

MINUTES
SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
ANNUAL COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, June 18, 2025

3:00 p.m.

Lac Lawrann Conservancy
300 Schmidt Road
West Bend, WI 53090

Meeting Occurred in Person and Via Video and Telephone Conference

Present:

Commissioners:

Michael Crowley, Secretary
Donna Brown-Martin
Paul Decker
Katrina Hanson
John Holloway
Dewayne Johnson
Trevor Jung
Mary Knipper
Thomas Kramer
Michael Maistelman
Amy Maurer
Joe Messinger
Natalia Minkel-Dumit
Robert Pitts
Jeffrey Schleif
Eric Stelter
David Stroik
Donald Trottier

Excused:

Charles Colman, Chairperson
Priscilla Coggs-Jones
Brian Holt

Staff:

Stephanie Hacker	Executive Director
Benjamin McKay	Deputy Director
Elizabeth Larsen	Director of Administration
Christopher Hiebert	MPO Director
James Zehner	Communications Specialist
Alina Panasiuk	Accounting/HR Specialist

Guests:

Kristina Boardman	Secretary of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation
-------------------	---

ROLL CALL

Commission Secretary Crowley called the 291st meeting of the Commission to order at 3:00 p.m. Roll call was taken, and a quorum was declared present. Secretary Crowley indicated that he was asked by Chairperson Colman and Vice Chairperson Brown-Martin to serve as the Chair for the Commission's

-2-
Annual Commission Meeting
June 18, 2025

Annual Meeting. Secretary Crowley noted for the record that Commissioners Colman, Coggs-Jones, and Holt had asked to be excused.

UPDATE FROM SECRETARY OF THE WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, KRISTINA BOARDMAN

Mr. Crowley introduced Ms. Kristina Boardman, Secretary, Wisconsin Department of Transportation, and asked her to provide an update on recent activities of the Wisconsin Department of Transportation.

Ms. Boardman thanked Mr. Crowley for his introduction and shared a brief presentation with the Commissioners.

During the presentation, the following comments and questions were addressed.

Mr. Messinger inquired about bidding for road projects and if the bidding process was competitive for very large highway projects, recalling that the same company names are on many of the awarded contracts. Ms. Boardman stated projects are split into several legs and thus several companies can bid. She further stated that the Department of Transportation has seen let savings overall for the fiscal year with a lot of competition for the projects.

Mr. Decker inquired about the Department of Transportation process for enhancing the longevity of pavement to avoid reconstructing roads every five to seven years. Ms. Boardman stated the Department has an asset management program that reviews roads and appropriate treatments at the right time to ensure there is maximum usability. If treatment is applied at a particular point in time, the road will last longer before a full reconstruction needs to be done. Ms. Boardman further stated that the Department has 30 to 35 data elements that are reviewed on a regular basis. In addition, vans equipped with cameras drive all roads in the State to map and to determine road wear and tear. This data is utilized to project road life.

Mr. Decker then inquired about engineering studies to improve surface capability. Ms. Boardman stated the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had worked with the Department of Transportation on pavement materials testing. She further stated working with research partners and the data from FHWA provided very good information to help improve pavement applications moving forward.

Mr. Johnson asked what the Commissioners can do locally to be supportive of overall transportation and safety. Ms. Boardman asked Commissioners to share the message that transportation funding needs to be viewed on a long term basis with an ongoing revenue source to ensure the transportation fund is protected. She also stated that sharing safety data and recommendations to improve safety based upon data is a number one priority.

Mr. Jung thanked Ms. Boardman and the State transit staff for their responsiveness during this time of uncertainty at the Federal level. Mr. Jung then asked if Ms. Boardman had any insights into the budget process and approval. Ms. Boardman stated that she is hopeful that a budget will come together quickly and will remain optimistic.

Mr. Crowley then thanked Ms. Boardman for her time and her continued work with the Department of Transportation.

Mr. Crowley then made a Chair decision to move the Consideration of the Commission's Budget for Calendar Year 2026 to the next item on the agenda noting that a Commissioner will need to leave the meeting early.

CONSIDERATION OF THE COMMISSION'S BUDGET FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2026

Mr. Crowley noted that copies of the proposed Commission budget for calendar year 2026 had been provided to all Commissioners for review prior to the meeting.

Ms. Hacker introduced the Commissioners to the proposed budget document noting that the assumptions underlying the budget had been reviewed and approved by the Commission Executive Committee at its May meeting.

