

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM WORKSHEET**  
**January 28, 2009**

**Department: Planning and Resources**

**Date: March 30, 2009**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Service Level Required</b>	<b>2008 Actual Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Grants/Fees Revenue</b>	<b>2009 Tax Levy</b>
Subdivision Ordinance	Review of survey maps to ensure compliance with ordinance requirements.	1	Compliance required for all land divisions	\$21,000	\$22,000	\$9,000	\$13,000
Hazardous Waste Management	Collection and proper disposal of hazardous wastes from homes, farms, and businesses	2	Participants must elect to attend collection events	\$104,357	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
Waste Pharmaceutical Management	Collection and proper disposal of waste over the counter and prescription medications	3	Participants must elect to attend collection events or go to drop off location	\$8,000	\$8,000 (from hazardous waste budget above)	\$0	\$8,000 (from hazardous waste budget above)
Geographic Information Systems Mapping	Dissemination of vital information via maps to support other County programs	4	Vital for several mandatory programs	\$156,000	\$224,112	\$86,000 (from Land Records fees)	\$138,112
Broughton Sheboygan Marsh Park	Management of a 14,000 acre wilderness and wildlife area with a 30 acre park.	5	Required to manage water levels and cattails, maintain park facilities	\$24,442	\$78,970	\$36,000	\$42,970
Wisconsin Fund	Administers grants to citizens for replacing failing septic systems	6	100% for grant recipients	\$64,400 (Dept. collected \$1,400 for admin. expense)	\$60,000 (Dept. will collect \$100 per grant for admin. Costs)	\$60,000	\$0

<b>Program</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Service Level Required</b>	<b>2008 Actual Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Grants/Fees Revenue</b>	<b>2009 Tax Levy</b>
Interurban Trail	Administration of 6 mile trail between Ozaukee County Line and Oostburg	7	Needed to maintain and promote Trail	\$3,100	\$14,568 (to pay half of bollard costs)	\$0	\$14,568
Elkhart Lake Boat Landing	Administration of the largest boat landing in the County system	8	Needed to maintain boat landing and facilities	\$5,900	\$8,000	\$0	\$8,000
Old Plank Road Trail	Administration of 18 mile trail from Sheboygan to Greenbush	9	Needed to maintain trail and facilities	\$22,026	\$493,000	\$150,000	\$343,000
Snowmobile Trails	Administration of State grants to 15 snowmobile clubs	10	100% for grant recipients	\$91,100 (Dept. collected \$2,000 for admin. expense)	\$57,100 (Dept. will collect \$2,000 for admin. expense)	\$57,100	\$0
Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Project	Administration of a \$25 million grant to develop and promote means for biking and walking	11	100% for duration of grant	\$358,431	\$2,913,426	\$2,913,426	\$0
County Stewardship Grant Program	Awards funds on a 50% match basis for conservation projects and Smart Growth land use planning	12	100% as long as program exists	\$46,929 (grant award of \$44,929 plus \$2,000 staff time)	\$132,532 (\$2,000 staff time, \$59,032 carryover, \$70,500 budget)	\$0	\$73,500 (\$59,032 was from 2008 tax levy)
Farmland Preservation	Administers program to ensure tax credits for farmers	13	100% as long as program is in place	\$150	\$150	\$150	\$0
Crystal Lake Boat Landing	Administration and maintenance of the site and facilities	14	Needed to maintain facilities	\$3,400	\$5,000	\$0	\$5,000

<b>Program</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Service Level Required</b>	<b>2008 Actual Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Expense</b>	<b>2009 Budgeted Grants/Fees Revenue</b>	<b>2009 Tax Levy</b>
Gerber Lakes Fish and Wildlife Area	Administration and maintenance of the site and boat landing	15	Needed to maintain facilities and rental house	\$1,550	\$3,000	\$7,200	-\$4,543
Little Elkhart Lake Boat Landing	Administration and maintenance of facilities	16	Needed to maintain facilities	\$3,380	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000
Jetzer's Lake Boat Landing	Administration and maintenance of facilities	17	Needed to maintain facilities	\$2,940	\$3,000	\$0	\$3,000
Amsterdam Dunes Preservation	Acquisition and protection of rare and unique habitats along Lake Michigan	18	Not required	\$0	\$8,000 (from staff salaries and benefit)	\$0	\$8,000 (from staff salaries and benefits)
Bock Farm	Holding and leasing 200 acres of agricultural land	19	Not required	\$483	\$0	\$16,575	-\$16,575
<b>Totals</b>				<b>\$909,588</b>	<b>\$4,126,858</b>	<b>\$3,335,451</b>	<b>\$732,032</b>

# SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

## January 28, 2009

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** SUBDIVISION ORDINANCE

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The purpose of the Subdivision Ordinance is to protect the public health, safety, convenience, and general welfare; encourage planned and orderly land use and development; promote property values and the property tax base; permit the careful planning and efficient maintenance of highway systems; promote the provision of adequate transportation, water, sewerage, health, education, recreation, and other public facilities; recognize the needs of agriculture, forestry, industry, and commerce in future growth; encourage uses of land and other natural resources which are in accordance with their character and adaptability; preserve wetlands; conserve soil, water, and forest resources; reduce erosion damage and sedimentation of surface waters; prevent downstream flood hazards and loss of life and property due to unmanaged peak flows, volumes, and runoff following the land development process; protect the beauty and amenities of the landscape and manmade developments; provide healthy surroundings for family life; encourage the efficient and economical use of public funds; and conserve the value of the buildings placed upon land, provide the best possible environment for human habitation, and encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout Sheboygan County.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

The program is intended to serve anyone in the unincorporated parts of Sheboygan County that wish to divide property. In 2007, there were 82 certified survey maps that divided property in Sheboygan County, and 5 subdivision or condominium plats that were reviewed under this Ordinance. In 2008, there were 46 certified survey maps, and 3 subdivisions or condominium plats reviewed under this ordinance. Every citizen and property owner benefits from orderly development and environmental protection.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. Review and approval of the proper layout and design of new lots catches survey errors early in the process before they become issues in the chain of title or the ability of the land to legally be conveyed. This process also protects natural resources and has long term positive impacts for the original owner that divides the property as well as for persons that may subsequently acquire the lots. The general public is also benefited long term by stable and sustainable development.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

This program compliments the County's sanitary ordinance and shoreland-floodplain ordinance. All new lots are reviewed for compliance with these other ordinances. A requirement of the sanitary ordinance is that each lot is served by suitable sanitary facilities. This allows the Department to require an inspection of an existing septic system as a condition of approval of the land division. This has resulted in the replacement of failing septic systems that could pollute the environment or harm public health. Soil testing must be performed on new lots. Lot lines can be shifted where necessary when suitable area for a septic system cannot be found. Lots that are not suitable for septic systems and therefore are not buildable without another form of sanitary sewer are also identified. This protects citizens from buying a lot that cannot be built upon because sanitary facilities are not available. The shoreland-floodplain ordinance review ensures that new lots are in compliance and protects people from building in flood-prone areas, on nonconforming lots, or in locations that would damage lakes and streams.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The Department frequently communicates with townships in the County as to the requirements in relation to local zoning decisions. A copy of any approval, denial, or other actions regarding land divisions is sent to town officials where the project is located. Each town is also an approving authority in the review of subdivision plats. The collection of property taxes is dependent on accurate property descriptions.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

The number of violations of the County subdivision ordinance corrected each year indicates value and effectiveness. The number of errors found during the review process also attests to effectiveness. Nearly 75% of land divisions submitted for review have one or more errors that would affect title, tax listing, or the ability to build on a lot. This points to a need for professional education within the program to help reduce the error rate.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Yes. A registered land surveyor, professional planner, or licensed engineer as an individual or part of a firm could review land divisions on a contract basis. From prior experience, however, anyone performing these services under contract must also not engage in land division activities in Sheboygan County. Costs may be competitive. Actual costs and the potential field of contractees could be determined by issuing an adequate Request for Proposals.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks 1<sup>st</sup> out of 19 discretionary programs. The necessity of this program is evident in the number of errors found during the review process as well as the potential for severe damages and problems that would plague citizens and the environment for many years to come throughout the County. The dependence on the tax levy for this program is minimal considering the positive impacts.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Town officials frequently review the lot layout relative to zoning, but seldom review the mechanics of the survey itself (legal description, road depiction, line bearings and lengths, and location description). Errors in these components of the survey will effect the ability to record a map and the ability of the land to be properly described and assessed for taxes. But, as indicated in Question 7, this service could be contracted to others.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Substantial loss in survey accuracy, reduction in adherence to professional planning standards of practice for lot layout and design, additional time required to process documents for tax assessment and collection programs, environmental damage and adverse economic impacts. By assuming these responsibilities, we also assume some degree of liability. This might be reduced if the services were contracted to others.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The cost of certified survey map and subdivision review in 2008 was \$21,006 in staff time. Fees collected for reviewing land division documents totaled \$11,363 in 2008. The tax levy thus contributed \$9,643 to the operation of this program last year, or 46% of the program cost. Considering the numerous potential harmful impacts if not being performed or performed well, this program is very effective compared with the tax levy cost.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be abbreviated, but with greater chance for resulting adverse impact. A better alternative would be to increase fees to pay for the full cost of this service, thereby completely removing funding by tax levy. A less attractive alternative would be to contract for outside professionals to perform land division reviews if it could be proven to be cost effective. Some oversight of subcontracted land division review would still be necessary, however.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

Sheboygan County's hazardous waste management program is critical for not only the protection of the environment and human health, but to ensure economic viability for small businesses and farms that generate hazardous wastes and whom might otherwise have to pay much higher costs for contracting this service. Ironically, contracting by farms and small businesses for these services would most likely be with the same provider that Sheboygan County uses but at a discount due to volume. Without this program, people may place hazardous wastes in the regular garbage or dispose of it down drains, in waterways, or spread it or bury it in soil. Hazardous wastes that are collected under this very successful program include mercury, arsenic, DDT, other pesticides, and lead based paints. Some of these materials are recycled, while others are properly incinerated under high temperature thermal destruction. We have been very successful the last two years in obtaining state grants to cover 20 to 25% of the program as we have formed a regional hazardous waste management compact with several surrounding counties to apply for grants and to receive the best prices for collection and disposal services. The budget proposed by the Governor, however, eliminates State funding for hazardous waste management grants.

