costs for providing sanitary sewerage system alternatives. The analysis shall include monetary costs, environmental costs, as well as other non-monetary costs consistent with NR-110.

Environmentally Sensitive Area: Geographic areas consisting of all lakes and streams shown on USGS quadrangle maps and their adjacent shoreland buffer areas. Also all wetlands shown on the state Wisconsin Wetland Inventory Maps and floodways as delineated on the official Federal Emergency Management Administration Flood Boundary and Floodway Maps.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Meeting Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/30/97</td>
<td>Notice of SSA and Land Use / Transp. Plan Update project initiation sent to communities. (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/97</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Town of Empire &amp; Excel Engineering to discuss projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/97</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Outlying Sewer Users Group (OSG) to introduce project / coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/10/97</td>
<td>Meeting w/ OSG Technical Committee to coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/21/97</td>
<td>Meeting w/ T. Empire at ECWRPC to continue discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ T. Empire &amp; Excel Engineering at Excel - SSA Plan and Land Use Plan coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/24/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ T. Friendship Land Use Plan Committee to introduce SSA and discuss relationship to Land Use Plan (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/03/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ T. Empire (Sanitary Districts) &amp; Excel Engineering to discuss proposed SSA Update Allocation Areas and Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/30/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Johnsburg Sanitary District Commissioners to discuss: SSA Plan Update; ECWRPC Roles, and provide Facilities Plan demographic data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/11/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ City of Fond du Lac Staff to discuss SSA Plan Update and coordination aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/24/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ OSG to discuss progress, coordination aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20/98</td>
<td>Johnsburg Sanitary District Meeting at ECWRPC offices (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ City of Fond du Lac representatives to discuss initial projections, SSA maps, and issues related to the Johnsburg Sanitary District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ City of Fond du Lac and Town of Fond du Lac Sanitary Districts to discuss potential sewered development areas (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/28/98</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Towns of Taycheedah, Calumet &amp; Brothertown (also Johnsburg S.D., St. Peter S.D., T. Taycheedah S.D. #1 &amp; T. Calumet S.D. #1) to discuss acreage projections and potential sewered development areas (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/23/99</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Johnsburg S.D. President to discuss Facilities Plan and other issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/12/99</td>
<td>Meeting w/ WDNR staff and City of Fond du Lac (in Madison) to discuss OSG Agreement &amp; Facilities Planning issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/13/99</td>
<td>Meeting with WDNR and St. Peter S.D. &amp; Engineers to discuss Facilities Plan issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/99</td>
<td>Meeting w/ Fond du Lac County Sanitarian regarding failing on-site system issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/13/99</td>
<td>Meeting with Town of Friendship and Village of North Fond du Lac officials (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Meeting Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/00</td>
<td>Meeting with T. Friendship, T. Fond du Lac, and V. North Fond du Lac officials to discuss changes to proposed SSA boundary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/00</td>
<td>Public Informational Meeting / Open House at Fond du Lac City/County Building (public noticed) - No comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/00</td>
<td>Public Hearing in Conjunction with the ECWRPC Regional Development Committee meeting (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/00</td>
<td>ECWRPC full Commission meeting and approval (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/08/00</td>
<td>Meeting with Town of Taycheedah, Foth &amp; Van Dyke and representatives of St. Peter and Johnsburg Sanitary Districts to discuss potential modifications to SSA Plan Update.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/00</td>
<td>Public Hearing in Conjunction with the ECWRPC Regional Development Committee meeting (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/00</td>
<td>ECWRPC full Commission meeting and re-approval of modified plan update (public noticed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETING
& PUBLIC HEARING NOTICE

Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update

The East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (ECWRPC) will be holding a Public Informational Meeting on the draft Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan update. The Public Informational Meeting will be held in an "open house" format from 4:30 p.m. to 7:30 P.M., Tuesday, April 18th, 2000, with a brief formal presentation being given at 5:30 p.m. The meeting will be held at the Fond du Lac City/County Building, 160 Macy Street, Rooms F and G (1st Floor), Fond du Lac, Wisconsin.

The Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update was developed by ECWRPC over the past three years with the assistance of the affected communities. ECWRPC developed the plan update under the guidance of Wisconsin Administrative Code NR-121 through a contract agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. This plan updates the 1992 plan and identifies areas which could cost-effectively be provided public sanitary sewer over the next twenty years (year 2020). The plan also identifies Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) which would preclude future sewered development.

All citizens and local officials of the affected communities, which include: the Town of Black Wolf (Winnebago County); the Towns of Friendship, Fond du Lac, Empire, Taycheedah, and Calumet, the Village of North Fond du Lac, and the City of Fond du Lac (Fond du Lac County); and, the Town of Brothertown (Calumet County), are invited to review and comment on the draft Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan map and materials. These materials are available for public review prior to the April 18th meeting at either the City of Fond du Lac Community Development Office, 4th Floor, Fond du Lac City/County Building, 160 Macy Street, or at the ECWRPC offices located at 132 Main Street, 3rd Floor, Menasha, Wisconsin. You may also contact Eric Fowle or Joe Huffman at (920) 751-4770 for more information.

In addition, a public hearing will be held prior to plan review/approval by the Commission's Regional Development Committee (RDC) on April 19th, 2000 at 9:30 a.m. at the ECWRPC offices located at 132 Main Street (3rd Floor), Menasha, Wisconsin. A final opportunity for comment will be provided at the Commission's quarterly meeting scheduled for 1:30 p.m. on Friday, April 28th, 2000 at the Menominee Bingo Casino Hotel, STH 47/55, Keshena, Wisconsin.

Verbal or written comments regarding the draft plan must be received no later than 4:00 p.m., Thursday, April 27th, 2000, and should be addressed to: Eric Fowle, ECWRPC, 132 Main Street, Menasha, Wisconsin, 54952.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing (Town, Village, Citizen, Organization, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Al Safter</td>
<td>T. Calumet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. John B. Leonhard</td>
<td>City of Fond du Lac Utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wayne Rollin</td>
<td>City of Fond du Lac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rich Blouviot</td>
<td>HNTB (City)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mark Randall</td>
<td>DNR - Wildlife Biologist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 7. |
| 8. |
| 9. |
| 10. |
| 11. |
| 12. |
| 13. |
| 14. |
| 15. |
| 16. |
| 17. |
| 18. |
| 19. |
| 20. |
| 21. |
| 22. |
| 23. |
| 24. |
| 25. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(d)</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Phone/Letter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/06/00</td>
<td>DuWayne Klessig</td>
<td>Calumet County</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Concerns on T. Brothertown Allocation - not in Subdiv. Ord. “growth area” - agreements not to extend further previously made? Will bring to 4/7/00 P&amp;Z Committee for some discussion and will get back to me. I will check OSG agreement, Sub. Ord. “growth area” and previous minutes regarding future extensions (talk to Harlan also). Also check old “Stockbridge” study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/07/00</td>
<td>Wayne Rollin</td>
<td>C. Fond du Lac</td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Initial editorial comments on draft - I responded that we will look into them. Will send additional comments as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10/00</td>
<td>Kathryn Bullon</td>
<td>T. Fond du Lac</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Schedule meeting prior to 4/28 (possibly 4/18?) to discuss details of draft map. She will get back to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/00</td>
<td>Dr. Franz Schmitz</td>
<td>Johnsburg S.D.</td>
<td>Letter</td>
<td>Concurs with current plan - looks forward to future inclusion in SSA pending P.F. approval - interested in any concerns by the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/11/00</td>
<td>DuWayne Klessig</td>
<td>Calumet Co.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Discussed above Calumet Co. concern w/ P&amp;Z Committee - no direction - Eric will call Town of Brothertown - possibly remove area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/00</td>
<td>Mike Burns</td>
<td>Flood Mobile Hm. (T. Friend. SD #3)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Concerns on NR-150 EA process &amp; approval timeframes - would like to meet regarding potential interim amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/00</td>
<td>Wayne Rollin</td>
<td>C. Fond du Lac</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Review of Technical comments + St. Agnes Convent change (will be at Tues. mtg. W/info) - Also, Johnsburg issue not to be pressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/00</td>
<td>Dr. Franz Schmitz</td>
<td>Johnsburg S.D.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Acknowledged receipt of letter and informed him of conversation with W. Rollin regarding city's intent not to press P.A. issues at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/13/00</td>
<td>Jeanold Puetz</td>
<td>T. Brothertown</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Discussed county concerns. Would like to leave it in. Would like to see sewer extended further north to existing homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/00</td>
<td>Mike Burns</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td></td>
<td>Met w/ to discuss SSA approval timeframes and concerns. Looking at future 2000 sewer installation - Eric will contact with suggested method for proceeding (i.e., amendment, approval contingent on no connections, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/14/00</td>
<td>Kathryn Bullon</td>
<td>T. FDL / V.NFDL</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Called to schedule meeting with T. FDL and V. NFDL representatives to discuss draft SSA Plan. Scheduled for 2 p.m. April 18th.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/00</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>T. FDL / V. NFDL &amp; T. Friendship</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Meeting @ Katherine Bullon's office to discuss SSA boundary modifications based on local plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/18/00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Informational Meeting - No comments (SSA Plan approved with potential for Brothertown area to be removed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/00</td>
<td>Regional Development Committee Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No verbal comments submitted - 1 written comment submitted (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/19/00</td>
<td>Wayne Rollin</td>
<td>C. Fond du Lac</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Concurs with SSA configuration - concerns on population/development projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/00</td>
<td>Al Boneil</td>
<td>Citizen - T. Brothertown</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Landowner in T. Brothertown preferred that allocation area be removed from final SSA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/25/00</td>
<td>DuWayne Klessig</td>
<td>Calumet Co.</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Issue resolved if T. Brothertown allocation is removed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/28/00</td>
<td>Full Commission Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/27/00</td>
<td>Regional Development Committee Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional comments received on proposed modifications to add Johnsburg S. D. / St. Peter S.D. and C. FDL addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/27/00</td>
<td>Full Commission Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No additional comments received on proposed modifications to add Johnsburg S. D. / St. Peter S.D. and C. FDL addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
April 18, 2000