Ms. Larsen then called attention to Tables 3 and 4 of the budget document and reviewed the budget assumptions.

During the budget presentation, the following questions and comments were addressed.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Schleif, Ms. Larsen stated that the Milwaukee Area Racine Kenosha (MARK) Commuter Rail Feasibility Study is for the Kenosha-Racine-Milwaukee corridor with the study being led by the City of Racine. The City has received grant monies to conduct the study.

In response to a second inquiry by Mr. Schleif, Ms. Larsen stated that the Regional Chloride Impact Study is funded in part by FHWA Planning monies and Commission reserve funds.

Mr. Schleif then stated that Washington County is feeling budget constraints, and an increase in the Commission's tax levy request is difficult for the County. He acknowledged that the Commission has held the line on the levy for the past 19 years and that there's a cost to continue. He further stated that the County is disturbed because the Commission's Executive Director came to visit, and stated 'we had a great visit', with Washington County staff on November 1, 2023, and was not heard from again until January 2025, when a tax levy increase was discussed.

In response to an inserted comment by Mr. Stroik, Mr. Schleif also noted that approximately 10 years prior, Washington County had conducted a strategic priorities study to review work efforts of the County. Required work efforts received high ratings and non-required efforts received low ratings. Many of the low rated work efforts are no longer conducted by the County. He further stated he would like the Executive Committee of the Commission to take a hard look at work efforts like the Regional Chloride Impact Study and not conduct non-required projects in the future.

Mr. Crowley commented that the Executive Committee had vetted the budget and discussed that the budget document needs to be prepared and addressed earlier in the year to allow for lengthy in-depth discussion and review.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Messinger, Ms. Larsen stated the tax levy is mandated by State Statute and makes up 25 percent of the Commission budget. Ms. Larsen then commented that service agreement revenues are comprised of requests from Counties, local governments, and special units of government within the Region requesting assistance on projects. Service agreement revenues make up approximately 24 percent of the Commission's budget and 46 percent of the Commission's budget is from Federal transportation funds.

Mr. Stroik inquired whether any of the priorities of the five-year Strategy have been anticipated in the 2026 budget. Ms. Larsen stated that the 2026 budget does not contain funding for the Strategy priorities.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Johnson, Ms. Hacker stated that nothing had changed in the regional tax levy request amount since the Commission approved it at the March 2025 quarterly meeting.

Annual Commission Meeting
June 18, 2025

Mr. Stroik stated that he, Ms. Hanson, and Mr. Schleif had met with Washington County Community Development Department staff to determine why Washington County is considering ending its participation in the Commission. He stated it seemed that County staff and Commission staff desire to continue the working partnership, but the Washington County Executive will probably not include the Commission tax levy his recommended County Budget. He noted that the County Chair can add the Commission tax levy back into the County Budget with a two-thirds vote in support of the Commission. Mr. Stroik continued to note that in a meeting between the Commission Executive Director and Washington County staff it was implied that the County could conceivably do some sort of a la carte 'get the items that you want' from the Commission, expressing concern about the precedent that would set. He stated that 'a la carte' causes a lot of problems, and expressed concern to customize, do priority budgeting, or pick priorities. Mr. Stroik then noted opposition to the Commission's fee in general, stating again that both County staff and Commission staff want to stay together, and that breaking away would be like offering a prenup after 59 years of marriage. He then stated that he feels that Commissioner Schleif is optimistic about staying with the Commission, however there are efforts afoot to pull Washington County out, and to potentially work with other Counties. Mr. Stroik then stated that what Washington County will discover is that it's not a piece of cake to get done what the Commission does, and that ironically, the County maintains interest in shared services, of which the Commission has 59 years of practice.

Ms. Hanson then commented that additional discussion did occur in the referenced meeting with Washington County. She indicated she did ask Washington County staff if they did not utilize the Commission for services, what would be the cost to the County to replace these services, and stated that the answer was "we don't know". Ms. Hanson stated that she did not know how the County could make a decision if they do not know the cost to replace those services, and expressed not understanding why the discussion was happening now to dismantle and that it did not make sense on a basic level. Ms. Hanson explained that if the question of cost cannot be answered then the discussion cannot continue until Washington County actually knows the numbers. She also noted that some people's concerns about lack of communication between the Commission and the County leads her to the suggestion that the conversation should start with improving communication and to start a dialogue versus start a divorce. Ms. Hanson then expressed uncertainty about the Annual Meeting being the correct forum for this conversation.