This program also collects all types of batteries, ballasts, compact fluorescent light bulbs, fluorescent light tubes, televisions, computers, and other electronic/lighting wastes. These items may contain hazardous wastes. Up to 98% of these materials by weight are then recycled into other products.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

All citizens that own or rent a home, farm, or small business in Sheboygan County are eligible to participate, which means every person in the County. During the collection events that are covered by state grants, residents from participating counties can also use Sheboygan County facilities, but that has been extremely rare. (Sheboygan County residents may also use facilities in surrounding counties.) In 2008, approximately 60 tons of hazardous wastes were collected and properly disposed of by nearly 1,000 participants. This program benefits every citizen's health and well-being by keeping hazardous wastes out of the environment.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. Many hazardous wastes are deadly to humans, fish, and wildlife. Some common hazardous wastes such as DDT, mercury, lead, and cadmium can build up in living tissues and magnify in the food chain. These same hazardous wastes and others also cause cancer and reproductive and neurological damage in all animals and humans. These toxic materials can be dangerous or lethal for hundreds of years or longer if improperly disposed of. Clean-up costs for hazardous waste disposal sites or environmental contamination are very costly and very frequently involve the removal and destruction of large volumes of soil. Children are much more susceptible to harm by hazardous wastes than adults. These serious adverse impacts are all prevented by the Sheboygan County hazardous waste management program.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. Under the mandatory storm water control program, we are to control discharges or placement of hazardous wastes into ditches and surface waters. Exposure to lead based paint is reduced, which is a public health concern and ongoing program to avoid permanent damage to children. Spills of hazardous wastes are often dealt with through emergency management and fire department functions. The University of Wisconsin Extension provides assistance with agricultural hazardous waste education and administration.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Sheboygan County is now part of a hazardous waste management compact with several other counties to more effectively, efficiently and economically deal with hazardous wastes. The state recognizes this and has given us two successive grants to help fund the effort. We work with all units of local government in our promotion and education activities. We are now also gaining the advantage of a significant volume discount, which may be as much as 15%.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Participation as well as the amounts of hazardous wastes collected has greatly increased over the last two years. The County Board has recognized this and increased the hazardous waste budget by about 18% for 2009. The numerous favorable comments from citizens who must sometimes wait in line for an hour or more due to the sheer volume of participants on some collection days attests to the value of this program.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Grants are only given to government agencies, most commonly counties. We provide administration, coordination, oversight, grant writing, education, and promotion activities. The actual collection and disposal of hazardous waste is under contract to the best provider of these services in the world.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **2nd** out of 19 discretionary programs. It would rank number 1 due to the critical environmental and public health benefits, but the heavy reliance on tax dollars brought it down to number 2.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Alternatives are currently available, mostly by contracting with service providers on an individual basis, but this greatly increases cost, reduces accountability, and would result in cases of improper disposal. Contracting with other service providers would be possible, but would be more expensive as our provider has the state contract for these services and that discounted rate is passed on to us. Our provider also successfully recycles more of these wastes instead of relying on landfilling and incineration as other providers may do to a greater extent.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

There would be the potential for paying much higher costs for remediating contaminated sites. We may also be in violation of storm water management regulations if spills or discharges occur into waterways. Episodes of environmental contamination and human health impacts may increase.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

This program has a major impact on the protection of the environment and human health, and also assists homeowners, farmers, and small business owners to responsibly manage hazardous wastes and dispose of waste lighting and electronic equipment at discounted prices. The total amount spent by Sheboygan County for hazardous waste management fees from the tax levy in 2008 was **\$83,357.13**. The grant award for 2008 was about **\$21,000**, so the total expense for contracted services in 2008 was **\$104,357.13**. Since nearly 60 tons of hazardous wastes were collected, that translates to \$1,738.29 per ton, or \$0.87 per pound (120,000 pounds total). Another way to look at this would be the approximate average cost of \$104.36 per participant. There also is an estimated **\$8,000** in staff time spent on this program every year (for grant writing, administration, promotion, and coordination). Anyone understanding the high costs of hazardous waste disposal would clearly see that this is indeed a bargain. At some point, the costs are expected to decline as the amount of hazardous waste in storage finally declines.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be curtailed, but that would result in less hazardous waste being collected. Fees could be collected when citizens deliver their hazardous wastes, but that would be a very complicated endeavor due to the large numbers of citizens and technicians involved during the hectic collection periods. Assessing fees may encourage illegal dumping. There are some services that government can best provide, and this is one of them. All residents of Sheboygan County benefit from a cleaner environment and reduced threats to public health at a much lower cost than individuals would have to collectively pay for the equivalent service.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** WASTE PHARMACEUTICAL MANAGEMENT

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

Sheboygan County has been involved in the collection and proper disposal of waste pharmaceuticals for the last two years. This effort is a team approach with the Healthy Sheboygan County 2010 Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Committee. In 2007, St. Nicholas Hospital sponsored initial funding. A grant has also been obtained for 2009, but is being eliminated by the Governor due to state budget problems. Waste pharmaceuticals are emerging as one of the most important environmental issues as we more clearly understand what happens when they are improperly disposed of. Flushing them down the toilet was recently the suggested method of disposal by medical and even some environmental officials. We now know that waste drugs are not significantly degraded by community waste water treatment plants and septic system. The flushed drugs build up in waterways and in the tissues of aquatic organisms and the terrestrial organisms that consume them. The waste medications are also ingested through drinking water. The synergistic acute and chronic effects of this complex cocktail of waste medications are just beginning to be understood. The most serious effects reported thus far are reproductive disorders and the feminization of males in affected species. Some researchers suspect that some of these mixtures of drugs and drug derivatives may also cause cancer and a host of other health issues. The most immediate threat of waste pharmaceuticals is that they have replaced street drugs as the illegal drugs of choice by young people and those that are chemically dependent. Sheboygan County has substantial rates of abuse of waste and stolen pharmaceuticals. In addition, up to 25% of accidental poisoning episodes of children can be traced to the availability of old medications. The collection program is designed to educate citizens and medical practitioners and to remove waste drugs from the environment and from substance abusers. This program consists of a County-wide collection event held in October in conjunction with the Crime Stoppers Safety and Crime Prevention Fair and a new permanent drop-off location at the City of Sheboygan Police Department. Other permanent drop off locations are pending.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

All residents of Sheboygan County and all medical providers in the County are intended audiences. This includes veterinary medical services. Senior citizens unwittingly provide a majority of the waste medications improperly disposed of or obtained by substance abusers. In 2008, 334 citizens and small medical/veterinary providers participated. An accounting of users was not obtained for 2007, but based on the 2008 results, it is estimated that about 150 people participated. Keeping these drugs out of the environment and the hands of abusers is of great benefit to all citizens.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. Without this program, citizens will continue to hoard old drugs, making them more available for substance abusers and for accidental ingestion by children. Without this collection and disposal program, the only other means for disposal would be flushing them down the toilet or placing them in the trash, polluting water supplies. Once into the environment, waste pharmaceuticals and their derivatives can be persistent.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. This function is currently a part of the hazardous waste management budget under the jurisdiction of the Planning and Resources Department. This program has extensive partnerships with other community organizations (local law enforcement agencies, St Nicholas Hospital, and the Healthy Sheboygan County 2010 Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Committee) and County departments (Sheriff's and Health and Human Services). This entire effort is an outstanding example of an innovative community team project.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The state has given us two successive grants to help fund the collection and proper disposal of waste medications due to our extensive partnerships. The budget proposed by the Governor, however, takes away the grant we were awarded for 2009. We work with all units of local government in our promotion and education activities.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Participation as well as the amounts of waste pharmaceuticals collected has greatly increased over the last two years. The numerous favorable comments from citizens also attest to the value of this program.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Probably not. Grants are only given to government agencies, most commonly counties. We provide administration, coordination, oversight, grant writing, education, and promotion activities. The actual collection and disposal of collected waste pharmaceuticals is under contract to the best provider of these services in the world under a County contract or incinerated by the City of Sheboygan Police Department under County administration and coordination.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks 3rd out of 19 discretionary programs. The major environmental and public health benefits accomplished at very small cost make this an extremely effective program.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Other program arrangements may be possible such as trying to convince pharmacies and medical providers to form a take back program, but the County is the best and most logical administrator of this program as every community and many agencies participate. Grants are almost always awarded to counties to fund this program.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Waste pharmaceuticals would contaminate the environment and have adverse implications for human health. Clean up costs may be much higher later.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The program cost for contracted services was about \$4,000 in 2007 and about \$8,000 in 2008. A grant paid provided \$5,000 to help defray the \$8,000 in contracted costs in 2008. The annual cost in staff time is estimated to be \$5,000. About 350 pounds of waste over the counter and prescription medications were collected in 2007. About 22 pounds of the much more tightly controlled Schedule 1 narcotics were also collected. The 2008 collection project removed more than 764 pounds of waste prescription and over the counter medications, 8.8 pounds of medical aerosols and inhalers, and more than 46 pounds of Schedule 1 narcotics from the environment and out of the hands of youth and substance abusers. A memorandum of agreement between the City of Sheboygan and Sheboygan County has just been signed to place a permanent drop off box for waste medications in the City of Sheboygan police station. This will provide full time means for citizens to safely dispose of waste pharmaceuticals.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that furnishes broad administrative support, funding, and coordination.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be curtailed, but that would result in fewer waste pharmaceuticals being collected. Partners in this effort can be asked to contribute funds, but they are under the same budget constraints. Fees could be collected when citizens deliver their medications, but that would be a very complicated endeavor due to the large numbers of citizens and technicians involved during the hectic collection periods. Assessing fees may encourage illegal dumping. There are some services that government can best provide, and this is one of them. All residents of Sheboygan County benefit from a cleaner environment and reduced threats to public health at a much lower cost than individuals would have to pay for the equivalent service.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS MAPPING

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The County GIS (Geographic Information Systems) mapping system has been in place in some form since at least 1992. This program includes data that is developed and/or maintained by the Planning and Resources Department, Highway Department, Land and Water Conservation Department, and the IS Department. Currently, Sheboygan County is undertaking the mandatory Smart Growth comprehensive planning process. All communities in Sheboygan County are involved in one or more programs that require them to create a comprehensive plan. Over the last four years, the County has been actively involved in assisting Communities with their planning processes which also includes developing map products. Demand for mapping products continues to increase as local governments conform to mandated planning requirements. Various County plans such as those for farmland preservation (now mandated under the Governor's new budget) and outdoor recreation are periodically updated, and compliance with federal and state laws for storm water management require mapping for final documents. Maps are created and used for various Planning Department projects such as for non-motorized transportation, enforcement cases, and zoning issues. The Department works with the Sheriff's Department to implement the cellular E911 dispatch system. The GIS unit maintains the database for the entire County dispatch and E911 systems. Enhancements and maintenance of this database such as adding new addresses are required on an ongoing basis to ensure proper functioning. The mapping projects create data that is entered into the dispatch system and creates the underlying road information and map necessary for the E911 system. The GIS unit also creates maps and double checks mapping and parcel information for County tax listing functions. Because of the mandatory tax listing, E-911, stormwater, Smart Growth, and floodplain and shoreland ordinance support needs, this program has now probably evolved into a mandatory program that we cannot do without and thus should no longer be considered discretionary. Maps have also been prepared for sex offender registry, water contamination episodes, ambulance services, fire departments, and school districts.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

All residents of Sheboygan County, local units of government, and other County Departments utilize or depend on GIS services. Private businesses and developers also utilize these services from time to time for a fee. A primary beneficiary of GIS mapping is the public. A shared GIS data base allows all staff to provide more detailed information about a property from their desktop or the front counter at the office to help the public. The real property function in the Treasurer's office uses mapping to keep track of parcel ownership and the assessment of these parcels. Most GIS data is made available on the land records page of the County's website. Real estate agents, attorneys, banks, title companies, appraisers, assessors, and local officials all have varying degrees of access that allow them to get information about a parcel that they are interested in. In addition, the GIS unit has provided mapping services to other Departments such as responder maps for the Sheriff's Department, and mapping of the lead abatement program administered by the HHS Department. GIS mapping services on the County website receive far more hits than any other County program.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. Demands placed on modern development projects and the multitude of plans, studies, and governmental functions that are mandated all require the preparation of maps and other spatial reference data. The County provides these geographic resources as a one stop shop. As many of the GIS unit functions have become mandatory, this program has in fact become more essential, enough to argue that it is now a mandatory program.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. Planning and zoning functions all require a variety of complex maps. The GIS unit also performs work for other County departments such as the Treasurer's office, Highway Department, Sheriff's Department, Emergency Management, Health and Human Services Department, Information Services Department, elections, and others. GIS personnel (2) are involved in the overall land records administration efforts of the County. Data sharing is practiced between the City of Sheboygan Public Works and the County through a formal agreement to prevent duplication of efforts.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Having a comprehensive one stop shop for geographic information avoids duplication of efforts and promotes efficiency of personnel and other resources. This includes the data sharing agreement with the City of Sheboygan.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