Mr. Eric Fowle
ECWRPC
132 Main Street
Menasha, WI 54952-3100

Dear Eric:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the 2000 Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Update. City staff has reviewed the proposed map, and with the minor technical changes that we have discussed, we have no objection to the map.

We do, however, wish to comment again about the basic methodology utilized to arrive at the acreage allocations. Population projections are translated into acreage projections, which are then mapped. This is a rational process, but it is flawed from the beginning due to the use of inadequate population projections. These projections have been the source of comment from many municipalities, including Fond du Lac. We have pointed out since 1990 that the population projections for our community have been too low. As our growth has continued, we have consistently exceeded ten-year growth projections within five years or less. We expect that this will occur again over the next several years.

For the record, we object to the population projections used within an otherwise rational process. We have no objection to the mapping itself, and extend our congratulations to you and Joe for a job well done.

Sincerely,

Wayne Rolfin, AICP
Community Development Director

Co: Stephen T. Nemonen, City Manager
The meeting was called to order by Donald De Groot at 9:40 A.M.

Those Committee members present were:
Donald De Groot .................................................................................................... Outagamie County
Joe Maehl ............................................................................................................Winnebago County
Lester Van Loon ......................................................................................................Waushara County
Clarence Wolf.............................................................................................................. Calumet County
Donald Wilson ...........................................................................................................Waushara County
Richard Wollangk ....................................................................................................Winnebago County

Those Committee members absent were:
Ken Hurlbut ..............................................................................................................Waupaca County

Other persons in attendance were:
Wayne Rollin ........................................................................................................ City of Fond du Lac
John Loehnard ....................................................................................................... City of Fond du Lac
Mary Nordin ..................................................................................................... Nordin/Peterson Assoc.
Matt Pleshak .................................................................................................... Nordin/Peterson Assoc.
Harlan P. Kiesow ...........................................................................................................ECWRPC Staff
Eric Fowle .................................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff

1. Roll Call / Introductions
Donald De Groot acknowledged the committee members present and identified those who were absent.

2. Shawano Lake SSA Plan Amendment (Belle Plaine / Waukechon Utility District)
Mr. Eric Fowle presented background information on the amendment request by the Belle Plaine-Waukechon Utility District. The proposed amendment would add approximately 123 total acres of land (92 vacant) to the SSA along the western side of the STH 22/29 interchange. In exchange, approximately 92 vacant acres would be removed from an area east of the Wolf River, south of the existing High School, within the Town of Waukechon. Mr. Fowle stated that the proposed project would extend a new gravity sewer line comprised of segments of 8-inch, 10-inch and 12-inch sewers to service proposed commercial development in the southwest quadrant of the interchange. Mr. Fowle noted a meeting was held with the towns and their engineers to discuss details of the proposal and to rectify staff's concern's regarding the cost-effectiveness of using the new gravity line versus connecting to the existing Bonduel forcemain.

Mr. Fowle also stated that concerns were brought up by the City of Shawano via a phone conversation between himself and Mr. Jim Stadtler, City Administrator. These concerns related mainly to the provision of municipal water to the new development. Mr. Fowle noted that the Utility District is currently involved in a water study with the Richmond Sanitary District. The City may be willing to extend water to this area, without annexation, if the proposed development meets the City's development requirements. Mr. Fowle explained that, although the city's concerns were valid, they were beyond the scope of East Central's SSA Amendment criteria.

There being little discussion on the matter, Joe Maehl moved to approve the amendment as proposed. Clarence Wolf made the second. Motion passed unanimously.
3. **Fond du Lac SSA Amendment Request - Town of Taycheedah S.D. #1**

This item was tabled at a previous meeting of the RDC. It was removed from future agendas at the request of Dan Duester, Town of Taycheedah Sanitary District No. 1. Motion made by Clarence Wolf to remove the agenda item. Don Wilson made the second. Motion approved unanimously.

4. **Informational Session and Public Hearing on the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update**

Mr. Fowle presented background information on the draft Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan update including population, housing, and employment projections. Mr. Fowle summarized timeframes, meetings, and discussions which occurred during the update process. Additional information was distributed regarding specific comments made by communities on the draft map. Mr. Fowle summarized these proposed changes to the draft map and also informed the committee of a still pending issue within Calumet County in regards to the proposed addition of acreage within the Town of Brothertown. Mr. Fowle noted a telephone conversation just prior to today’s meeting with Mr. Duane Klessig of Calumet County. That discussion lead to a proposal that the land allocated to the Town of Brothertown stay in the SSA, as proposed, until the County Planning and Zoning Committee meets in May, to discuss the issue in more detail. Should the conclusion be made that it be removed from the SSA, Mr. Fowle would contact the WDNR immediately to request that it be disregarded in terms of their review and approval. Mr. Fowle also noted that the WDNR would likely initiate an Environmental Assessment process under NR-150 due to the inclusion of more than 1,000 acres to the SSA.

Mr. Fowle noted concerns from communities regarding the population projections and stated that given the current configuration of the SSA and recent/planned projects within the urbanized area such as the new USH 151 bypass, new high school, and an aggressive economic development program, staff expects future growth to exceed the projections. The point is somewhat moot due to the inclusion of an additional 2,800 acres of vacant, developable land to the SSA. Additionally, with the recent approval of the Outlying Sewer Users Group agreement and the previous Town/City Growth Agreement, it is likely that additional growth will occur due to the new-found “stability” of political concerns regarding annexations. Henceforth, the additional acreage added to the SSA is felt to be justified from staff’s perspective.

Mr. Fowle stated that a Public Information Meeting was also held on the evening of April 17th, 2000 with minimal attendance and no comments. Mr. Fowle offered an opportunity for additional public comment. Mr. Wayne Rollin stated that the City of Fond du Lac appreciated the effort made by East Central to conduct and complete the update and that the City was supportive of the draft configuration. No other comments were made.

5. **Proposed Resolution No. 11-00: Approval of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update**

Mr. Fowle noted the previous comments regarding the draft SSA map. Mr. Wollangk made a motion to approve Resolution 11-00 and the Fond du Lac SSA Plan update with changes incorporated as discussed previously and contingent on the resolution of the Calumet County/Town of Brothertown issue. Motion seconded by Don Wilson. Motion approved unanimously.