Mr. Crowley thanked Ms. Hanson and Mr. Stroik for their comments. He then reiterated that the Commission budget process will start earlier for the next budget year, and discussion will begin with the Intergovernmental and Public Relations Committee, which needs to begin meeting more frequently. In addition, the Executive Director and staff need to communicate earlier on their forecast for future tax levy rates so that conversation can occur through the year with the Executive Committee and Intergovernmental and Public Relations Committee, and can be brought to the Commission on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Crowley recommended that the Commission move forward with the 2026 budget as presented and asked if Ms. Hacker would like to comment.

Ms. Hacker stated that she would like to address the Commission on the many components of just this part of the dialogue on the budget. She stated feeling compelled to address the item on communication because of being cited thus far. First, Ms. Hacker recalled that Mr. Schleif and Mr. Stroik were part of the search committee for the Commission Executive Director and she took away from conversations with the search committee that if she were to join the Commission as an outside individual it was imperative that she spend year one focusing on the staff. She then stated the second focus not as greatly discussed with the search committee but came out of conversations with staff and Commissioners in late 2023 into 2024 was getting to know the Commissioners and understanding the process that the Counties and the Governor's office take to appoint Commissioners, noting she worked to establish a process for communicating to the Counties and the Governor's office about Commissioner appointments and reappointments, so she could inform those

-5-
Annual Commission Meeting
June 18, 2025

Counties when terms were coming due. Ms. Hacker stated that those conversations brought her to the end of year two with the Commission. She acknowledged that she first turns to the Commissioners to understand what the Counties need from the Commission. She stated that the 2023 meeting cited by Washington County, which was an excellent conversation, led the agency into 2024 in which the Commission did not propose a change to the regional tax levy for the 2025 budget. Ms. Hacker explained that therefore, the Commission's process for discussing the budget from the Executive Division to the Counties was not as intense and that was intentional because it was the same dollar amount as it had been for 18 years prior.

Ms. Hacker again recalled she had started the conversations with the Commissioners at the December 2024 full Commission meeting, which resulted in the Commissioners advising the Executive Director to speak with the Counties about the budget early in 2025. She confirmed that discussions occurred with each County early in 2025. Ms. Hacker expressed understanding Washington County's view of meeting frequency with the Executive Division given the direction of the Commission regarding the levy, emphasizing that meanwhile and importantly, Commission staff were meeting with Washington County on a regular basis.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Johnson, Ms. Brown-Martin indicated that Chairperson Colman has discussed and emphasized to the Executive Committee the importance of ensuring there is ongoing discussion concerning the Commission budget. She further stated these are difficult times and there are directions being given to the staff from a Federal level almost on a weekly basis regarding regulations that have difficult ramifications for all agencies that utilize Federal funds.

Mr. Decker commented that there cannot be enough done to educate the Commissioners and communicating to the Counties and the general public about the Commission budget. Mr. Stroik stated that Commissioners need to listen carefully and be sensitive to what is done within the following budget.

In response to a comment from Mr. Decker, Ms. Hacker stated that at the July Executive Committee meeting there may be an agenda item to discuss the schedule and convening of the Intergovernmental and Public Relations Committee that will help to guide staff and Committee members as to what Counties need from the Commission.

There being no additional comments, on a motion by Mr. Jung, seconded by Mr. Stelter, the budget for the calendar year 2026 was adopted by a vote of 17 ayes and 0 nays (Copy of the 2026 Budget is attached to the official minutes).

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MARCH 5, 2025 QUARTERLY COMMISSION MEETING

On a motion by Mr. Stroik, seconded by Mr. Decker, and carried unanimously, the minutes of the March 5, 2025, Quarterly Commission Meeting were approved as published.

CONSENT AGENDA: CONSIDERATION OF STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Prior to voting on the Consent Agenda, Mr. Crowley explained that this is a new item to the Commission meeting agenda and is designed to speed up the meeting process, noting that these items have been previously voted on unanimously in the Committee meetings and the materials noted in the reports are not in question.

Mr. Stroik stated that the "strategy" he specifically voted against and would like to share that. He expressed that as the problem with Consent Agenda because things can get through this. Mr. Stroik expressed he thinks it is important that this group understand his observations.

Mr. Crowley commented Mr. Stroik had asked to pull Item 4 in the May Executive Committee Report, “Reviewed the CI Design Messaging Guide and reviewed and approved the Strategy.” Mr. Crowley explained that the Executive Committee report does not indicate the vote, and that acting now would be to approve the standing committee report.