One way to measure how the program is being effectively provided is to look at the number of "hits" on the County's Land Records web pages maintained by GIS. The number of hits on GIS web pages is about 40,000 per month, or half of the activity total on the entire County website. Another is the number of tax listing maps created: 476 in 2007 and 407 in 2008. The favorable comments by those served also indicate that the program is well received.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Due to the complexity of data sharing and the need for data security and privacy, this function is best handled by County government.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **4th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There are mandatory requirements for this program and it supports a tremendous variety and number of other programs. This program has the highest tax levy cost for any 'discretionary' program in the Planning and Resources Department, however.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

No. As a long shot, a request for proposals could be developed and issued that adequately describes all the functions and responsibilities. Any responses could be analyzed to see if the same essential services could effectively and efficiently be provided at less cost while maintaining the necessary data security.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

This program should now be considered a mandatory program due to the many mandatory programs it supports. Without this program, the other related mandatory functions of County government might fail. Regarding citizens, there would be no other location to simply gather information that the public demands to conduct its business.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The direct program cost for salaries and supplies was about **\$140,000** in 2007, and about **\$156,000** in 2008. Revenues were about **\$4,400** in 2007 and **\$2,200** in 2008. There is an estimated additional annual staff cost of about **\$10,000**. Funding for some specific GIS projects such as periodic orthophotographic flights comes from the Land Records budget from fees collected by the Register of Deeds.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that furnishes broad geographic information needs required by other County departments and the public.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be curtailed, but that would result in a reduction in critical expectations. Fees could be increased, but fees could only capture a small amount of the program's cost. Provision of data to other units of government and the public could cease and then hopefully someone in the private sector could duplicate the services. A request for proposals could determine costs to replace services currently provided by the County. There are some functions that government does best, however, and this is likely one.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** BROUGHTON SHEBOYGAN MARSH PARK

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The Broughton Sheboygan Marsh consists of about 14,000 acres. The Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) owns 752 acres while Sheboygan County owns 7,414 acres. The balance of the Marsh is under private ownership. All public lands owned by the DNR and the County are managed by a long term cooperative agreement and a plan, both of which are periodically updated. A Marsh Management Advisory Committee appointed by the County Administrator and by County ordinance provides oversight of the Marsh, making recommendations to the County Board via the Planning, Resources, Agriculture, and Extension Committee. Members of the advisory committee are DNR and County staff, County Board members, and representatives from conservation organizations. This committee and its functions regarding the Marsh are mandatory under terms of the management agreement and by County ordinance. This program performs vegetation management (primarily cattail removal by prescribed burning and use of selected herbicides), fisheries and wildlife management, public access, and water level management. The management of water levels remains somewhat controversial due to conflicting interests, but has been well-balanced by staff and the advisory committee. When the County accepted the initial donation of lands in the Marsh, a requirement as part of that donation allegedly required County management into perpetuity. The Marsh is also home to an outdoor education program that provides environmental and outdoor educational opportunities for children. A major emphasis of this program is the maintenance and leasing of a recreation complex consisting of a modern lodge (with full service bar and restaurant), an old lodge building and garages that are at the end of their service lives, and a 64 site campground, all on 30 acres at the main entrance to the Marsh.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

All residents of Sheboygan County and the many tourists that visit the County may find interest in the Marsh. It is impossible to precisely determine the numbers of people who hunt, fish, snowmobile, and recreate in the vast Marsh with its many access points. Determining the numbers of campers and users of the restaurant can be estimated, however. There are 25 permanent campsites that are rented on an annual basis and in 2008 there were about 1,500 transient campsite rentals and about 57,500 restaurant/tavern visitors. This represented about a 2% increase over 2007. Gross receipts for the lodge and campgrounds operated by the lessee totaled about \$678,000 in 2008, and about \$648,000 in 2007. In addition, about 4,000 children participate in the educational activities at the Marsh every year. With the addition of the soon-to-be-built observation tower, the numbers of people that visit the Marsh will grow considerably. There are also plans to tear down the older buildings and replace them with a very low maintenance structure that will serve as a storm shelter, classroom and interpretive center at relatively little cost to the County, thus eliminating safety hazards and reducing long term maintenance budgets while further promoting the Marsh to visitors.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. The County has been involved in protecting and promoting the Marsh since 1937, with the potential to continue that stewardship long into the future. Recreational and educational opportunities are dwindling as development continues. (Sheboygan County lost 3,000 acres to residential and commercial development in the last five years.) The Marsh will thus become much more important as a last vestige of wild open space.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Department's Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan, Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan, and Natural Areas and Critical Resources Plan also involve the Marsh.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The presence and protection of this vast resource for relatively little money would be considered effective and efficient by most observers and taxpayers. The intergovernmental relationship with the DNR also enhances effectiveness and efficiency as partial management and all resources-based law enforcement are performed by the state.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Interactions with the public, DNR, lessees of park facilities, the advisory committee and the Planning, Resources, Agriculture, and Extension Committee all indicate satisfaction with the Marsh and its management, with the exception of the remaining controversy over water level management. However, water level management has greatly reduced the County's expenditure for removal of cattails from behind the dam, saving taxpayer money. FEMA paid for cattail removal and disposal in 2008 due to the severity of area storms.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

This question has a mixed answer. The County is contracting with successful lessees to operate the 30 acre park with lodge and campground facilities. The current lessees now desire a longer term lease, and enjoy a much better relationship with the County than previous lessees have had. Subcontracting the balance of the program could perhaps be done with the DNR, but that would result in much public opposition. The Marsh has a legacy of use that has been passed down from generation to generation, and many residents of Sheboygan County as well as the numerous conservation organizations would strenuously oppose major shifts in management of the Marsh.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **5th** out of 19 discretionary programs. The relatively small expenditure combined with the amount of revenue accomplishes so much for the numerous users of the Marsh, and the numbers of users will increase in the future without a large corresponding increase in expenses.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

No. There are no other providers of this service. A request for proposals could be issued to determine if another lessee could operate the 30 acre park with lodge and campground more efficiently and with less cost to the County, but the long history has shown that the partnership now occurring is better than any in the past. New lease discussions will attempt to increase revenues and/or reduce expenses.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

The original management terms of the Marsh could be researched to determine exactly what the obligations of the County are. If we eliminate County management of the 30 acre park, the lodge and campgrounds and all other buildings could be removed or sold as is. Cattail mats would once again clog the dam and the Sheboygan River, causing distress for neighbors many miles downstream and hindering enjoyment of the Marsh by citizens. Before water management activities, the County could spend up to \$39,000 per year on cattail removal.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

In 2007, direct program expenses were **\$69,809** while revenues were **\$36,694**. In 2008, direct expenses were **\$24,442** with **\$41,511** in revenues. (The large increase in expenses for 2007 was due to upgrading the pit toilets and electrical system in the campgrounds.) In addition, an estimated **\$20,000** in additional indirect staff time is spent on Marsh-related activities per year. Managing such a vast resource with such a small budget can be considered a remarkable achievement.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that could undertake this management function for the Broughton Sheboygan Marsh.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be trimmed. Water and vegetation management could be eliminated, but that would result in more uprooted cattails. The lodge and campground could be leased on different terms placing responsibility for all expenses on the lessee, but it is unlikely that we could find a tenant willing to accept those terms. The buildings could be sold, but there may then be disputes. The lodge and campground could be torn down and the Marsh could then be operated for strictly outdoor recreation. The observation tower may increase maintenance costs slightly from time to time so the tower could still be turned down.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** WISCONSIN FUND

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

Sheboygan County participates in the State-funded Wisconsin Fund, a grant program to assist property owners with the cost of private on-site waste water disposal (septic) system replacement. The Planning & Resources Department serves as a "pass-through" for the State grant program and gets an administrative fee in the process to cover our expenses. Unfortunately, this is a reimbursement program so an affected property owner must first pay for repairs or replacement of a failing sanitary system. This requires them to obtain a loan or find other means of payment. The only way property owners can obtain funding is via the County's participation in the program. The Department handles all of the administrative aspects of the program, and collects an administrative fee of \$100 from the property owner so there is no tax impact.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any citizen of Sheboygan County with a failing septic system and that has an income of less than \$45,000 and any small business with gross annual income of less than \$362,500 are eligible for a grant. The exact amount of the grant is dependent on the money allocated for any year divided by the number of requests. The average grant in Sheboygan County over the last four years is about \$4,600.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. Aside from the financial benefits to the individual property owners, the program provides an enduring, essential service to the entire County by eliminating failing septic systems that may be contaminating wells and ground and surface waters. This program also eliminates potential public health problems that could be caused by untreated or undertreated sewage in the community.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. This program directly supports the County sanitary ordinance program that we are mandated by state law to enforce. Property owners that must achieve compliance with sanitary ordinance requirements are sometimes financially unable to do so, or at least might be financially crippled by the high cost of sanitary system repair or replacement because of low income. This program supports the sanitary ordinance by providing financial assistance as an incentive for low income citizens and small businesses.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

By participating in the Wisconsin Fund, Sheboygan County government is much more efficient by eliminating the need to prosecute property owners with failing sanitary systems that may lack the financial means to comply. This reduces the backlog and expense of enforcement issues under the sanitary ordinance that may end up in court. Providing financial assistance to low income people and small businesses with failing septic systems makes County government more citizen-friendly as well.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

An informational sheet is handed out with every sanitary permit issued for a replacement septic system. Property owners apply for the reimbursements grants if they are eligible.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Counties are required by state law to administer the program.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **6th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There are no property tax implications with this program and little staff time and expense involved in administering the program. Benefits are important for the entire County, but the number of participants is fairly small.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

No. This program by law must be provided by counties.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

The eligible citizens and small businesses would not receive financial assistance for failing septic systems. The County would have a more difficult time of ensuring that sanitary systems were properly functioning. The likelihood of human exposure and environmental contamination by sewage would increase.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

This a pass-through program with administration costs provided to the Department for serving as the conduit for grant reimbursements. There is no support by the tax levy for this effort. The average grant is \$4,600, and there were 14 beneficiaries in 2008. Administrative revenue collected was **\$1,400**. Staff time, postage and supply expenses totaled less than **\$800**. Similar expense to revenue ratios occurred in previous years.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity can provide this service by state law.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

This program requires minimal staff time and expense. Due to the nature of the program, funding cannot be reduced, but could be eliminated. There is no County funding of this program and revenues exceed expenses, leaving very small net gains annually. Cutting this program would eliminate an important economic benefit for citizens and small businesses, and could potentially lead to environmental and public health problems while actually increasing tax levy expense for enforcement, prosecution, and clean-up.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** INTERURBAN TRAIL