6. **Other Business**

There being no additional business the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 A.M.
I. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

II. **MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION**

III. **ROLL CALL**

Due to the absence of Chair Claire Alexander and Vice-Chair Donald De Groot, the meeting of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission was called to order by Acting Chair Norm Weiss at 1:30 P.M. Roll call was taken showing the following attendance:

**Commission Members Present**

Merlin Gentz ................................................................. Calumet County
Wilma Springer ............................................................ Calumet County
Walter Cacic .................................................................. Marquette County
Brian Kowalkowski ....................................................... Menominee County
Ruth Winter ................................................................. Menominee County
Robert “Toby” Paltzer ................................................ Outagamie County
Marvin Fox (Alt. for Sally Mielke) .............................. Outagamie County
Timothy Hanna ............................................................ Outagamie County
Alfred Krause ............................................................... Outagamie County
Arlyn Tober ............................................................... Shawano County
M. Eugene Zeuske ........................................................ Shawano County
Clarence Natzke .......................................................... Shawano County
Duane Brown ............................................................... Waupaca County
La Verne Grunwald ..................................................... Waupaca County
Ken Hurlbut ............................................................... Waupaca County
Norman Weiss ............................................................ Waushara County
Lester Van Loon .......................................................... Waushara County
Yvonne Feavel (Alt. for George Sorenson) .................. Waushara County
Joseph Maehl .............................................................. Winnebago County
Ernie Bellin ................................................................. Winnebago County
Richard Wollangk (Alt. for Jon Dell’Antonia) .............. Winnebago County

**Commission Members Absent**

Clarence Wolf ............................................................ Calumet County
Howard Zellmer ........................................................ Marquette County
Claire Alexander ........................................................ Marquette County
Don Wilson ............................................................... Marquette County
Randy Reiter ............................................................. Menominee County
Donald De Groot ......................................................... Outagamie County
Jane Van De Hey ........................................................ Winnebago County
Arden Schroeder ........................................................ Winnebago County
Staff Members Present

Harlan Kiesow ........................................................................................................ Executive Director
Ann Z. Schell ........................................................................................................ Assistant Director
Fred Scharnke ........................................................................................................... Principal Planner
Eric Fowle .................................................................................................................. Associate Planner
Ed Kleckner ................................................................................................................... Associate Planner
Betty Nordeng ............................................................................................................. Planner
Kathy Thunes ............................................................................................................... Planner
Elizabeth Runge ......................................................................................................... Planner
Tom Faella .................................................................................................................. Information Technology Manager
Vicky Johnson ............................................................................................................. Administrative Specialist
Elizabeth Knaack ....................................................................................................... Financial Specialist

Others Present

James Schuette ........................................................................................................ Outagamie County

Mr. Kiesow announced the newly elected commissioners and introduced those who were present.

IV. MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 28, 2000 MEETING

Mr. Van Loon motioned to approve the minutes of the January 28, 2000 meeting, seconded by Mr. Wollangk. The motion was passed unanimously.

V. BUSINESS

A. Steering Committee


Mr. Van Loon motioned to accept the Summaries of Proceedings for the January 28 and March 17, 2000 meetings. The motion was seconded by Ms. Springer and passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the CY 1999 Audit Report

Paul Denis briefly explained that the name of the auditing firm has changed from Jonet & Fountain to Schenck & Associates. He stated the audit report is summarized in the management letter. The ending fund balance is 27% of next year’s budget, which is where he felt it should be.

Mr. Wollangk motioned for approval of the CY 1999 Audit Report, seconded by Mr. Maehl, passing unanimously.

3. Proposed Resolution No. 12-00: Authorizing the Commission to Enter into an Agreement with Carlson Dettmann Associates to Perform a Classification and Compensation Study
Mr. Kiesow referred to the summary of the salary study contract proposal included in the packet. He indicated that this study was discussed at the Steering Committee level and approved. A number of firms within the State were contacted who do this type of work. Carlson & Dettmann from Madison had the most experience with units of government. Carlson & Dettmann are proposing to do a study of the positions at East Central, the system that is being used for salaries and how it is administered, and coming back with recommendations. The study will be completed by the beginning of July in order to incorporate any aspects of the study, into the planning program budget for next year. The cost of the study is $7,500. Recommendations will be brought back to the Commission at the July meeting.

Mr. Cacic questioned why the study was being done. Mr. Kiesow replied that some of the positions were experiencing turnover and part of the turnover was related to salary levels. Also the system of salary advances was of concern to some employees.

Mr. Wollangk motioned to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 12-00, seconded by Ms. Winter. Passed unanimously.

4. Smart Growth Conference report

Mr. Kiesow stated that there was a Governor's Conference on Comprehensive Planning in January with attendance of approximately 700 people from around the State. This conference explained the basics behind the legislation and some of the things coming up. The Council of Regional Planning Organizations, of which East Central is the host agency, also put on six regional conferences around the state to further explain this comprehensive planning legislation, answer questions, and discuss how to go about approaching/dealing with the planning that is involved in this legislation. Mr. Kiesow explained that what the legislation states is that any unit of government that is going to be dealing with land use decisions, zoning ordinances, official maps, subdivision regulations, floodplain regulations, etc. needs to prepare a comprehensive plan before the year 2010 in order to implement those ordinances. The comprehensive plan should contain specific criteria. If a comprehensive plan is not prepared by 2010, then a zoning ordinance cannot be administered.

Mr. Kiesow explained that the other part of the program states that there is some funding that will be available from a couple of different sources. The first round of funding, from the Transportation Department, for the transportation portion of this type of planning is in the works right now. More funds should be available this year through other programs. Regional Planning Commissions also have until 2010 to develop a regional plan under the same guidelines. At the State level the Governor has formed the Wisconsin Land Council to oversee the program. The Council is now developing guidelines on this particular issue and funding and will present these to the communities.

B. Economic Development Committee


Mr. Brown stated the Chairman's Report and Summary of Proceedings for the Economic Development Committee were distributed prior to the meeting, and motioned for acceptance, seconded by Mr. Zeuske. Passed unanimously.

C. Open Space and Environmental Management Committee


2. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 11, 2000 meeting.
Mr. Natzke indicated the Chairman’s Report and the Summary of Proceedings for the Open Space and Environmental Management Committee were in the packet and motioned for acceptance of them. Mr. Krause seconded the motion. Unanimously passed.

3. Proposed Resolution No. 10-00: Authorizing the Commission to Enter into an Agreement for Preparing a Geographic Information Systems Inventory Project for the Wolf Basin Geographic Management Unit (WDNR)

Mr. Fowle stated Proposed Resolution No. 10-00 is a contract between the Commission and the Department of Natural Resources, more specifically the Wolf Basin Geographic Management Unit. Mr. Fowle explained that the project is a GIS oriented project, to be used as a tool in the future not only by the basin and the partners within that basin, but also by East Central. The GMU team received $25,000 from a Great Lakes National Program grant and East Central will serve as the contractor for the project. The intent of the project is mainly an inventory of existing geographic information systems data within the Wolf Basin boundaries. A portion of the boundaries do extend outside of East Central’s region, so East Central will be partnering with other RPCs and possibly some of the counties. A Technical Advisory Committee will clarify the inventory and data items will be discussed by that committee for inclusion on a final product. The final product is envisioned as a CD-ROM that would be distributed to key people within the basin for use as environmental based data for decision making. Mr. Fowle stated that this is as much a process as it is a product, and that this type of work should be continued for the other two major river basins within East Central’s region.

Mr. Fowle explained East Central would be matching $5,000 of its money to this program, essentially that would provide staff oversight and planning work. Those dollars would come out of the Open Space update project budget. The grant requires a limited term employee position, to work totally on this project.

Mr. Fowle noted he is now Chair of the Fox-Wolf Basin Advisory Council, which is a group of partners of various entities that are looking at ways that they can not only assist the GMU teams but each other in the work planning efforts.

The Open Space and Environmental Management Committee and the Steering Committee have approved this resolution.

A brief discussion followed concerning the types of data collected and the fact that this would involve existing data not new data.

Mr. Kiesow stressed to the Commissioners that this would involve hiring a limited-term employee for the duration of the project. Upon completion of the project, funding sources would be looked at and a decision would have to be made whether this position would be continued.

Mr. Cacic motioned for approval of Proposed Resolution No. 10-00, seconded by Ms. Feavel. Motion passed unanimously.

D. Regional Development Committee


Mr. Maehl stated the Summary of Proceedings for the Regional Development Committee was handed out prior to the meeting. He made a motion to accept the proceedings and the Chairman’s Report, seconded by Mr. Wollangk. Passed unanimously.

**3. Proposed Resolution No. 11-00: Updating the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Plan**

Mr. Fowle stated that Proposed Resolution No. 11-00 is to approve the update of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Plan. Mr. Fowle presented background information on the Plan. He stated the plan was last updated in 1991. The previous sewer service area had a total of approximately 16,000 acres, of that, there were 2,800 acres of developable vacant land within the service area. There was an excess of 712 acres within that service area. The 1995 update started in 1997, but due to staff turnover and workload is being completed now. A public information meeting was held in Fond du Lac last week, with sparse attendance and no comments.