A discussion then ensued with Mr. Decker to determine how to take out a specific item in the standing committee report on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Crowley indicated that item number 4 “Reviewed the CI Design Messaging Guide and reviewed and approved the Strategy” will be pulled out from the Executive Committee May 2025 meeting report, noting there was not unanimous approval of this specific item.

There being no additional questions or comments, on a motion by Mr. Johnson to approve the Consent Agenda with the two standing committee reports, noting the objection by Mr. Stroik, seconded by Ms. Brown-Martin, and carried unanimously, the Consent Agenda was approved.

CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE REGIONAL WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN

Amendment to the City of Port Washington sanitary sewer service area (Resolution No. 2025-06)

Mr. Crowley asked the Commission to consider Resolution No. 2025-06, noting that the Resolution would revise the City of Port Washington sanitary sewer service area. He asked Mr. McKay to present this Resolution.

Mr. McKay noted that the proposed amendment was reviewed in detail at the May 6, 2025, Planning and Research Committee meeting. He stated the Planning and Research Committee recommended adoption of the amendment by the full Commission. He then provided a brief overview. During the overview Mr. McKay explained that one area is proposed to be added to the existing sewer service area. He noted that the subject area to be added is 73 acres in size and proposed to be developed for residential use. He also noted that the extension of sewers to serve new development in portions of the subject area with an isolated natural resource area comprised of 1-percent-annual-probability floodplain, wetlands, and steep slopes is not permitted.

There being no discussion, on a motion by Mr. Messenger and seconded by Mr. Decker, Resolution No. 2025-06 was adopted by a vote of 17 ayes and 0 nays (Copy of Resolution No. 2025-06 is attached to the Official Minutes).

CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION DIRECTING STAFF TO APPLY FOR A U.S. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION GRANT TO PREPARE A NEW COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR THE REGION (Resolution 2025-07)

Mr. Crowley asked the Commission to consider adoption of Resolution No. 2025-07, directing staff to apply for a U.S. Economic Development Administration grant to prepare a new Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the Region. He noted the resolution was provided prior to this meeting.

Mr. McKay presented Resolution No. 2025-07, directing staff to apply for a U.S. Economic Development Administration grant to prepare a new CEDS for the Region. He indicated that the Commission had worked with the Milwaukee 7 (M7) and Regional Economic Partnership to develop the current CEDS, which was acted on by each of the seven Counties in the Region in 2021. He explained that the purpose of developing

the CEDS was to provide a more widespread understanding of the ongoing economic development work in the Region, drawing heavily on the M7, and to meet the requirements of the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) to allow counties and local governments with economically distressed census tracts to be eligible to apply for funding from the EDA Public Works and Economic Adjustment Assistance Programs. Mr. McKay then explained that the CEDS needs to be updated every five years for these counties and local governments to remain eligible to apply for the funding.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Messinger, Mr. McKay stated the Commission would take the lead in developing the report, working closely with the M7.

In response to a comment from Mr. Holloway, Mr. McKay stated that the CEDS not only serves to make certain county and local governments eligible to apply for EDA funding but also brings together projects that county and local governments may want to undertake into one document. Mr. Crowley noted the potential grant revenue is reflected in the 2026 Budget. Mr. Decker commented that the last CEDS planning process helped all the Counties work together with M7, which is an indicator of the Commission's value to the Region.

There being no questions or comments, on a motion by Mr. Stroik to approve Resolution 2025-07, seconded by Mr. Decker, and carried by a vote of 17 ayes and 0 nays, Resolution 2025-07 was approved (copy of Resolution 2025-07 attached to Official Minutes).

CONSIDERATION OF TREASURER'S REPORT WITH STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENDITURES

Mr. Crowley asked Mr. Stroik to present the Treasurer's Report. Mr. Stroik inquired with Mr. Decker if he were to speak about strategic planning, whether that would be out of order. He then noted that a copy of the disbursements and the Treasurer's Report had been provided to all Commissioners for review prior to the meeting, and the Report was for financial period ending April 20, 2025, and represents the financial status of the Commission through 2025 reporting period number four. Mr. Stroik called attention to the following items:

1. Based upon disbursements through April 20, 2025, it is projected that total disbursements for the year will approximate \$8.98 million. Revenues are projected at about \$9.86 million, exclusive of interest income and miscellaneous revenues.
2. The Commission's Reserves Policy indicates a minimum reserve amount of \$5,092,110, with a maximum reserve amount of \$10,058,220. The audited cash and cash equivalents at end of year 2023 are \$6,053,254.
3. As of April 20, 2025, the Commission had in investments and cash on hand approximately \$8.00 million. Just over \$7.08 million were invested in the State of Wisconsin Local Government Pooled Investment Fund. As of April 20, 2025, that fund was yielding 4.39 percent interest. Other funds are held in savings, checking, and certificate of deposit accounts at several banks.