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The Interurban Trail currently extends from the Ozaukee County – Sheboygan County line to Oostburg, a distance of about six miles. This existing portion of the Interurban Trail (IUT) was constructed in two phases, from the County line to Cedar Grove in 2005, and from Cedar Grove to Oostburg in 2007. It is a ten foot wide, paved surface that is completely off-road and lies on the abandoned Interurban Railroad Line right of way now owned by WE Energies. The terms of our long term lease with WE Energies restricts the Trail to just non-motorized uses. Snowmobiles are thus prohibited. Equestrian users are also prohibited, however. The Interurban Trail to the south of us in Ozaukee County is considered a major economic asset and tourist destination. In fact, only a few interruptions link the Interurban Trail from Oostburg south to the Chicago area. There are plans to extend the IUT from Oostburg to Sheboygan via Kohler Andrae State Park and has much support from local governments, the DNR, businesses, and citizens. Stimulus Bill funding is being sought for this important link, which will then form a critical hub in Sheboygan that will connect with the Old Plank Road Trail and many of the individual projects that will be constructed by the County's non-motorized transportation pilot program. There are longer term plans to connect Sheboygan to Green Bay via the IUT, and periodic planning meetings are being held with participating local governments and the DNR. When completed, the Interurban Trail will stretch from Chicago to Green Bay, with links west to Wausau and north to Door County. This will become one of the most significant non-motorized trails in the entire nation when completed. Construction of the existing portion of the IUT has been 100% grant-funded so far. The IUT has been noted in Money Magazine and on CNN.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident of the County or visitor can use the Interurban Trail. Surveys have indicated that 17,820 bicyclists and 7,560 hikers used the IUT during the warmer nine months in 2008. Total users thus probably approached 30,000 trip events.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes, benefits are long lasting. People can take advantage of a dedicated Trail for non-motorized transportation for commuting and recreation. This improves air quality and health, while reducing congestion on roadways.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Highway Department performs Trail maintenance.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The IUT connects non-motorized projects in communities along the route, providing a central spine that increases the utility and value of components. There has been a tremendous partnership with local units of government, the DNR, and We Energies to construct this Trail which continues after construction. Oostburg State Bank donated \$20,000 to construct trailheads in Cedar Grove and Oostburg. Once connected to Sheboygan, the potential use and the value of the IUT will increase exponentially as even more non-motorized program projects will be connected and a link will be made with the Old Plank Road Trail.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Even though the Interurban Trail is only a fraction of the length of the Old Plank Road Trail, has been in existence for only a fraction of the time the Old Plank Road Trail has, and lies in much smaller communities, its use rate all ready approaches the non-motorized use rate for the Old Plank Road Trail. This shows that this is indeed an effective program especially considering the fact that we have yet to even advertise this Trail and develop and distribute a trail map.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Administration, maintenance, and promotion could be subcontracted. Oversight would still be necessary. Grants and the provision of the easement can only be made to units of government, however, and it may be difficult to assign the easement to another party. A request for proposals could be issued to determine any interest and the cost of undertaking this program outside of County government.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Interurban Trail program ranks **7th** out of 19 discretionary programs. The costs are very low with comparatively high usage rates. There are positive health, recreation, transportation and air quality benefits. Economic benefits for the IUT in Ozaukee County can also be shared by Sheboygan County with adequate promotion, especially if extended into Sheboygan.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

No. We either have the Trail or we don't, and there are requirements that tie us to the program. Alternative arrangements could be investigated to determine interest and cost through a request for proposals.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

People would still use the Interurban Trail unless it were demolished and barricaded at nine intersections with roadways. Deteriorating conditions and lack of maintenance would make the Trail less safe for users. There may be legal risk if we kept the Trail open or available for use while allowing it to become unsafe. The investments provided by the local units of government and businesses in partnership with the County would be for naught.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

There were approximately 30,000 users of the IUT in 2008. There is an estimated **\$2,000** in staff time spent to oversee this Trail per year. The cost to maintain the Trail by the Highway Department was about **\$1,100** in 2008. About a third of this was storm-related damage for which FEMA reimbursed the County for about three times as much as our total maintenance costs were for the year. There are no electrical expenses as there are no lights, no toilet facilities, and no drinking water wells under County jurisdiction. Trailheads will be constructed, maintained, and managed by municipalities. This is thus an extremely effective and cost efficient program and managed more efficiently and under a different philosophy in terms of County expenses and responsibilities than the OPRT.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity provides this service, although another department such as Highway or Land and Water Conservation could be given the responsibilities.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

There would be less maintenance and oversight. Although recreational immunity offers some protection, we may be exposed to liability if we knowingly allow unsafe conditions that are detrimental to the intended use to exist and get worse. User fees could also be established, but those would have to be quite high to pay the expenses. Enforcement costs would then escalate as we would have to educate the public, post signs for visitors; then patrol the Interurban Trail, issue citations, and prosecute violators in circuit court. Since this is a new recreational/alternative transportation asset, maintenance costs are expected to be low at this point. But, short-changing on any maintenance during the initial years may greatly increase maintenance costs later.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** ELKHART LAKE BOAT LANDING

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

Elkhart Lake is the largest natural lake in the County. The Lake's clear water and rock, gravel, and sand shoreline make it ideal for almost any recreational use, particularly swimming and boating. The property for the Elkhart Lake boat landing on the east side of CTH P was purchased in 1964. The County actually acquired the boat landing site by condemnation, which resulted in legal challenges. The lawsuit was fought all the way to the state supreme court, pitting many of the lake owners against Sheboygan County for providing a means for the public to more easily access what was perceived as their lake. The County obviously prevailed. (It is doubtful whether the County would undertake condemnation of private property today to acquire recreation land, and surviving a legal challenge today may be more tenuous.) The property on the west side of CTH P was purchased in 1993 and developed into a parking lot with permanent toilet facilities. The Sheboygan County Conservation Association and member clubs were largely responsible for funding the improvements, and supplied the match requirements when DNR grants were obtained to fund improvements. The boat landing contains a fishing pier, boat ramp, parking areas, a picnic table, and other amenities besides the toilet facilities and parking. The boat landing is also used by ice fishers, canoeists, kayakers, and others besides power boat enthusiasts during every month of the year. There is a ban on motorized boats on Elkhart Lake on Sundays. Elkhart Lake is an astonishing resource, one of a small number of lakes created from the melting of massive chunks of ice that were left buried after the retreat of the last glacier. Its waters remain extremely clear with a maximum depth of about 119 feet, making it the fourth deepest inland lake in the entire state. It supports a good sport fishery for smallmouth bass, rock bass, and even trophy-sized walleye. The lake is 286 acres in size and has 3.74 miles of shoreland that is mostly developed.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident of the County or visitor can use the Elkhart Lake boat landing in any season. The numbers of users has never been determined. But, during most spring and summer weekends and many warm evenings, the ample parking lot is completely full and boat landing users park along CTH P for quite a distance, attesting to the popularity of this recreational resource.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes, benefits are long lasting, enabling many more people to enjoy this great outdoor asset than those who by happenstance live on its shores. The Elkhart Lake boat landing has been used for almost 50 years, and with just a little annual attention, can last many years into the future.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Highway Department performs some maintenance and snow plowing.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The operation of this much-used recreation site was made more efficient in 2008, improving its appearance and maintenance, while lowering the cost to do so. In previous years, landscaping companies and the County Highway Department performed maintenance, and this resulted in high costs. A unique partnership was developed with Tri-County Sportswomen to perform most of the maintenance and upkeep at the entire site at far less cost. Tri-County Sportswomen provide the labor, have obtained the services of a professional landscape

architect without cost, and have been successful at obtaining additional donations of labor, money, and materials such as a bench. The Kayak Club and Muskies, Incorporated join with Tri-County Sportswomen to clean the site and make it ready for the busy spring and summer seasons on Earth Day weekend. Koenings Conservation Club maintains the fishing pier.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Visual inspections readily show site improvements, and accolades from neighbors (one of which now volunteers to mow adjoining road ditches to further improve the site) and the public attest to site improvements.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Maintenance of the boat landing is now mostly subcontracted at less cost than it was before, with volunteers providing much of the other work.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **8th** out of 19 discretionary programs. It is the largest boat landing site and likely has the highest usage rate. A small amount of money is paid to maintain the asset compared to its visibility and high use rate by the public.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Not likely. The county has all ready greatly reduced the small amount it formerly spent to maintain this property by subcontracting and organizing conservation clubs to help support the effort.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

People would still use the site unless it were demolished and barricaded. Deteriorating conditions and lack of maintenance would make the property less safe for users. The toilet facilities would attract vandals. Trash would accumulate.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Although exact numbers of users are unknown, anecdotal evidence and periodic observations show that the Elkhart Lake Boat Landing is heavily used during the fishing and boating seasons, and much less frequently at other times. The County contract with Tri-County Sportswomen pays them **\$1,000** per year for gasoline, tools, mulch, and ornamental vegetation. Work by other conservation organizations is donated. The Highway Department charged **\$2,900** for maintenance in 2008. Indirect personnel costs for this program are estimated to be **\$2,000** per year. The total annual cost is thus about **\$5,900** for this program.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity provides this service, although another department such as Highway or Land and Water Conservation could be given the responsibilities.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

The boat landing property could be sold, but it has little potential for alternative uses due to its size and shoreland/floodplain zoning restrictions. The property could be permanently deeded over to a conservation organization such as the Tri-County Sportswomen or to the Town of Rhine and Town of Greenbush (part of the property is located in each Town), but these entities would have to agree to obligate themselves with the responsibilities of ownership. Less funding would mean less maintenance and less frequent trash collection. Toilet facilities could be closed to save pumping costs, but that would result in unsanitary conditions at the site. This site all ready is operated on a barely adequate budget, and rather than reduce funding further, it would be best to abandon the site and demolish and remove improvements.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** OLD PLANK ROAD TRAIL