Mr. Fowle stated that the Regional Development Committee approved the plan after a public hearing was held for comments. After the Commission approves this process, the DNR will review and certify the plan in their standard plan. Mr. Fowle indicated that due to the amount of acreage being proposed to be added to the sewer service area, an environmental assessment will be required under NR 150 of the DNR Administrative Code. That is a separate process that is handled by DNR, and East Central may have to provide additional information to them, which could extend the approval process by three months.

Mr. Fowle noted concerns from communities regarding the population projections. He stated that given the current configuration of the SSA and recent/planned projects within the urbanized area such as the new USH 151 bypass, new high school, and an aggressive economic development program, staff expects future growth to exceed the projections.

The Outlying Sewer Users Group, which is a group of towns, and the city have been working for the past three years to update and renegotiate their sewer contract. That effort was approved late last year. The City and surrounding towns also have locally based growth area agreements. The updated SSA plan reflects these local efforts.

Mr. Fowle explained that based on the projections by East Central the justified amount of acreage needed to develop out to the year 2020, was 2,120 acres. There were a couple of planning area additions in the proposed plan to help keep things consistent with the locally based sewer negotiation agreement, which identifies 20 year or 50 year service areas. One major exception is an area in the St. Peters Sanitary District and Johnsburg Sanitary District, which have been recently formed, and have been doing facilities planning. Those two sanitary districts will be dealt with as amendments to the sewer service area plan. As far as proposed changes or comments to the service area that were received through this process, they were mainly minor technical comments, just minor reconfigurations of the boundaries based on some miscommunication or errors in some of the data.

Mr. Fowle noted that there was a last minute comment from the City of Fond du Lac requesting that an area in the Town of Fond du Lac be removed due to its inconsistency with the locally development Outlying Sewer Users Group agreement. Mr. Fowle noted that staff had not time to contact the parties prior to the Commission Meeting in order to resolve the issue. Mr. Fowle stated that the request was minor in nature and that staff would catch any sewer extension into that area through the 208 review process, and thereby would require agreement by both parties prior to approval. Mr. Fowle suggested that the Commission approve the plan noting that this specific area may be removed prior to WDNR submittal pending discussion with both parties.

Mr. Van Loon moved to approve Proposed Resolution No. 11-00, noting the above concern, seconded by Mr. Brown. Resolution passed unanimously.
E. Transportation Committee


2. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the April 11, 2000 meeting.

   Ms. Springer motioned to accept the Chairman's Report and the Summary of Proceedings, seconded by Mr. Bellin. Passing unanimously.

3. Proposed Resolution No. 09-00: Amending the Transportation Improvement Program for the Fox Cities (Appleton-Neenah) and Oshkosh Urbanized Areas, 2000

   Ms. Schell stated at the January Quarterly Meeting she presented to the Commissioners a resolution that amended the 2000 TIP and indicated at that time there would be another amendment coming in April. Ms. Schell explained that Proposed Resolution No. 09-00 refers to three items to be amended in the TIP. The first part of the amendment refers to transferring STP-urban funds in the Oshkosh urbanized area. She said that originally for the construction year 2000, the project that received the STP-urban funds was Oakwood Road, a Town of Algoma project. The Town of Algoma and the County were unable to come to an agreement on the local match. The next project that was eligible was the CTH K project, which was also in the Town of Algoma. Ms. Schell explained that the same problem continued with that selection, so now funds are proposed for transfer to the CTH A project, from Snell to Bowen. The CTH A project had received some STP-urban funds in a previous year, but was funded a very low percentage.

   The second part of the amendment refers to an addition of a project - Section 5310 application submitted by United Cerebral Palsy of Oshkosh for the purchase of a paratransit bus. UPC is requesting $53,312 or 80 percent of the total $66,640.

   The third item of the amendment is to include the application to Wisconsin Employment Transportation Assistance Program, which is a continuation of the services started under the Jobs Access Reverse Commute Program last year. Ms. Schell indicated that funding has been received through the WETP Program, and that one portion was not funded. The unfunded service was the donated wheels program or the Tri-County Transportation portion of the grant application. Efforts are underway to find alternative funding for the program.

   Mr. Hanna made a motion to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 09-00, seconded by Ms. Springer. Motion passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Nominating Committee

   Mr. Maehl, Chair of Nominating Committee, indicated that the Nominating Committee met prior to the Quarterly Meeting and the name of Donald De Groot, Outagamie County was placed in nomination for Chair and Yvonne Feavel, Waushara County for Vice-Chair. There being no other nominations, Mr. Maehl moved nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast for the candidates, seconded by Mr. Wollangk, passing unanimously.
VII. **ESTABLISH TIME AND PLACE FOR NEXT COMMISSION MEETING**

Acting Chair Weiss stated that the Annual Meeting will be held May 19th at the Fox Cities Stadium in Outagamie County. He explained that the By-laws stated the Annual Meeting should be held the Wednesday before Memorial Day. The date of May 19th is a few days earlier and approval is required. Ms. Springer motioned for approval, seconded by Mr. Hurlbut. Motion passed unanimously.

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Springer moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Kowalkowski. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:20 P.M.
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 11-00
UPDATING THE FOND DU LAC SEWER SERVICE AREA PLAN

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources as the sewer service area management agency for the ten county East Central region, and;

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has entered into a memorandum of agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to develop, update, and manage sewer service area plans for the designated area and select non-designated areas, and;

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Agency is preparing updated sewer service area plans for communities through the year 2020, and;

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has held numerous public participation and community meetings for those areas affected during the planning process, and;

WHEREAS, the Sewer Service Area Plans will be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and certified as part of the Wisconsin Water Quality Plans;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

Section 1: That the Commission adopt the updated plan for the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area and recommend Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources certification of the plan update, and;

Section 2: That the Commission provide continuing sewer service area planning and management functions including sewer service area amendments, the review of wastewater and sewer plans and the review of sewer extension requests for the Fond du Lac SSA.

Effective Date: April 28th, 2000

Submitted By: Regional Development Committee

Prepared By: Eric W. Fowle, AICP - Assoc. Environmental Planner

Donald DeGroot, Chair
Clarence Wolf

Joseph Lesch, Vice-Chair
Don Wilson

Ken Hurlbut
Richard Wollanigk

Lester Van Loon
The meeting was called to order by Yvonne Feavel 9:35 A.M. Committee members present were:

Yvonne Feavel ............................................................................................................. Waushara County
Ruth Winter ............................................................................................................. Menominee County
Lester Van Loon ......................................................................................................... Waushara County
Don Wilson ................................................................................................................ Marquette County
Clarence Wolf ........................................................................................................... Calumet County
Richard Wollangk ..................................................................................................... Winnebago County

Committee members absent were:

Ernie Bellin ................................................................................................................. Winnebago County

Others in attendance:

Stan Martenson ........................................................................................................... Martenson & Eisele
George Dearborn ....................................................................................................... Town of Menasha
Steven J. Spanbauer .................................................................................................. Town of Neenah
Allen Davis .............................................................................................................. Town of Grand Chute
David E. Schmidt ...................................................................................................... Director, Winnebago County Planning
Wayne Volkman ......................................................................................................... Martenson & Eisele, Inc.
Arden Schroeder ......................................................................................................... Town of Clayton
Eric Fowle .................................................................................................................. ECWRPC Staff
Joe Huffman ................................................................................................................ ECWRPC Staff
Betty Nordeng ........................................................................................................... ECWRPC Staff

1. Welcome & Introductions

Ms. Feavel welcomed everyone to the meeting and introductions were made and the meeting was called to order at 9:35 A.M.