There being no discussion, on a motion by Mr. Johnson, seconded by Mr. Pitts, and carried unanimously, the Treasurer's Report for the period ending April 20, 2025, was approved (copy of the Treasurer's Report is attached to the Official Minutes).

CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES TO COMMISSION BYLAWS RESULTING FROM UPDATE TO COMMISSIONER PER DIEM TABLE

Mr. Crowley asked Ms. Hacker to review the update to the Commissioner Per Diem Table.

Ms. Hacker stated on May 15th the Executive Committee approved a modification to the Commissioner per diem table. She stated that prior to May 15th the Commissioner Per Diem Table referenced an \$150 optional per day meeting payment and it referenced mileage. In addition, the Commission Bylaws referenced the per diem table, mileage, and meals.

As of the May 15th Executive Committee meeting the Commissioner Per Diem Table now reflects \$175 per day for meeting reimbursement inclusive of meals. As the Executive Committee approved this change, meetings and engagements of the Commission that occur on May 16th and thereafter are \$175 optional payment per day plus mileage. The Bylaws will be modified with the set of changes before the Commission to reflect this change and also administrative modifications for the Standing Committees.

On a motion by Mr. Pitts, seconded by Mr. Stelter, the changes to the Commission Bylaws were approved unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF THE STRATEGY FOR 2030

Chair Crowley asked Ms. Hacker to present the Draft Strategy for 2030.

Ms. Hacker reviewed and commented on the Draft Strategy for 2030 document and next steps.

Mr. Stroik asked if this document embraced the image guidelines developed by the outside consultant.

Ms. Hacker stated this draft is what was reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee with the one word change suggested by the Executive Committee. Ms. Hacker further stated that this document does incorporate the messaging guide developed by CI Design.

Mr. Messinger stated he does not feel this document is ready for approval as some of the objectives can be measured while others are abstract. He also noted that the word diversity is in the document and asked if the document has been reviewed for language that may jeopardize the Commission's federal funding. Mr. Messinger then noted that it is important that the State is informed of the Commission's Strategy for 2030 as they are also a source of funding. Mr. Messinger then recalled the earlier discussion about keeping the Counties involved, noting that communication lends to concrete objectives and that reaching out to people is easily measurable.

Mr. Stroik noted that he had made comments at the May Executive Committee meeting about the Strategy for 2030. Those comments were not addressed at that meeting as the goal was to bring this document for approval at this Commission meeting. Mr. Stroik then commented that the Strategy is not supported by a majority of the staff and carries items that are inappropriate to strategic planning. He also noted that staff has not included strategic plan items in the 2026 budget, although the strategic plan goes out to 2030 so perhaps inclusion in the 2026 budget is irrelevant.

Ms. Maurer noted that the Strategy does not mention the Counties the Commission serves. Ms. Hacker responded to Ms. Maurer stating that the document can be modified to mention the Counties by name.

In response to comments by Mr. Messinger, Ms. Hacker stated that staff has received guidance from MRA, one of the consultants used to assist with the development of the Strategy on sample metrics. She stated

-9-
Annual Commission Meeting
June 18, 2025

that staff had then determined they felt uncomfortable using those metrics as the final set, and staff will populate tracking mechanisms with metrics for tracking the who, the what, and the how. The Commission will receive a report on the status of the tracking mechanisms on a recurring basis over the next five years.

Ms. Hacker also stated this document is intended to be for the staff, for Commissioners, and for those in the Region who are interested in understanding the high level of the Commission's mission, vision and goals for the next five years. As such, this document is not intended to provide the tracking mechanism for accountability in the next five years.

Ms. Brown-Martin stated that within the context of the Strategy, the Commission should consider not only staff, but also the member Counties of the Commission and representation from each of those Counties. The staff may need to clarify the Strategy objectives and the desired outcome.

Mr. Decker commented that there are a lot of objectives to be accomplished along with a measurement of those objectives. The measurements must be made on a regular basis and reported to the Commission, noting this is what staff accomplished, this is where the Commission is headed, and why. Meeting the objectives would be beneficial in developing better strategies going forward. Mr. Decker also stated that he does not see what we are trying to say we can learn. He asked what the Commission is going to do with those lessons and how quickly Commission staff is going to implement what we learn. He also asked how the Commission gets leaders engaged so the Commission can keep upgrading and how staff can be immersed in continuous improvement.