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The first stretch of the Old Plank Road Trail (OPRT) was constructed in the late 1970's, and reached about ten miles from Sheboygan to Plymouth. The next leg was constructed about ten years later and added another nine miles to Greenbush, for a total Trail length of about 19 miles. Trailheads such as those at Greenbush, Meadowlark Road, and Erie Avenue allow visitors to park motor vehicles and provide added amenities such as toilet facilities. This is a one-of-a-kind multi-use Trail, as it accommodates hikers, walkers, cross country skiers, in-line skaters, bicyclists, equestrians, Segue users, snowmobilers, and moped riders. Despite the multiple uses, conflict among user groups is rare. Different organizations sponsor events and runs on the Trail as fund-raising events. The first section of the OPRT was constructed without the proper gravel base as a cost savings measure and is eight feet wide. The second leg of construction had the proper gravel base and is ten feet wide, the new minimum standard for multi-use trails in order to receive funding. Despite the lack of a gravel base and substantial use over the years, the initial segment has held up remarkably well until recently. Now, deterioration is rapidly occurring due to freeze-thaw cycles on the crumbling asphalt pavement and the intrusion of vegetation. There are numerous potholes, exposed roots, and other hazards. The Department worked out an agreement with Wisconsin Public Service Corporation to pay for reconstructing the first 2.2 miles of the old section of the Trail, and Stimulus Bill funds have been sought to fund the balance of the reconstruction plus repair the lighting and the surface coating in the tunnel under I-43. In addition, the County has budgeted about \$300,000 for reconstruction and a grant award of \$150,000 has been received from the DNR. When State Highway 23 is reconstructed to Fond du Lac, there are plans to extend the OPRT from Greenbush all the way to Fond du Lac. Snowmobile club volunteers perform summer maintenance such as grass cutting.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident of the County or visitor can use the OPRT in any season. An estimated 36,000 user trips occur during the warmer nine months, and an estimated 5,000 snowmobile use trips occur during the months when snow is present. An unknown but substantial number of other people use the trail during the off-season besides snowmobilers. Use is rapidly escalating as mopeds and bicycles are becoming popular for commuting between the urbanized areas and places of employment along the Trail. Moped users accounted for about 20% of users in 2007, and less than 15% in 2008 as the use of bicycles increased at a greater rate than mopeds.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes, benefits are indeed long lasting. The original pavement has held up for almost 30 years, and reconstruction should give it another 50 years of life with only minor repairs needed from time to time after reconstruction. Users of the OPRT consider it vital for exercise and recreation and also for commuting. The presence of trails such as the OPRT promotes healthy lifestyles and fights obesity.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Highway Department performs maintenance and reconstruction and also supports the formation of trails as a means for alternative transportation.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The presence of the OPRT serves as a major artery that links other trails and provides vital intercommunity connection. This enhances the County's alternative transportation efforts as advanced by the Planning and Resources Department and the Highway Department.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Surveys have been conducted on OPRT users for two warm weather seasons to determine means of alternative transportation used as well as attitude. People utilizing the OPRT unanimously attest to its value and worth, while sometimes lamenting the poor condition of the remaining portion of the original section.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Grants must go to local units of government, and as the OPRT reaches beyond community boundaries, the County would be the best choice for obtaining grants and ensuring overall consistency along the entire Trail.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **9th** out of 19 discretionary programs. The costs are fairly high compared with the numbers of users. Much of this is due to the age of the OPRT and the need to reconstruct the older portions and upgrade Trail amenities.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Not likely. This program and others like it are generally services provided by broader governments. It would be difficult financially, administratively, and logistically for a town, city, or village along the OPRT to assume the functions of this program. It may be possible to issue a request for proposals to determine if private companies have an interest in assuming these responsibilities and at what costs.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

We would have to likely close off the Trail and go through the expense of decommissioning it and making it unusable to reduce liability issues from lack of administration and maintenance. This would probably cost more than maintaining the Trail. There would also be a large outcry from the public.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Volunteers from various snowmobile clubs perform warm weather maintenance such as grass cutting along the entire trail. The County provides the mowers, and the clubs provide manpower and fuel. Master Gardeners under a new contract with the Department perform landscaping services at a much lower cost than landscape companies formerly charged. Area businesses and foundations have provided much of the associated infrastructure at the trailheads and various resting places without cost to the County. The OPRT is thus a true community partnership. Direct program expenses in 2007 were **\$24,170** while revenues were **\$0**. In 2008, direct expenses totaled **\$22,026** and revenues were **\$25**. Of the expenses in 2008, about \$11,700 was paid to the Highway Department for maintenance work, about \$3,800 for electricity for the lights, well pumps, and pump house heaters, and about \$2,400 for pumping out trailhead toilets. Larry's Hauling donates trash collection and disposal. Indirect annual personnel costs for administration, grant writing, and supervision is estimated to be **\$8,000**. The County has budgeted about **\$300,000** for reconstruction this year, and the DNR has contributed another **\$150,000**. These funds would cover about 50% of the needed reconstruction. Stimulus Bill funds are also being pursued to cover the total cost of reconstruction to save the County money, but the use by mopeds on the OPRT appears to be an issue under Stimulus Bill funding.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity provides this service. With modifications, the management and administration of the OPRT could be assumed by the Highway Department, however.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

There would be less maintenance and oversight. Although recreational immunity offers some protection, we may be exposed to liability if we knowingly allow unsafe conditions that are detrimental to the intended use to exist and get worse (we have started receiving complaints of injuries and even ambulance calls and hospitalizations arising from unsafe OPRT conditions as of last year). User fees could also be established, but those would have to be very high to pay all the expenses. Enforcement costs would then escalate as we would have to educate the public, post signs for visitors; then patrol the Trail, issue citations, and prosecute violators in circuit court.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** SNOWMOBILE TRAILS

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The Planning and Resources Department administers the snowmobile trail program in Sheboygan County. Currently, there are 228.4 miles of County snowmobile trails. The portions of the snowmobile trail system in the Broughton Sheboygan Marsh and Kettle Moraine State Forest are especially attractive to residents and visitors alike and offer a snowmobile experience generally found much farther north. The Department handles all of the administrative aspects of the trail program such as facilitating maintenance and project grants and distributing funds to snowmobile clubs for maintenance and other trail projects under terms of awarded grants and acts as the liaison between the snowmobile clubs and the DNR. This program basically serves as a conduit whereby the Department passes DNR funds on to the various clubs for trail maintenance and specific grant funded projects – money in and money out. Funding requirements mandated by DNR such as maintaining and updating a list of landowners with trail agreements that allow the presence of trails on their properties within Sheboygan County must also be performed by the Department. Participation by landowners is voluntary. The clubs work with landowners to keep and expand the trail system and perform all the work to mark and groom the trails in the network. The clubs also operate a website that shows the trail system, provides links to the individual clubs in the County, and advises users of trail conditions. The clubs determine when the trail system is open for use, and when trail conditions become unfit for use by snowmobiles.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident of the County or visitor can use the Sheboygan County snowmobile trail system, provided there is adequate snow to support snowmobile use. There are 15 snowmobile clubs in Sheboygan County that participate in the program. Although there have been no surveys to determine the numbers of users, anecdotal evidence and observations reveal that there is substantial use of the trail system. People who own snowmobiles do not have to belong to any club in order to take advantage of the trails.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes, benefits are long lasting. The snowmobile trail program has been administered by Sheboygan County since 1974. Even in tough budget times, this program is funded by the DNR and so the prospects for long term future existence seem certain. This program is indeed essential to the snowmobile clubs and the numerous people who enjoy riding the trails in the winter as the funding must be passed on to counties by law. Sheboygan County can opt out of the program, but then there would be no means for the program to continue as a benefit for citizens and visitors.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

No. No other County department is connected to the snowmobile trail system program. The snowmobile clubs include the Old Plank Road Trail and the Sheboygan Marsh as part of the trail network, and club members perform valuable summer maintenance on the Old Plank Road Trail without charge to the County.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

This program makes the DNR more efficient as counties throughout the state act as their agents in administering the program in a very effective manner. In fact, this program could be used as a model to extend

other state services into service populations in counties. Little staff time is spent on this project in comparison to most other projects in the Department.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Feedback from both the DNR and the snowmobile clubs is provided to the Department.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. By law the County must administer this program if the County wishes to provide assistance to the snowmobiling public.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The snowmobile trail program ranks **10th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There are no costs to the County and comparatively high usage rates. There are positive recreation benefits. There are some economic impacts of snowmobile tourism, but those impacts have never been quantified.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

No. By law the County must administer this program if the County wishes to provide assistance to the snowmobiling public. Another County department could be given the responsibility, however.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

People would likely still snowmobile, but there would be no coordinated program. There would be no risk or liability. But, there would be an uproar of adverse feelings from the snowmobile clubs, snowmobilers, and their supporters in the conservation community. Cutting this program would not save a penny, but there would be a loss of financial support for snowmobilers.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The DNR pays the County \$250 per mile for every mile in the trail system approved by the DNR for maintenance. This represents a total of \$57,100 per year. The Department then apportions the maintenance funds based on the length of trail each club has agreed to maintain. That amount has been the same since 2002 when the County last petitioned to increase the number of miles in the system. This pays for a fleet of trail grooming machines, gasoline, and other maintenance supplies. During heavy snow years, supplemental funding may become available. For 2008, an additional \$34,000 was awarded for distribution, although the clubs submitted claims that totaled over \$63,000. The clubs then had to make up the difference of over \$29,000 by members. The County does not contribute funds to this program in such situations. In 2008, a bridge construction project was approved by the DNR which awarded an additional \$22,350 for this work. The Department collects **\$2,000** from the maintenance award per year to cover its staff and supply costs, which has been an adequate amount. This is thus a very effective program that costs the County nothing to provide the services to the many people who enjoy snowmobiling.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity provides this service, although another department such as Highway or Land and Water Conservation could be given the responsibilities.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

The County is in no position to reduce the amount of funding as that is a set amount based on the number of miles in the system authorized by the DNR. That would be a decision by the legislature and/or the DNR. The County can, however, decide to no longer sponsor the program, thus entirely eliminating support of the snowmobile trail system. Although there is no information of this occurring elsewhere, perhaps an adjacent county could take over the program if that were possible.

*NOTE: Snowmobile clubs petitioned the County to enter into this program. A similar program exists for all terrain vehicles (ATV's), but no ATV club has approached the County to participate in the state ATV trails program. When time permits, the Department may attempt to organize this recreational opportunity in Sheboygan County in association with stakeholders.*

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PILOT PROJECT

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Project is a limited term, project-specific program that seeks to enhance the use of pedestrian and bicycle means of transportation throughout the County. The program is completely funded by a grant from the federal Department of Transportation, and Sheboygan County is one of four such pilot projects in the nation. The project works with employers, school districts, units of government, advocacy groups, and citizens to provide education, promotion, and facility construction activities. Two limited term project-specific positions have been created to fulfill the requirements of this program, and both positions will be eliminated when federal funding ceases. Sub-grants are awarded to applicants based on a ranking hierarchy developed to rate proposals. A Citizen's Advisory Committee comprised of about 30 members helps develop programs and priorities and evaluates proposals. The Citizen Advisory Committee then makes recommendations regarding its work and findings to the Joint Resources and Transportation Committee comprised of county board supervisors who serve on those two otherwise independent committees. This program enjoys widespread support from medical practitioners, schools, businesses, and citizens. The program is in its third year and it is estimated that there may be as much as two years left to complete the project.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Increasing options for non-motorized transportation will benefit every resident of the County as well as visitors. There will be more opportunities for biking and walking to work, school, and other places and for exercise and relaxation. Traffic congestion could be reduced and air quality improved.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

The benefits of this program are long lasting. The network of trails that will be constructed accompanied by promotion and education will last far into the future. Changing transportation habits will improve health.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

The NMTTP program interacts extensively with the Highway Department regarding construction of projects and with the other trail efforts undertaken by the Planning and Resources Department such as the Old Plank Road Trail and Interurban Trail which serve to link individual community projects.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Work undertaken by this program must conform to state and federal standards, and extensive coordination is maintained with federal and state departments of transportation. Reports on the work of this program are also made to the U.S. Congress. NMTTP staff makes the County more effective in becoming a leader in alternative modes of transportation. Rather than relying on a consultant that was hired to create a bicycle and pedestrian plan, NMTTP staff took over the effort and saved the County about \$100,000.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Feedback from the state and federal departments of transportation is used to evaluate program success and priorities. The Citizens Advisory Committee also evaluates the program on an ongoing basis and works with NMTTP staff to ensure successful implementation of program goals. Annual surveys of people observed walking and biking at numerous critical transit points were started last year, and those surveys will be repeated

every year during the remainder of the project to determine and document any increases in non-motorized transportation.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Perhaps. Since much of the work undertaken by this program is of a temporary nature, due to the type of work being conducted, and since project work is essentially contract-type work dealing with a range of contractors, this program is perhaps the best possible case for subcontracting in the Planning and Resources Department. There also are numerous consulting firms qualified to do the work and actively seeking that work. A request for proposals could be developed and distributed to determine the interest and cost. As the NMTTP program is of short duration and the program is fully funded by the grant, however, there would be little or no advantage to the County except that there might be more money available for projects.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The non-motorized transportation pilot project ranks **11th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There are no direct costs to the County as the Grant covers all expenses, even the time other staff spends on it. There is widespread public support for this program. But the program is temporary, and may actually result in higher costs for the County and other governments in terms of future maintenance expenses for projects now being completed. Some have argued that the price tag of \$25 million is very high for what may be accomplished by this expenditure, although there is no impact on the tax levy currently.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Possibly. The Highway Department could perform the tasks of the NMTTP as they undertake the same type of work and approvals for traditional highway projects. Consultants could also conduct the work.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