2. Informational/ Public Hearing on Revised Addendum Policies

Mr. Fowle summarized the events of this past summer leading to the revision of policy changes to the Long Range Transportation / Land Use Plan for the Fox Cities, Oshkosh and Fond du Lac Urbanized Areas Addendum document. These changes affected primarily Policy 1.4 dealing with unsewered development issues. Mr. Fowle briefly reviewed minor changes to the overall document language and in particular the sewer service area planning refinements. Also discussed were comments submitted by Land Use Advisory Committee members prior to today's action. Steven Spanbauer raised issue regarding municipal water systems indicating that townships find themselves in a difficult situation acquiring water from corporate entities. He also felt that it seemed politically impossible at times to address this provision of service from a township standpoint. Mr. Fowle stated that there were no enforceable policies to address potable water supplies other than it was a required element in developing comprehensive plans. There being no further discussion the information hearing was closed.
3. **Resolution # 00-18: Approval of the Revised Addendum Document**

Mr. Fowle recommended approval of Resolution 00-18 to the committee members. Clarence Wolf moved to approve Resolution #00-18 thus adopting the revised addendum document. Don Wilson made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

4. **Informational/ Public Hearing on Revised Urbanized Area Sewer Service Amendment Process**

Mr. Fowle gave a brief overview of the existing SSA amendment process and explained the Land Use Advisory Committee's role in developing the revised amendment process affecting the region's urbanized areas, (Fox Cities, Oshkosh and Fond du Lac). Mr. Fowle presented written comments from interested parties for discussion. The significant changes to the amendment process included terminology and definition revisions, additional information/documentation for future amendment requests and re-evaluation of the existing development amendment policy. The existing development policy was modified to address the disparity of vacant acreage added along with the existing development. Vacant acreage within this policy must now be “swapped out” to eliminate any net gain of acreage to the sewer service area. There being no additional comments the hearing was closed.

5. **Resolution #19-00: Approval of Revised Urbanized Area Sewer Service Area Plan Amendment Policies and Procedures Document**

There being no further discussion on this item Richard Wollangk moved to approve Resolution #00-19 that adopts the revised amendment policy for the urbanized areas. Ruth Winter made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

6. **Informational Session/Public Hearing on the Revised Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update**

Mr. Fowle presented the committee with the revised Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan. Mr. Fowle reminded the committee that this plan was approved previously in April, 2000. In light of the changes and addition of two sanitary districts since that time made it necessary to modify the original update. There were no additional comments made based on materials distributed reflecting the major modifications. Facilities planning documents were developed this year for the Johnsburg and St. Peter Sanitary Districts making inclusion to the update feasible. Although the City of Fond du Lac expressed concerns regarding sprawl development no formal objection was submitted. Growth agreements between St. Peter and the City of Fond du Lac are presently in place thus alleviating that concern.

In addition to adding the two sanitary districts, the city filed for a slight modification in its allocation areas. The removal of approximately 100 acres from the city's growth area, located in the southern portion of the city, was re-configured and placed near the city's new high school development. Mr. Fowle explained that this seemed logical as development pressures are likely to occur around the school site. It was also mentioned that the Town of Fond du Lac had reservations of removing this allocation area as it was not designated city growth area based on the Outlying Sewer Users agreement. However, the Town of Fond du Lac did not object to the addition within the city citing growth impacts from the new high school. There being no additional comments the hearing was closed.

7. **Resolution #20-00: Re-Approval of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update**

There being no further discussion on this matter, Clarence Wolf moved to approve Resolution #00-20 adopting the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update as presented. Lester Van Loon made the second. The motion passed unanimously.

8. **Designated Management Agency Status for the St. Peter Sanitary District**
The St. Peter Sanitary District requested designated management agency status based on facilities planning submitted earlier this year. St. Peter intends to combine gravity sewers and force mains with connections through Taycheedah Sanitary District. Based on staff reviews of the facilities planning document, it was determined that this alternative was the most cost-effective. Staff recommends Category III status be granted to the St. Peter Sanitary District. Mr. Fowle then described the sewer service area allocated to St. Peter. There being no further discussion Lester Van Loon moved to approve DMA status to St. Peter. Don Wilson made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

9. **Designated Management Agency Status for the Johnsburg Sanitary District**

The scenario for the Johnsburg Sanitary District was very similar to the previously approved DMA status for St. Peter. Based on facilities planning documents the community of Johnsburg intends to collect and transport wastewater via combined force mains and gravity sewer. Mr. Fowle reiterated that the selected alternative for wastewater collection and treatment was the most cost-effective. Staff recommends that a DMA status Category III be granted to the Johnsburg Sanitary District. There being no further discussion Richard Wollangk moved to approve the DMA request. Clarence Wolf made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

10. **Town of Clayton Land Use Plan Certification**

Betty Nordeng presented the Town of Clayton Land Use Plan giving an overview of the process and what the Commission requires relative to essential elements for these plans. Staff reviewed the document this past summer and commented outlining deficiencies needing addressing. The Town of Clayton has subsequently addressed these concerns to the satisfaction of the Commission. Mr. Wayne Volkman presented an updated land use plan map noting that the Towns of Neenah and Menasha had concerns regarding land use conflicts along the eastern edge of the Town of Clayton. The areas in question for the Town of Clayton had originally proposed commercial/industrial uses thus abutting single family residential uses for the Towns of Neenah and Menasha. Through successful negotiations the Town of Clayton changed those uses to multi-family development as a buffer between the single-family and proposed commercial/industrial uses.

The other concern regarding this plan was the airport overlay zone located in the northern part of the township. Outagamie County and the Town of Clayton were continuing discussions on the limitations of this area relative to appropriate land use designations. Mr. Volkman stated that single-family developments would be discouraged in this area and felt confident that a mutual understanding between the town and county was imminent. George Dearborn indicated that the Town of Menasha had no objection to the plan as presented today other than some minor concerns regarding the details of land use proposals along the U.S.H. 10 corridor. There being no further discussion Clarence Wolf moved to approve the Town of Clayton Land Use Plan with the caveat that the area along U.S.H. 10 be identified as a “conflict area” until sufficient information was submitted to East Central staff. Ruth Winter made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

11. **Appleton Sewer Service Area Swap Amendment**

This request was removed from the agenda for additional information and possible reassessment of the amendment request.
12. **Shawano-Shawano Lake Sewer Service Area Amendment, (Village of Bonduel Swap)**

Mr. Fowle presented the amendment request in which the Village of Bonduel has petitioned for an acreage swap. The acreage involved was approximately 17.4 acres. Mr. Fowle described the area to deleted and distributed the environmental assessment for the amendment area. It was pointed out that an additional 3 acres were added to the request to accommodate a proposed sewer line. The proposed commercial development being situated near the new S.T.H. 29 interchange, was a result in development pressures in this area. There being no further discussion Lester Van Loon moved to approve the amendment request contingent upon receipt of proper notification to the property owners being removed. Ruth Winter made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

13. **Neenah-Menasha Sewer Service Area Planning Area Boundary Adjustment**

Mr. Fowle introduced the Waverly Sanitary District's request for a planning area boundary adjustment in order to provide service to a proposed subdivision. The provision of service by the Waverly Sanitary District provides the most cost efficient alternative. The district via this request would also receive existing development already serviced by Waverly. Mr. Fowle stated that the City of Menasha and the City of Appleton were notified and had no formal objection to the planning area boundary adjustment. There being no further discussion Don Wilson moved to approve the amendment request. Richard Wollangk made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

14. **Wautoma – Silver Lake Sewer Service Area Amendment Request**

Mr. Fowle presented the City of Wautoma's request for a swap of acreage within the Wautoma-Silver Lake Sewer Service Area. The 23 acres being requested was illustrated on maps provided by East Central. The area to be removed was city-owned property and at this time is undevelopable. Mr. Fowle explained that the city and sanitary district would share service responsibilities for the amendment area. The transition area involved with the request, (details of the transition area are found in the Wautoma-Silver Lake SSA Plan), prompted negotiations between the city and sanitary district. Mr. Fowle indicated that the amendment area was within a Tax Increment Finance District slated for commercial/industrial development. The details for sewer construction were discussed and a concept development plan was presented to committee members. There being no further discussion Clarence Wolf moved to approved the amendment request. Lester Van Loon made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

15. **Waupaca – Chain ‘O’ Lakes Sewer Service Area Amendment Request**

The City of Waupaca has petitioned for an acreage exchange under East Central's swap amendment policy. The city proposes to add approximately 55 acres to the Waupaca – Chain 'O' Lakes Sewer Service Area. Mr. Fowle described the area to be removed from the service area, which lies north of Brainard Road and west of S.T.H. 49. The city proposes to expand their industrial park south of S.T.H. 22/54. Mr. Fowle described the proposed sewer layout that includes an 18” sewer main to be constructed as part of this project. Treatment plant officials indicated that there was sufficient plant capacity for the projected wastewater flows from the amendment area. There being no further discussions Lester Van Loon moved to approve the amendment request contingent upon receipt of proper notification to the property owners being removed. Richard Wollangk made the second. Motion passed unanimously.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:25 A.M.
I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. MOMENT OF SILENT MEDITATION

III. ROLL CALL

Chair Donald De Groot, the meeting of the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission was called to order at 1:40 P.M. Roll call was taken showing the following attendance:

Commission Members Present
Merlin Gentz ................................................................. Calumet County
Wilma Springer .............................................................. Calumet County
Clarence Wolf ................................................................. Calumet County
Walter Cacic ................................................................. Marquette County
Robert "Toby" Paltzer ....................................................... Outagamie County
Sally Mielke ................................................................. Outagamie County
Alfred Krause ................................................................. Outagamie County
Donald De Groot ......................................................... Outagamie County
Arlyn Tober ................................................................. Shawano County
M. Eugene Zeuske ......................................................... Shawano County
Clarence Natzke .............................................................. Shawano County
Duane Brown ............................................................... Waupaca County
La Verne Grunwald ......................................................... Waupaca County
Yvonne Feavel (Alt. for George Sorenson) ................................ Waushara County
Norman Weiss ................................................................. Waushara County
Lester Van Loon ............................................................. Waushara County
Richard Wollangk (Alt. for Jon Dell’Antonia) ......................... Winnebago County
Ernie Bellin ................................................................. Winnebago County
Arden Schroeder .......................................................... Winnebago County

Commission Members Absent
Howard Zellmer .......................................................... Marquette County
Don Wilson ................................................................. Marquette County
Ruth Winter ................................................................. Menominee County
Brian Kowalkowski .................................................... Menominee County
Randy Reiter ................................................................. Menominee County
Timothy Hanna .......................................................... Outagamie County
Ken Hurlbut ................................................................. Waupaca County
Jane Van De Hey ........................................................ Winnebago County
Joseph Maehl .............................................................. Winnebago County

Staff Members Present
Harlan Kiesow ............................................................ Executive Director
Ann Z. Schell ............................................................... Assistant Director
Fred Scharnke .............................................................. Principal Planner
Walt Raith ................................................................. Principal Planner
Eric Fowle ................................................................. Associate Planner
Denise McShane .......................................................... Associate Planner
Betty Nordeng .............................................................. Planner
Kathy Thunes ................................................................. Planner
Elizabeth Runge ........................................................ Planner
**IV. MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 3, 2000 MEETING**

Ms. Feavel motioned to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2000 meeting, seconded by Mr. Paltzer. The motion passed unanimously.

**VI. BUSINESS**

Chair De Groot stated Carlson Dettman & Associates would be arriving late and amended the order of the agenda. He called for the Transportation Committee to be heard first.

A. Transportation Committee


3. Acceptance of the Summary of Proceedings for the October 11, 2000 meeting.

   Ms. Springer motioned to accept the Chairman’s Report and the Summary of Proceedings, seconded by Mr. Weiss, passing unanimously.

3. Proposed Resolution No. 22-00: Reaffirmation of Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan for the Fox Cities (Appleton-Neenah) Urbanized Area

   Ms. Schell stated that based on federal urbanized area planning regulations and guidance from WisDOT, action needs to be taken on the long-range plans prepared for both the Fox Cities and Oshkosh Urbanized Areas. She explained that federal law requires that the plans be updated every five years and must have a 20-year horizon. The reaffirmation essentially buys us five more years, delaying our need to adopt a full update until 2005. The reaffirmation process involves a review of the plan to determine if the trends of population growth and other socioeconomic variables are following the projections developed in the 1997 plans, and that recommendations are still sound. Ms. Schell stated the reaffirmation has been approved by the original Long-Range Plan Technical Advisory Committee and the ECWRPC’s Transportation Committee and now needs approval from the full Commission.

   Ms. Mielke made a motion to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 22-00, seconded by Mr. Grunwald. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Proposed Resolution No. 23-00: Reaffirmation of the Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area.

   Ms. Schell explained that a separate action, resolution and documentation is required for the Oshkosh Urbanized Area. She requested approval from the full Commission.

   Mr. Wollangk moved to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 23-00, seconded by Mr. Schroeder. The motion passed unanimously.
B. Steering Committee


   Mr. Van Loon motioned to accept the Summaries of Proceedings for the August 3 and September 28, 2000 meetings. The motion was seconded by Mr. Weiss and passed unanimously.

2. Proposed Resolution No. 21-00: Adoption of the Annual Affirmative Action Program for Equal Employment Opportunities

   Ms. Schell explained the various tables found in the Affirmative Action Program Report. She noted that because East Central has relatively few employees, it doesn't take much to sway the percentages from under-employment of minorities or females in any given job category, to over-employment. Ms. Schell indicated that the anticipated turnover is expected to be fairly stable at one professional position and two technical positions in the coming year. It is recommended that the one professional position projected to turn over, be filled with a male, and the anticipated technical position openings be filled by one male and one female.

3. Mr. Natzke motioned for approval of Proposed Resolution No. 21-00, seconded by Mr. Gentz, passing unanimously.

   Chair De Groot indicated that the consultants have not yet arrived and the following two items would be addressed later in the meeting.

4. Acceptance of Salary Study Recommendations

5. Smart Growth Planning Status

C. Economic Development Committee


3. Mr. Brown stated the Chairman's Report and Summary of Proceedings for the Economic Development Committee were included in the packet, and motioned for acceptance, seconded by Ms. Mielke and passing unanimously.

D. Open Space and Environmental Management Committee


   Mr. Natzke motioned for approval of the Chairman's Report and the Summary of Proceedings from the October 10, 2000 meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Krause and passed unanimously.
3. Proposed Resolution No. 24-00: Requesting the Addition of Calumet and Fond du Lac Counties to Proposed WDNR “Stewardship Funding” Modifications (NR-51)

Mr. Fowle briefed the committee on the status of the Stewardship funding program, stating that when it was re-authorized, a new “bluff protection program”, funded with one million dollars, was added. The draft language includes portions of the Niagara Escarpment, but only within Door and Brown Counties, within six miles of Lake Michigan. Mr. Fowle stated that other communities and counties within the region have noted concerns with regard to funding opportunities for escarpment protection, and this language leaves them out. He explained that most of the escarpment in Calumet and Fond du Lac Counties does, in fact, drain waters to Lake Winnebago, and henceforth the Lake Michigan Basin. Mr. Fowle requested that the Commission support this resolution so that it could be forwarded to the WDNR and state legislators in hopes that the language would be modified during the next legislative session.

Mr. Gentz motioned for approval of Proposed Resolution No. 24-00, seconded by Mr. Cacic. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Status Report on Fox Locks Transfer

Mr. Kiesow stated that in September a ceremony was held between the State of Wisconsin and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers to formally transfer ownership of the Fox River locks and associated lands from the Us. Army Corps of Engineers to the State of Wisconsin. Under the terms of the Agreement, the State would initially receive $10 million from the Corps and could receive up to another $5 million total in matching funds, which would be available on an annual basis. Before the transfer can be finalized, the money will need to be included in the Corps’ budget and appropriated as part of a water resources bill currently being drafted. These funds could become available as early as 2001. To implement the transfer the State will need legislation to create a new management body and provide $2.5 million in funding as its share of the system upgrade. An annual appropriation of $350,000 to $375,000 for seven years is proposed. The local area expects to generate a like amount annually through private fund raising efforts. The role of the Parkway Commission will be to initially complete the transfer and develop a management plan and secondly, to create the proposed Heritage Parkway.

Mr. Paltzer questioned whether the Fox Cities was guaranteed to receive the funds from the State. A brief discussion followed, with Mr. Kiesow indicated that the funds would go to the system. Ms. Mielke expressed concerns as to who would be responsible for the system during the transfer time. Mr. Kiesow stated that it would be the responsibility of the federal government.

Chair De Groot noted that Carlson Dettman & Associates had arrived and were ready for their presentation of the Salary Study recommendations.

Mr. Kiesow introduced Ms. Marianne Oyaas and Mr. Brian Ronk of Carlson Dettman and Associates to present their recommendations in the classification and compensation study, which they conducted for the Commission.

Ms. Oyaas stated that, overall, Commission salaries are very much on track and that making the minor corrections that are included in the recommendations should not be too costly. She indicated that the salary situation needs to be carefully monitored in the coming years because the “Smart Growth” legislation, adopted by the State, will likely increase the demand, and consequently salaries, for both GIS and planning positions. Adjustments may be necessary to retain experienced staff.
Ms. Oyaas continued with an explanation of the point factor job evaluation system used to measure job content. By breaking down responsibilities and accountabilities of each position, a point value range is assigned for each position. This process reviewed the internal equity of existing pay plan, and found it to be very logical and on the mark. Employees have an opportunity to appeal this gradation, if they feel their position’s score is inaccurate. It is recommended to use a non-base adjustment method to recognize commendable performance by those employees that have “maxed out” their salary range. The non-base adjustment is a one time payment, having no effect on the base salary, and helps to avoid the error of reclassifying employees when job duties have not actually changed. Under the proposed pay plan, an average employee would reach the top of their salary range in nine or ten years.