Mr. Crowley commented that he is viewing this draft 2030 strategy as very high-level strategy or as the beginning stages of a larger strategic planning initiative. He noted that the first few pages orient new employees to the organization, providing background and expectations among other items. Mr. Crowley stated he feels this is a great start to moving forward in improving and deepening the culture of the Commission and educating not only Commissioners, but staff, and then the public. He stated this isn't necessarily a piece that's going to each of the seven Counties for presentation. This is more internal and is a start to a deeper strategic initiative.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Decker, Ms. Hacker stated in the future staff will be evaluated on the Strategy objectives.

Mr. Messinger directed the conversation back to certain language within the document stating that he had read that some Federal grants were not approved because of using the word 'diversity' and asked if it was a possibility that the Commission would not receive funding because of a commitment to diversity. Mr. Messinger stated it is not his personal view, but rather what he is seeing in the environment. Mr. Crowley quoted the bullet point, "Calibrate the agency's offices and amenities to recruit and retain a diverse workforce," and stated that it refers to a diverse workforce. A diverse workforce can be interpreted differently than diversity. Ms. Brown-Martin stated that she feels that this specific sentence is defensible. A diverse workforce does not necessarily equate to diversity, inclusion, and equity —terms that have been identified by the current Federal administration. Ms. Brown-Martin reiterated that "diverse workforce" is not the same and is not a contingency that would eliminate our ability to do it. Mr. Stroik interjected with concern about taking a chance.

In response to remarks from Commissioners, Mr. Crowley affirmed that a word change is feasible. Mr. Jung mentioned the word 'representative' as what the Commission would hope to achieve and meanwhile not trigger political alarm.

There being no additional comments, Mr. Holloway made a motion, seconded by Mr. Crowley, to approve the Draft Strategy for 2030 as presented.

Discussion ensued regarding the word diverse.

The motion was amended by Ms. Brown-Martin to reflect representation rather than diverse. The amended motion was seconded by Mr. Jung. Mr. Holloway stated that the word diverse is appropriate for that sentence and he would vote against amending it. He further stated that the Commission should not be concerned with the word diverse in the context of which it is used. The amendment was passed by a vote of 14 ayes and 3 nays.

Additional comments ensued with Mr. Messinger then stating he would like to amend the Strategy to remove the seed bank goal because it does not fit the mission, vision, or capabilities of the Commission.

Ms. Hacker stated that Commission staff is knowledgeable about native plants in the Region, and in addition to providing the Region with knowledge on seeds and plants, the Commission could provide the seeds or plants. She further stated that the Commission could have a seed bank or native plants so that when stating that the Commission is the steward of environmental corridors within the seven Counties, the Commission would have the product to support that.

Mr. Messinger stated that he was able to purchase plants from Ozaukee County under a similar service.

Mr. Messinger then made a motion for a second amendment to the Draft Strategy for 2030 to remove from the Strategy “native seed bank”, seconded by Mr. Stroik. The motion failed by a vote of 2 ayes and 15 nays.

Discussion occurred concerning the original motion, which has now been amended. Mr. Johnson made a motion to accept the Draft Strategy for 2030, accepting the first amendment and rejecting the second amendment, seconded by Ms. Brown-Martin.

Additional discussion ensued with Ms. Knipper asking how the staff will make the commitment to this document and how the Commission will receive reports on the Strategy.

Ms. Hacker stated staff will bring forward a tracking mechanism and report card to the Commission and to its Committees in the forthcoming months. The tracking mechanism and report card will show the metrics that are developed and what is being done to accomplish the priorities within the Strategy.

On a call of the vote, the motion passed with 15 ayes and 2 nays.

CORRESPONDENCE AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Hacker announced that the June 26, 2025, Executive Committee meeting will be cancelled.

Mr. Heibert announced that the Commission had received an award for excellence by the National Association of Regional Councils for the Flex Ride pilot project that the Commission staff cooperatively worked on with staff from UW Milwaukee. He stated that funding for the pilot project was received from the National Science Foundation.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, on a motion by Mr. Stroik, seconded by Ms. Brown-Martin, and carried unanimously, the meeting was adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

-11-
Annual Commission Meeting
June 18, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Hacker
Deputy Secretary

SH/BRM/EAL #278321