There would be few ramifications if this program were to end prematurely, except the possibility of numerous loose ends regarding projects yet to be constructed that other staff would have to contend with. However, eliminating this program would not save the County any money

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Some have questioned if the impact and effectiveness is worth the cost in terms of getting people out of motor vehicles and having them bike or walk instead, especially in winter. The County was awarded a \$25 million grant to undertake this pilot project, of which about \$5 million was skimmed off the top for administrative costs by departments of transportation. That left about \$20 million available for projects and County salary and benefit and other administrative costs. To date, 38 local projects have been awarded by the NMTTP program at a total cost of **\$19,635,000**. Of this amount, about 94% has been for construction projects, 2% for promotion activities (bike and walk to work week, advertising, etc.), and 4% for support functions (bicycle racks, pavement striping, bike corrals, etc.) Administrative costs (primarily salaries and benefits) were **\$65,300** in 2006, **\$152,800** in 2007 and **\$208,000** in 2008. Administrative costs in 2008 also included money for promotional events. County consultant costs were **\$146,000** in 2006, **\$132,000** in 2007, and **\$0** in 2008. There is no more money left to allocate for any additional projects. There is a contingency fund of \$900,000 to cover project cost over-runs such as the escalating price of concrete, steel, and asphalt. Any contingency money left over will be devoted to additional projects. About **\$482,000** has been reserved for future salaries – two people through 2010, and one person for 2011 and 2012. Due to the tremendous delays in the approval process, only one construction project has actually been completed (sidewalks on Eastern Avenue in Plymouth at a cost of \$48,500). It is expected that six construction, promotion, and support projects will be completed in 2009 at a cost of \$2 million. That leaves 31 projects still awaiting final approval by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

Yes, the Highway Department performs essentially the same work for traditional transportation projects utilizing essentially the same procedures and management consultants.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Staff could be cut from two people to one person. In fact, that will likely be the course of action undertaken by the Department near or at the end of 2009 or 2010 anyway. With projects designed and approved, project management would become the major activity and one person could probably do that in conjunction with promotion activities. That would slightly increase money available for projects. If the federal highway bill is reauthorized with additional NMTTP money and Sheboygan County obtains a second round of funding, then we could determine the need for additional project-specific staff again.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

In November of 2000, nearly 70% of the voters of Sheboygan County in a referendum voted in favor of establishing a County Stewardship Fund to develop recreation opportunities and help conserve natural resources. The types of projects that the County will support include project development, purchase of development rights, land acquisition, and habitat restoration. Goals of the Sheboygan County Stewardship Fund are: ensure citizen involvement in the stewardship process; cultivate environmental stewardship within individuals, organizations, and government entities; help implement projects identified in the County's Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan; provide matching funds for leveraging dollars from federal, state, local, and private entities for conservation activities; coordinate County stewardship activities so they are in harmony with other conservation and recreation activities already occurring or planned for the County; initiate only those stewardship activities that cannot be accomplished by current or upcoming regulatory tools, such as land use planning, zoning, land division ordinances, and shoreland-wetland-floodplain regulations; preserve the County's natural resources while minimizing the loss of local property tax revenues; form green space and wildlife habitat corridors by linking existing natural areas together; acquire, protect, and restore only those resources that can adequately be maintained by specific public or private custodians in the future; preserve the natural resources of the County while continuing to promote wise growth and economic development; and promote beautiful, healthy, and thriving cities and villages, so new and existing residents will always have attractive alternatives to living in rural areas. The Stewardship program also provides grants to local units of government for Smart Growth planning purposes. This encourages land use planning. Municipalities that have adopted Smart Growth compliant comprehensive plans receive higher priority for Stewardship funding. Funding awards are recommended by the Smart-Growth Stewardship Technical and Advisory Committee and approved by the Planning, Resources, Agricultural, and Extension Committee.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any conservation organization, school district, local government, or other group throughout Sheboygan County would be eligible to submit project proposals. Every citizen benefits from recreational opportunities and environmental protection and enhancement.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Projects that are acquired, improved, preserved, or reconstructed will endure long into the future for the enjoyment of future generations.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

This is a unique program within Sheboygan County, and it is independent of other programs and departments. Projects are generally identified in, or must be compatible with, the natural areas and critical resources plan, outdoor recreation and open space plan, and Smart Growth plans. Projects generally protect shorelands, wetlands, and/or floodplains.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Stewardship funds have been awarded to the City of Sheboygan, City of Plymouth, City of Sheboygan Falls, Town of Rhine, Village of Howards Grove, and the Village of Elkhart Lake for nature-based projects.

Stewardship funds were used to help the Sheboygan County Conservation Association leverage other funding for acquisition of 10 acres of land in the Sheboygan Marsh. This parcel was subsequently donated to Sheboygan County. The State of Wisconsin mandates Smart Growth land use planning, and the planning grants made available by the Stewardship program has been a valuable resource for 26 units of local government within Sheboygan County. (Only Waldo and Kohler have not requested Smart Growth funding through this program.) Any unused funds are returned to the County.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

With the exception of 2008, there are always requests for far more funding than what was available. Nearly all of the local communities that have undertaken Smart Growth planning have applied for and been awarded grants. In fact, the Smart Growth grants encourage effective planning by doubling the grant award from \$5,000 to \$10,000 if planning is conducted in partnership with other local governments. Most have elected to do so.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Staff time and other expenses are minimal. Funding decisions are made by the advisory committee and approved by the Planning, Resources, Agriculture, and Extension Committee.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Stewardship program ranks **12th** out of 19 discretionary programs. This program was initiated after citizens demanded the County to provide this funding opportunity. There are high citizen demands, positive environmental impacts, and low administrative costs in providing this program.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

The DNR also has a Stewardship program, but it is statewide and far more competitive and many local projects such as Smart Growth planning would not be deemed eligible.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Habitat protection and restoration, preserving lands for public use and enjoyment, and conservation projects would become greatly impeded, and the many people who demanded this program would likely raise vocal objections.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

This program is very effective as it will only pay up to 50% of a project cost, thus supplemental funding from other sources must be obtained. This broadens a project's support and appeal. Since inception, the Stewardship program has awarded \$362,000 for 20 conservation projects. This means, at minimum, another \$362,000 in matching funding had to be obtained, doubling the effectiveness of the program. In addition, \$225,000 has been awarded to 26 local governments for Smart Growth planning funding. This provides financial incentive for effective community planning. The administrative cost of this program averages less than **\$2,000** per year for staff time. When initiated, about half of the funding for the Stewardship program was obtained from fees collected from subdivision reviews, which nearly every county and other local government in Wisconsin did. This was recently prohibited by a supreme court case. Since this court decision, funding for this program has been completely from the tax levy. Funding was **\$106,000** in 2006. In 2007, funding was **\$40,000**, and in 2008, funding was **\$104,000** (part of the increase in 2008 came from returned funds which go back into this account which is non-lapsing by County Board resolution.) This program preserves, restores, and protects critical habitat that is rapidly disappearing for the enjoyment of future generations (3,000 acres of rural Sheboygan County was lost to development in the last five years). Compared to the overall County budget, this is a relatively small cost for the permanent benefits obtained, and for leveraging additional investment in those benefits. All project lands are open for public use.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. No other entity provides the equivalent of this program.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Reduced funding would translate directly to reduced investment in the protection of wild lands and development of conservation projects that benefit present and future citizens. The effect would be magnified as there would be less outside investment as well. Since administrative costs are very small, the only reductions would be directly in the funding of projects.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** FARMLAND PRESERVATION

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

*Note: Under the governor's new budget proposal, many farmland preservation requirements have become mandatory under the new Working Lands Initiative. The entire structure of Wisconsin's farmland preservation efforts will be changed as a result of this proposal and ramifications and requirements are not known at this time. This program thus may no longer be considered discretionary.*

Farmers in Sheboygan County, provided they meet certain requirements, are eligible for the State Farmland Preservation Tax Credit, a credit filed for on an individual's income tax return. One of the requirements is that the farmer must submit a "Zoning Certificate" certifying that their farmland is zoned in the appropriate district. Sheboygan County does not have a countywide zoning ordinance. However, on behalf of 14 towns and 1 village, we complete the zoning certificates. Our intent is to provide a central location for farmers to visit to obtain the certificate during daylight hours. As an added benefit to the service, we are provided with the zoning information from the various municipalities which we then provide to the public via the County website.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any farmer who desires to have tax benefits may be served if certain conditions are met. Formerly, every farmer had to be recertified on an annual basis. At that time, approximately 850 farm families were issued zoning certificates every year. Currently, the law only requires that farm lands only be recertified when farm parcels are bought, sold, or rezoned. About 150 farmers are issued certificates by this Department each year.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Farmland preservation agreements are generally for 25 years. When this period expires, farmers may enroll.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

The County has a farmland preservation plan and this program is an extension of that. Farmland preservation also ties in with Smart Growth land use planning activities as that is a common goal with widespread public support.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Data is shared between the County and other units of government. The County generally prepares the zoning maps for these local governments. Having a one-stop location for this service maximizes efficiency and also provides a central website portal for public information. This consolidated arrangement saves money for local governments, and we get the service fee for providing the program.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection provides oversight and reviews of County activities and provides feedback. Satisfaction by the farmers served is also an indicator of effectiveness.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Not cost effectively. The program might be able to go back to each local unit of government, but that would greatly increase inefficiency. Units of government can only provide this service, and counties generally do that

statewide. Until new requirements have been developed to accompany the governor's mandate, it is unclear what the County may be able to do differently.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The farmland preservation program ranks **13th** out of 19 discretionary programs. It takes very little staff time and expense to administer, saving money for local governments, protecting farmland far into the future, and it enhances the tax situation for farmers in the County who wish to participate.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Probably. Although new requirements are not yet known, it may be possible to have local governments provide this service again, but it would not save the County any money as we collect a fee to pay the full cost of the Department's efforts.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Unless local units of government could resume the program, tax credits would not be available for County farmers. Important agricultural lands would not be protected in 25 year increments.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Since the economic downturn over the last few years, the Department has issued far fewer certificates – only 30 in 2008. The Department collects \$5 for each certificate that is issued, or a total of **\$150** in 2008. As it takes only 15 minutes or so to issue each certificate, that adequately recovers staff costs. According to the Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection website, the average claimant received \$652 as a tax credit. If we assume that the number of participants has remained about the same as in previous years, that would be worth about \$5.5 million dollars County-wide every year. (Since annual certification is no longer required, the Department has no way of knowing the number of active participants.)