Ms. Oyaas described the surveys used to compare the existing salary levels to market rates for each position. A number of surveys were used, including a custom survey of regional planning commissions in Wisconsin and several private planning firms throughout the state and in the Fox Valley area, and several other reputable and pertinent published surveys of public and private entities in the state and Midwestern U.S. In order to accurately reflect the relevance of the data, public entity data was weighted at twice the value of the private entity data.

The resulting proposed pay structure was built using the market average for each position as the midpoint of the salary range, 87.5 percent of the market average as the minimum salary, and 115 percent of the midpoint as the maximum salary in each range. In terms of merit increases, Ms. Oyaas recommended rewarding very clear excellence in performance (rate) with a 1½ step increase, perfectly acceptable performance with 1 step increase, and less than good performance with a “wake-up call”, ½ step increase.

Ms. Oyaas completed the presentation by asking for questions or concerns from the Commissioners. Ms. Mielke inquired how the benefits were addressed? Ms. Oyaas explained that the study was to look only at direct pay, not pay and benefits. Mr. Grunwald stated that if employee is paid at midpoint now, and after two years has reached the maximum, the incentive will be lost to excel, because a solid increase cannot be given. Ms. Oyaas said this is definitely one of the major concerns heard, and indicated that there are some things in place that should ease this concern. She stated that under the performance evaluation that is going to be put into place, that level is not unreachable. However, if a employee is at midpoint in the current plan does not necessarily mean that they will be at midpoint under the new plan. When an employee is getting into that upper half of the range, for most positions, what that is saying is that they are being paid higher than average and the question then becomes a question back to you, as the employer, how high are you willing to pay above market. Every employer has to make a choice of how high above market they are willing to pay. Ms. Oyaas continued by stating that East Central could look at performance non-base payments for employees at maximum, that would be distributed as a lump sum.

Mr. Schroeder asked what the rate of benefits was for the private sector versus the public sector? Ms. Oyaas responded that data pulled together from the U. S. Chamber of Commerce has indicated that public is significantly higher than private. Mr. Gentz commented that before his retirement from the public sector, his administration supplied a booklet to each employee that specific the total cost of that position, which helped the employee evaluate her/his position in the market. He also suggested that another option that is available is to move the midpoint up or down, that the minimum and maximum could slide with the economy.
Mr. Cacic stated that he had several questions, first being if Ms. Oyaas, when interviewing employees, asked them if they were satisfied with the present type of raises that were received each year according to the jobs they were doing. Ms. Oyaas indicated that the purpose of the interview was to obtain more information about the position and the employee was told to bring up any concerns they had. The question was not directly asked, but some employees supplied that information. Mr. Cacic continued by asking what the total impact would be, if all employees, were adjusted to the recommendations of Carlson Dettman in one year or can it be done in a period of two years? And what about the method of evaluation of employees according to their duties and responsibilities, who is going to do that, just the director or the director/assistant director? Wouldn't that take a lot of their time? And in the survey dealing with counties and other private/public sectors, as you were comparing, were you dealing with apples and apples, does each county or city have the same type of personnel, identical to the present staff at East Central? Did you take a county/city salary for a particular position per se without regard to educational background and/or years of service? Mr. Cacic stated that until more information is supplied on the total package impact on the budget in the year 2001, this has to have a definite bearing in terms of the present increases versus this adjustment. Another item, would the employees be satisfied, being such a small staff, with going to this new method or staying with the present?

Mr. Kiesow indicated that the program would be phased in through 2001. In January a cost of living adjustment will be made to all employees, and adjustments will be made to positions that are currently being paid below the recommended minimum. One of the recommendations being considered is that instead of salary adjustments being made at the first of the year, the adjustments will be made on the employee’s anniversary date, thus the adjustments would be staggered throughout the year.

Mr. Cacic indicated that he felt that the cost of the present adjustment package, and the cost of new adjustment package and the impact that each will have on the 2001 budget should be brought before the Steering Committee and the Commissioners at the next quarterly meeting. Chair De Groot stated that that was the intent and he was looking for acceptance of the salary study recommendations. The total ramifications on the budget would be taken to the Steering Committee in December and then to the full Commission in January and action will be taken at that time.

Ms. Feavel motioned to accept the salary study recommendations and to be excused from the meeting to honor a prior commitment. Mr. Bellin seconded the motion. A brief discussion ensued as to what was actually being voted on – the acceptance of the report, endorsing the report or adopting the report. Chair De Groot clarified that the vote was to accept the salary study recommendations.

Ms. Mielke questioned that if the vote was to accept the recommendations it appears that the Commissioners have accepted everything versus just accepting the report. She stated that the vote should be to accept the report and not the recommendations. Mr. Wollangk motioned to amend the motion made by Ms. Feavel to accept the report only and to have the recommendations reviewed by staff and addressed at the January meeting. Seconded by Mr. Paltzer. Motion to amended previous motion passed unanimously.
Chair De Groot requested Mr. Kiesow to present Item 4 – Smart Growth Planning Status, under Steering Committee, that was delayed early in the meeting.

Mr. Kiesow stated that there are various activities going on at the State level, there is a funding deadline coming up on November 15. Calumet, Waupaca and Outagamie Counties have smart growth committees in place and later this year there should be some kind of recommendation coming back from those county boards. East Central is working on the regional comprehensive plan study design, which should be done, as far as what direction East Central will be taking, for the January Commission meeting. East Central has been coordinating and participating on the Smart Growth Committees locally and at the State levels. Mr. Kiesow suggested that if communities don't need to do planning right now, wait a little while, there will be additional information becoming available that will make things a little easier and assist in getting a better handle on things in order to cooperate with their neighbors on combined efforts.

E. Regional Development Committee


Mr. Wollangk made a motion to accept the summary of proceedings and the Chairman's Report. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wolf and passed unanimously.

3. Proposed Resolution No. 18-00: Adoption of Policy Refinements for the Long-Range Transportation/Land Use Plan Addendum for the Fox Cities, Oshkosh and Fond du Lac Urban Areas

Mr. Fowle stated he would address Proposed Resolution No. 18-00 and 19-00 together. Mr. Fowle presented a brief background of the process involved in the refinements and revisions to the Addendum. He indicated that there were three main focuses of refinement to the Addendum. The first being more consistency in the definition section, tying some of the definitions to sewer service area planning definitions which these communities are accustomed to hearing. The second is a revision to policy 1.4 looking at unsewered development and looking at the impact when it is done near sewered development. Third, changes to the comprehensive plan definitions to be consistent with the new Smart Growth legislation.

Mr. Bellin moved to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 18-00, seconded by Mr. Paltzer. Resolution adopted unanimously.

4. Proposed Resolution No. 19-00: Approving Revisions to the Urbanized Area’s (Fox Cities/Oshkosh/Fond du Lac) Sewer Service Area Plan Amendment Process

Mr. Fowle indicated that a number of significant changes were made to this document and relate back to the discussions on the Addendum policies. Major changes included: revisions to the definitions section, particularly for “unique facilities”; documentation that would be necessary for existing development amendments to the service area plan in order to be more consistent with NR-110 facility plan requirements by the DNR. Another major change would be looking at requiring a swap of vacant land only on all existing development amendments. Also with the swap policy would use an acre for acre trade by land use type based on the community's land use plan which may give the Commission a little more flexibility in looking at unanticipated growth amendments based on the local plan. Mr. Fowle stated proposed Resolution No. 19-00 was approved by the Land Use Advisory Committee and the Regional Development Committee and he is now looking for approval by the full Commission. This document will then be forwarded to the DNR for approval.
A motion was made by Mr. Cacic to adopt Proposed Resolution No. 19-00, seconded by Mr. Wolf. Passing unanimously.