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No other entity provides the equivalent of this program. Local units of government could possibly undertake the program again.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

This program costs the County less than \$150 to administer, and those costs are recouped anyway. There would be no advantage of reducing the funding for this program.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** CRYSTAL LAKE BOAT LANDING

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The Crystal Lake boat landing is probably the boat landing with the second highest usage rates. The initial land was acquired in 1961, and the DNR subsequently acquired the land across the road for parking. Besides the boat landing, this site also has a parking lot and sanitary facilities consisting of one year round, and one seasonal portable toilet. A neighbor has been contracted with under a formal agreement for 2009 to maintain the site. The boat landing is used year-round, but much more use is evident during the summer. Crystal Lake has a 2.6 mile shoreline that is extensively developed. The Lake is about 152 acres in size and has a maximum depth of 62 feet. Fishing for northern pike, crappie, perch, walleye, bass, and bluegills can be excellent. Motor boats are prohibited on Sundays.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident or visitor is free to use the Crystal Lake boat landing. There have never been surveys of users at boat landings so there is no way to estimate the numbers of users. Anecdotal evidence and observations suggest that there is scant usage in the winter, but that there is heavy use during summer weekends and holidays.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

This program has been in existence for more than 40 years, with the potential to go on for many more. It is essential for the people who wish to boat or fish on Crystal Lake.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Boat landings used to be combined into one budget, but that should change so that individual expenditures can be better monitored. This will also make tough choices to cut programs easier as each boat landing will stand on its own merits. There are no other programs that are related to the Crystal Lake boat landing except periodic maintenance by the Highway Department.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

This program enables a broader use of a valuable resource – Crystal Lake. Without the boat landing, only residents around the lake would have access to it. This enables the Department to more effectively promote outdoor recreation and the conservation of natural resources.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

The absence of complaints by the numerous people who depend on this boat landing testifies to the effectiveness of the program. Citizens are quick to point out maintenance issues, trash accumulations, litter, and poorly maintained toilet facilities.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Landscape companies and the highway Department were formerly contacted to maintain this site. Starting in 2009, a formal contract has been executed with a neighbor to maintain the site at what is hoped to be much less money. The Department will only oversee and administer the program.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Crystal Lake boat landing ranks **14th** out of 19 discretionary programs. The budgetary impact is low compared with the numbers of users and the value of having public access to one of the major lakes in the County.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Probably. The DNR or the Town of Rhine could be offered the possibility of managing the boat landing. A conservation club could also be contracted with.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Even if all maintenance and administration would cease, people would still use the Crystal Lake boat landing unless it were demolished and barricaded. There may be some slight risk associated with abandonment.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Maintenance and operating expenses for 2008 totaled about **\$3,400**, including \$400 for electricity, \$1,300 for toilet facility rental and service, and \$1,000 for snowplowing and grass cutting. The new 2009 contract with a neighbor will pay **\$600** for grass cutting and litter control from May through October which should reduce overall maintenance costs. Indirect staff time is estimated to cost about **\$2,000** per year. Total program cost for 2009 and beyond will be about **\$3,600**. These are small costs for the benefit that is obtained for the public.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No other entity provides the equivalent of this program. The Town of Rhine or the DNR might be persuaded to take over management, but the County owns the land.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services would be reduced such as grass cutting and snowplowing. There isn't much left to reduce after that.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** JETZER'S LAKE BOAT LANDING

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The public can access the 15 acre Jetzer's Lake via this County owned and managed boat landing. The maximum depth is 39 feet, with a shoreline length of 0.63 mile. This property was acquired by the County in 1959. Jetzer's Lake is a family fishing lake upon which motorized watercraft are prohibited. The site also has a pier for fishing from the shore, which adds to the uniqueness of this lake. Though the bluegills and black crappies tend to be on the small side, occasionally good size fish can be hooked. Bass and northern pike can also be caught.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Any resident of Sheboygan County or visitor may use the boat landing and the fishing pier at Jetzer's Lake without charge. The Department has never attempted to determine how many people use this or any other boat landing. It may be wise to hire a limited term student worker to conduct user surveys on all boat landings in order to properly evaluate their use by the public.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. This site has been providing public recreation for almost 50 years, and with minimal periodic maintenance, can do so long into the future.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Department's Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan and Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan also involve the boat landing at Jetzer's Lake.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The management of this site furthers the goal of providing for public recreation at low cost to taxpayers through very efficient management.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

The Department would receive complaints if issues arise such as an accumulation of trash or litter, or if maintenance is neglected.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Unlikely. The budget is small and there would be no other agency to effectively manage the site. The DNR, the Town of Herman, or a conservation group could be contacted to possibly work out an agreement.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The boat landing program at Jetzer's Lake ranks 17th out of 19 discretionary programs. It is a small site, with probably the lowest usage rate among all the County's boat landings.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Possibly. The DNR, Town of Herman, or a conservation club could be contacted to determine interest in managing the boat landing and the expected cost of doing so. As long as the property remains in County ownership, however, there must be County oversight.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

If management was terminated and the boat landing remained in County ownership, people would still use the site unless it was barricaded and trespassers were prohibited. There would be some risk of people using the property under those conditions, probably slight. It would be best to sell or deed the property to another entity for management should the County choose to divest itself of management responsibility.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Maintenance by the Highway Department such as grass cutting and snow plowing comprise the largest expenses, which totaled **\$1,700** in 2008. Maintaining the toilet facilities cost **\$740**. There are no electrical costs as there are no lights for night-time use. Total direct program cost to manage this property in 2008 was thus about **\$2,440**. Indirect staff cost may have been **\$500**, for a total program cost of **\$2,940**. This is about average for the annual cost. Little staff time is involved. Larry's Hauling collects and disposes of the trash for free.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that could undertake this management function for the boat landing on Jetzer's Lake. No other entity currently manages such functions on County-owned property.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services such as snow plowing, grass cutting, and brush cutting could be trimmed. That probably would not seriously affect the use of the property, but those savings would be very small. In short, this is a very small expense budget for a boat landing managed for public benefit.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** LITTLE ELKHART LAKE BOAT LANDING

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

This boat landing provides access to Little Elkhart Lake and a small picnic area for members of the public. This property was acquired in 1961. Little Elkhart Lake provides excellent fishing for largemouth bass, bluegill, and musky. Motorboats are prohibited on Sundays. This Lake is about 48 acres in size with a maximum depth of 21 feet. A large portion of the 1.8 mile shoreline remains undeveloped.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

The boat landing at Little Elkhart Lake may be used without charge, like all other boat landings operated by the County, by any resident or visitor. No numbers of users have ever been determined, but the boat landing gets substantial use, especially in the summer months.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. This site has been providing public recreation for almost 50 years, and with minimal periodic maintenance, can do so long into the future. .

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Department's Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan and Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan also involve the boat landing at Little Elkhart Lake.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The management of this site furthers the goal of providing for public recreation.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Users complain to the Department if issues arise such as an accumulation of trash or litter, or if maintenance is neglected. The active lake association would also complain.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Unlikely. The budget is small and there would be no other agency to effectively manage the site. The DNR, the Town of Rhine, or a conservation group could be contacted to possibly work out an agreement.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Little Elkhart Lake boat landing program ranks **16th** out of 19 discretionary programs.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Possibly. The DNR, Town of Rhine, or a conservation club could be contacted to determine interest in managing the boat landing and the expected cost of doing so. As long as the property remains in County ownership, however, there must be County oversight.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

If management was terminated and the boat landing remained in County ownership, people would still use the site unless it was barricaded and trespassers were prohibited. There would be some risk of people using the property under those conditions, probably slight. It would be best to sell or deed the property to another entity for management should the County choose to divest itself of management responsibility.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The management cost of the Little Elkhart Lake boat landing is mostly for services rendered by the Highway Department such as grass cutting and snow plowing. The total cost of these services in 2008 was **\$2,330**. Electricity for lighting was **\$250**, and maintaining the toilet facilities cost **\$800**. The direct cost to manage this property in 2008 was **\$3,380**. In addition, there may have been **\$500** in indirect staff costs, for a total of **\$3,880**. This is about average for the annual cost. Larry's Hauling collects and disposes of the trash for free.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that could undertake this management function for the boat landing on Little Elkhart Lake. No other entity currently manages such functions on County-owned property.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services such as snowplowing and brush cutting could be trimmed. That probably would not seriously affect the use of the property, but those savings would be very small. Electricity could be turned off, but that might encourage vandalism or other improper activities. That again is a very small amount. In short, this is a very small expense budget for a boat landing managed for public benefit.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** GERBER LAKES PUBLIC FISH AND WILDLIFE AREA

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

Gerber Lakes consists of two contiguous basins connected by a navigable channel. Both lakes provide summer and winter fishing of bass, bluegills, crappies, and perch. Outboard motors are not allowed on the lakes. The boat landing parcel was acquired in 1959. Sheboygan County purchased an additional 108 acre parcel to the west and north of the lakes in 1996 and added 45 acres to the south in 2001. The only public facilities on this property are a boat ramp and small parking area. A portable toilet is no longer provided due to repetitive vandalism. A single family house that occupies the property is rented to a tenant. The County has attempted to restore native prairie vegetation on a part of the property. The Gerber Lakes Strategic Planning Council composed of conservation club members who helped fund the purchase of the property met on a regular basis during the early years of management and planning. That group has not met now for some time and is being disbanded with agreement from the Sheboygan County Conservation Association. The Planning and Resources Department will consult with the Association regarding any changes in management of the Gerber Lakes property.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

All residents of Sheboygan County and the many tourists that visit the County may find interest in the Gerber Lakes Public Fish and Wildlife Area. No surveys have ever been conducted of users so predictions on user rates cannot be made. Anecdotal evidence and observations show that the property is well used, especially during the summer and the fall hunting season.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. This area has been set aside from development and can be preserved long into the future for public use.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Department's Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan, Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan, and Natural Areas and Critical Resources Plan also involve the Gerber Lakes Public Fish and Wildlife Area.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

The protection and management of this property furthers the goal of providing habitat protection while providing lands for public use. This program can be judged to be effective due to its partnering with conservation groups for purchasing the property, working with them to develop a management strategy, and continuing to accomplish management for the good of the public at a very low budget. Revenue from the rental of the house contributes income to the County to offset costs.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

Interactions with the public and conservation groups indicate that there are few issues and that management has been effective for the public good.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Unlikely. The budget is small and there would be no other agency to manage the property as it currently exists. The DNR, the Town of Rhine, or a conservation group could be contacted to possibly work out an agreement.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

This program ranks **15th** out of 19 discretionary programs. The relatively small expenditure compare with the size and nature of the parcel used for public benefit and enjoyment represents an effective use of taxpayer dollars in a project that was co-developed with conservation organizations with many members. Rental income from the house offsets the cost of management.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Possibly. The DNR, Town of Rhine, or a conservation club could be contacted to determine interest in managing the property and the expected cost of doing so. As long as the property remains in County ownership, however, there must be County oversight.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

If management was terminated and the property remained in County ownership, people would still use the property unless it was barricaded and trespassers were prohibited. There would be some risk of people using the property under those conditions, probably slight. It would be best to sell or deed the property to another entity for management should the County choose to divest itself of management responsibility.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

Highway Department work at the Gerber Lakes property in 2008 for a parking lot construction project cost about \$400. (A grant from the DNR paid the remaining \$1,000.) Other Highway Department expenses totaled about **\$700** for snowplowing. The cost of electricity for lighting was **\$350**. Trash removal is donated by Larry's Hauling. Staff time may have reached **\$500**. The total management cost in 2008 was thus less than **\$2,000**. This was slightly more than the average in preceding years. Managing a public recreation complex such as this and of this magnitude for under \$2,000 a year is a very effective use of taxpayer dollars. However, it must be noted that rental income from the house on the property was **\$6,840** in 2007, and in 2008 the rent income was **\$7,075**. Expenses for maintaining the house was **\$80** in 2007 and **\$546** in 2008. The rental income thus pays for the management of the property with a substantial surplus going back to the County coffers every year.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that could undertake this management function for the Gerber Lakes Public Fish and Wildlife Area. No other entity currently provides management functions on County-owned property.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Services could be trimmed. That probably would not seriously affect the use of the property, but those savings would be extremely small. Electricity could be turned off, but that might encourage vandalism or other improper activities. That again is a very small amount. In short, this is a very small expense budget for a large property managed for public benefit, especially in light of the revenues contributed by the rental of the house on the site. The County should keep up with the maintenance of the house so that it remains habitable to generate income to offset expenses. Cutting maintenance costs on the rental house would be unwise, and instead maintenance should be considered an investment to keep the revenue stream. From time to time, more major maintenance expenses on the rental house should be expected such as for re-roofing or to replace the well pump, but even then revenues will continue to exceed expenses.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** AMSTERDAM DUNES PRESERVATION

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

A consortium of private parties owns seven parcels of land in the Town of Holland collectively known as Amsterdam Dunes. These parcels contain a total of 322.8 acres of land which consists of more than 1,800 feet of undeveloped shoreland along Lake Michigan as well as rare and remarkable habitats and organisms. This is the last large collection of such habitats along the western shore of Lake Michigan still in private ownership and in an undeveloped state. This program seeks to obtain funding from grants and partnerships to purchase the parcels to preserve the rare habitats and make the site available for day use by the public and for scientific and academic study. A unique part of this program is that few if any County tax levy dollars will be used to acquire, develop, or maintain the property into perpetuity. A portion of the property will be developed into compact clusters of single family housing. Such housing will only be built using sustainable and low impact building practices and materials. The site interpretive materials and center will include not only education and information on the unique habitats and organisms, but also on the built environment with sustainable technologies and materials exhibited in the homes. Lot prices will include a fee to be placed in escrow for development and management of the property for public benefit, and each lot owner will be assessed an annual fee much like a condominium association fee that will be used to further provide for development and maintenance. Future residents would pay such fees for the privilege of living in a unique ecological preserve with hundreds of acres around them and more than 1,800 feet of lakeshore frontage that would never be developed. Property taxes on the developed parcels will greatly increase, benefiting the Town of Holland and Sheboygan County over the *status quo*. The owners of the property have for the first time expressed a sincere interest in selling, and have reduced their asking price. The next step is going through the appraisal process and donors are being sought to pay for the appraisals. Grants are available to help in the purchase price and we already have some unofficial funding commitments. Additional funding partners will be sought.

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

The lots that may be developed will benefit the residents that live in them, while paying for the development and maintenance of public access during daylight hours by any resident of Sheboygan County or visitor. Since the site is about halfway between two heavily used state parks with camping facilities, Amsterdam Dunes would serve as a destination point by hikers or bikers at the state parks. There would be no camping or night time use permitted at Amsterdam Dunes. The numbers of people expected will be in the many thousands each year, especially during the summer.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

Yes. The County attempted to gain a conservation easement on a portion of the property in 2006 and 2007, but failed to do so. With the owners now willing to sell and a long term management plan to be formulated that will preserve the unique characteristics of this site in perpetuity for future generations, this program is long lasting.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

Yes. The Department's Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan, Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan, and most importantly the Natural Areas and Critical Resources Plan relate to this program and support its preservation.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

This program may be a demonstration project to show how units of government can partner with a developer to increase the tax base while preserving substantial ecologically significant lands for public use and study with little or no direct local tax levy expense. That is efficiency and effectiveness of the highest order.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

This project will be deemed to be successfully implemented if funding is achieved and the County Board accepts the management agreements, favorable tax implications, and ownership of the lands.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

Unlikely. There is at present no budget and minimal staff time involved. Other agencies and groups have in fact joined the partnership and are working with the County. Grants are generally made to units of government.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Amsterdam Dunes program is **18th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There are no current budgetary implications with the exception of a small amount of staff time, yet the potential has enormous value and public benefit.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

Possibly. The DNR, Town of Holland, or a non-profit group could undertake this coordination work, but they are already partners in the effort. Glacial Lakes Conservancy was in fact invited to take over the leadership role and they declined due to lack of time and staff resources.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

Termination of this program may well mean that private developers would create up to 20 lakeshore lots and many more inland lots, fracturing ownership of the properties into numerous small lots that would forever destroy the integrity of this unique place. There would be no risk or liability, however. Most importantly, there would be no reduction in the County budget as the only expense is a small amount of general staff time. If the project were successful, there would be an improvement in the tax base while still preserving this unique site.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The County paid \$8,500 for an appraisal of the property in December of 2006 in a failed effort to obtain a conservation easement. There wasn't an adequate partnership in place at the time to carry out the goal of obtaining an easement, and the owners of the properties were unwilling to do so. The appraisal at that time valued the seven parcels at \$6.795 million. The owners have now expressed an interest in selling the lands upon inquiry and offered to sell the combined properties for \$10 million. Negotiations have reduced that down to \$8.5 million. The appraisal process will further refine or support the final purchase price due to constraints on financial partners regarding project eligibility if asking price exceeds the appraised value. Property taxes paid on the 322.8 acres unquestionably worth several millions of dollars was only \$1,918.27 in 2008 due to the fact that it is considered partially agricultural land and more than half of the property is enrolled in the Managed Forest Land tax program. The managed forest lands are taxed at only slightly more than \$8 per acre despite their actual value. Protecting the property while incorporating development would greatly increase this paltry amount, despite taking most of it off the tax rolls. There was an unknown amount of staff time involved in this project in 2007, but it was small as the effort to obtain an easement was not successful. There were no program costs in 2008, and thus far in 2009, an estimated **\$2,000** in staff time has been spent on the Amsterdam Dunes program. Since the owners have given the County a one year option on the property to find enough funding for purchase, it is estimated that total staff time in 2009 for grant writing and coordination may approach **\$8,000**. If the properties could be acquired and developed as envisioned, with only a marginal amount of staff time involved and little or no other County expense, this would truly be a remarkable achievement.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County that is willing to coordinate this effort, despite being asked to do so.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

Since the only project expense is staff time without a dedicated budget, a request to reduce effort or eliminate the effort would have no impact on the budget. A reduction in the amount of staff time spent would endanger the effort as the only time spent is on necessary tasks. The success of the effort would thus be imperiled if staff time was reduced.

**SHEBOYGAN COUNTY PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE**  
**January 28, 2009**

**INSTRUCTIONS:** For each program, list the Scheduled Review Date, the Department, the Department Mission Statement and the Program Title at the top of the page, and answer the following questions for each program. The overall response for each program must be no greater than two (2) pages in length and in Arial Font size 10.

**SCHEDULED REVIEW DATE:** March 30, 2009

**DEPARTMENT:** Planning and Resources

**DEPARTMENT MISSION STATEMENT:** The Planning and Resources Department serves to improve and promote the quality of living, natural resources, and property records for Sheboygan County's 28 municipalities and its citizenry. In doing so, the Department aims to balance environmental and economic vitality in a business-principled, cost effective, and ethical manner.

**PROGRAM:** BOCK FARM

**1. Describe the program, its purpose and goals.**

The County owns approximately 200 acres of land in the northwest part of the Town of Wilson. The property was purchased to potentially serve as a solid waste management site. That program changed in emphasis to allow local units of government to be responsible for solid waste management, but the County retained ownership of the parcel. About 195 acres have been rented to a farmer for cropping purposes since 1991, and the rental fees are periodically increased. There are no long term plans for use of this property, although ideas such as developing it for wind power have been discussed from time to time. (A contact was made with Alliant Energy and they were not interested as they need about 80 acres per wind generator tower to eliminate wind shadowing and they need to cluster many towers together to lessen maintenance and operating expenses.)

**2. Who is the program intended to serve? How many are served?**

Currently, the program serves only the renter of the property which generates reliable revenue.

**3. Are the program benefits long-lasting and essential to the service populations?**

No. Although the County has owned the property for about 20 years, ownership does not benefit the public, only the renter. But, owning a parcel of land for future possible use may be considered to be a wise investment.

**4. Is this program directly or indirectly related to or does it support any other program in this department or another department? If so, how?**

No. There are no relationships with other departments or programs.

**5. How does this program make the department or county government more effective or efficient, including any intergovernmental relationship?**

Having a reliable source of revenue is efficient and effective, although in relative terms the revenue is quite small and the property is off the tax rolls for other units of government. Owning a revenue-producing parcel at this location for future government use could be considered effectively looking forward for possible needs.

**6. How do you determine/measure if this program has been effectively provided and implemented?**

This project is successful when lease extensions are negotiated. As long as revenue is generated and there is little administrative expense, the program is effective.

**7. Could the county cost-effectively subcontract this program?**

No. Renting the land is essentially contracting with the renter.

**8. State the numerical ranking of this program compared to all discretionary programs in your department and briefly explain.**

The Bock Farm program is **19th** out of 19 discretionary programs. There is little administrative cost in having the program, which produces modest revenue. But, there is little public benefit in owning the parcel.

**9. Are there current alternatives to this program available in the community? Can this program be provided through alternative arrangements with other providers?**

This question may not directly apply. Alternatives could include selling the property, developing it, or renting it for other uses. It would not make sense to have someone else administer the lease.

**10. If this program were eliminated, what would be the ramifications for the County (i.e., added risk, liability or legal issues)?**

This question may not also directly apply. If the County did not administer this program yet continue to own the land, it would become idle and crops would likely be replaced by invasive weeds. If elimination of this program meant selling the property, the County would lose a small annual revenue stream, yet gain whatever funds the purchase price entailed.

**11. What is the program impact and effectiveness related to the program cost? (Provide data if available.)**

The lease has been extended every three years since 1991. The lease was last extended for another three year term in 2008. During the lease extension work every three years, there may be at most **\$1,000** in staff and Corporation Counsel work involved. In addition, there is an estimated **\$150** in staff time to evaluate site conditions every year. An annualized program cost is thus about **\$485**. Other than that, there is steady revenue which was **\$12,200** in 2007, and **\$12,919** in 2008. The new lease will generate **\$16, 575** in annual revenue. Lease rates are based on the prevailing rate. It must be noted that the terms of the lease require good conservation practices, no soil erosion, and other protective measures to ensure that the County's interest in the property is not damaged.

**12. Is this program currently duplicated by another county department or provider in the community?**

No. There is currently no other provider in the County, however the Land and Water Conservation Department could conceivably take over the program.

**13. What adjustment or plan of action would you implement if funding is reduced?**

This question does not pertain to the situation. There is no funding to reduce unless the program was eliminated. It's an either-or situation; we have the program or we don't. If the County chooses to keep the program, there must be staff time devoted to managing the lease.