5. Proposed Resolution No. 20-00: Approving the Revised Update of the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan

Mr. Fowle stated the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan was approved by the Commission in April. Facilities planning documents were developed this year for the Johnsburg S.D. and the St. Peter S.D. and need to be incorporated in this SSA update. In addition to adding the two sanitary districts, the City of Fond du Lac filed for a slight modification in its allocation areas. The addition of approximately 100 acres near the city's new high school was proposed due to an increase in development pressures. Mr. Fowle stated that staff may have inadvertently underestimated the demand increase for this area. Mr. Fowle also indicated that there was a minor change to the map that was distributed with the packet. (Just to the east of the word “St. Peter” on the map, the boundary jogs into the west, that should be a straight line to include a few more acres because the sewer line is being run through that area via an easement)

Mr. Paltzer motioned for adoption of Proposed Resolution No. 20-00, seconded by Mr. Weiss. Motion passed unanimously.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business.

VII. ESTABLISH TIME AND PLACE FOR NEXT COMMISSION MEETING

The next Quarterly Commission Meeting will be at the Winnebago County Courthouse, 1:30 P.M., Friday, January 16, 2001

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Springer moved for adjournment, seconded by Mr. Bellin. Motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 P.M.
PROPOSED RESOLUTION NO. 20-00

APPROVING THE REVISED UPDATE OF THE FOND DU LAC SEWER SERVICE AREA PLAN

WHEREAS, the Commission had previously approved and recommended that the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources certify the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan Update (April; 2000), and;

WHEREAS, additional localized Facility Planning efforts conducted under NR-110 by the St. Pete Sanitary District and the Johnsburg Sanitary District require conformance with the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan, and

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has been designated by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources as the sewer service area management agency for the ten county East Central region, and

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has entered into a memorandum of agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources to develop, update, and manage sewer service area plans for the designated area and select non-designated areas, and

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Agency is preparing updated sewer service area plans for communities through the year 2020, and

WHEREAS, the East Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission has held numerous public participation and community meetings for those areas affected during the planning process, and

WHEREAS, the Sewer Service Area Plans will be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and certified as part of the Wisconsin Water Quality Plans, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EAST CENTRAL WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:

Section 1: That the Commission adopt the revised update for the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area.

Section 2: That the Commission provide continuing sewer service area planning and management functions including sewer service area amendments, the review of wastewater and sewer plans and the review of sewer extension requests.

Effective Date: October 27, 2000
Submitted By: Regional Development Committee
Prepared By: Eric W. Fowle, AICP -- Assoc. Environmental Planner

Donald De Groof, Chair
June 5, 2001

Mr. Harlan Kiesow
ECRPC
132 Main Street
Manasha, WI 54952

SUBJECT: Fond du Lac SSA

Dear Mr. Kiesow:

We have completed our review and approve of the update to the Fond du Lac Sewer Service Area Plan. This plan update involves a 4,244.63 acreage increase in the size of the sewer service area for the T. of Black Wolf, T. Friendship, V. Fond du Lac, C. Fond du Lac, T. Empire, T. Taycheedah, T. Calumet and T. Brodiertown. These communities should ensure that stormwater and erosion are controlled during and subsequent to development.

The approval of this revision does not constitute approval of any of the following:
• private sewage systems pursuant to Chapter 1LHR 83, (WI Admin. Code),
• sewer extension pursuant to Chapter NR 110, (WI Admin. Code),
• authority to alter the bed or banks of any navigable waterway (Chapter 30, WI Stats.),
• certification for any wetland alteration (Section 401, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and NR 105.299, WI Admin. Code),
• takings of threatened and endangered resources pursuant to Wisconsin Statutes 29.415.

Those approvals must be obtained separately from the respective agencies. In addition, storm water management plan development is required for any construction site activity disturbing five or more acres of land pursuant to Chapter NR 216 (WI Admin. Code).

Any person aggrieved by this approval has the right to appeal the decision. Wisconsin Statutes and Administrative Code establish time periods within which requests to review Department decisions must be filed. For judicial review of a decision pursuant to s. 227.52 and 227.53, Wisconsin Statutes, a petition for review must be filed within 30 days after service of the decision. The respondent in an action for judicial review is the Department of Natural Resources. This notice is provided pursuant to s. 227.48(20), Wisconsin Statutes.

Sincerely,

Charles Ledin
Section Chief
Great Lakes & Watershed Planning Section
Bureau of Watershed Management

c. Rob McLenman, NER-Oshkosh
Goals represent common community ideals. They give statements of direction in which planning is aimed. Objectives are more specific targets along the path of satisfying community goals. Objectives may be measurable, adding to the community good. Policies are strategies for accomplishing the stated objectives. Specific policies can be used in the decision-making process.

As part of the updating process, the earlier set of goals, objectives and policies have been refined to provide more specific guidance for service area planning. The refinements are a result of additional community and technical advisory committee participation in the service area update planning process. The refinements also reflect various state and federal laws and regulations which impact sewer service area growth and development activities. They address three basic questions. How much development is anticipated to occur? What type of development can be expected? Where should this development occur?

Two overall goals have been identified. The first goal and related objectives and policies pertain to land use and urban development issues. The second goal addresses public facilities, specifically sanitary sewerage systems. Objectives and policies related to both goals point out the significant interrelationship between urban land use and sanitary sewerage planning and provide a sound basis for determining a community's future development and sewerage system needs.

GOAL

To encourage an orderly and planned pattern of community growth and development that will provide a high quality living environment.

OBJECTIVE: To promote a balanced and realistic allocation of land areas to accommodate current and future urban development needs.

Policies

1) The supply of land allocated for urban development should approximate current and future needs as determined from population, employment and land use projections.

2) Urban development patterns should incorporate planned areas of mixed use and density that are clustered and compatible with adjacent uses.

3) The allocation of future urban development should maximize the use of existing urban facilities and services.

OBJECTIVE: To promote compact communities which contain centralized, concentrated and compatible urban development patterns.

Policies

1) Future urban development should be encouraged to infill vacant developable lands within existing communities and then staged outward adjacent to existing development limits.
2) A greater proportion of subdivision development now occurring in rural areas should be encouraged within existing communities where urban services area are available.

3) Future commercial and industrial development should expand upon existing areas and be readily accessible to major transportation systems.

4) Urban development areas should consider existing political boundaries and jurisdictions.

5) The boundaries of urban development should consider natural and man-made features, such as ridge lines, streams and major highways.

6) Residential land use patterns should maximize their accessibility to public and private supporting facilities.

7) Urban development should occur only in designated urban service areas.

OBJECTIVE: To promote urban development which is environmentally sound and compatible with the natural resource base.

Policies

1) Urban development should be directed to land suitable for development and discouraged on unsuitable land, such as floodplains, wetlands, prime agricultural soils, areas of high bedrock and groundwater, prime wildlife habitat, unique scientific areas and areas of historical or archeological significance.

2) Environmentally sensitive areas should be preserved and protected from urban development.

3) Urban development should pose no significant adverse impacts to surface water and groundwater.

OBJECTIVE: To promote urban development in an efficient and economical manner.

Policies

1) Urban development should be encouraged at densities adequate to sustain reasonable urban service costs.

2) Future urban development should be located in areas which can be conveniently and economically served by public facilities.

3) Future residential development should provide an adequate variety of types, prices and locations of housing and convenience and choice in acquiring goods services.

4) Existing communities and their central businesses districts should be preserved and enhanced.

GOAL
To provide and maintain a full range of community facilities and services which are efficient, economical and environmentally sound.

OBJECTIVE: To promote sanitary sewerage systems which will effectively and economically serve urban development.

Policies

1) The number of waste treatment plants should be minimized to avoid duplication of facilities, institute economies of scale and lessen environmental degradation.

2) Urban development should be provided with sanitary sewer service which is reasonably sized.

3) Existing capacity in sanitary sewerage systems should be used before making substantial expansion or extensions.

4) Sanitary sewerage system construction and sizing should be staged to encourage lower capital investment and greater flexibility.

5) Sanitary sewerage systems should be provided for existing development whenever they are the most cost-effective alternative for addressing failing on-site disposal systems.

6) Gravity flow sanitary sewer and interceptor systems should be utilized whenever it is cost-effective.

OBJECTIVE: To promote sanitary sewerage systems which are environmentally sound.

Policies

1) Disturbances to natural resources should be minimized when constructing sanitary sewerage systems.

2) Constructing sanitary sewers through environmentally sensitive areas should be avoided whenever possible.

3) The design and construction of sanitary sewerage facilities should not promote development in environmentally sensitive areas.

4) Sanitary sewerage systems should meet water quality standards.

5) When feasible, sanitary sewer systems and stormwater drainage systems should be designed and constructed concurrently to achieve pollutant abatement, gain drainage benefits, and minimize disruption of natural resources.

6) Erosion and sediment control practices should be utilized in constructing sanitary sewer systems where the potential for erosion is high.