

COMMITTEE MEETING

July 2, 2026

9:00 a.m.

Room #264, Grant County Board Room, Administration Building
Lancaster, Wisconsin

The Grant County Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee meeting was called to order on July 2, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. by Joe Mumm, the Conservation, Sanitation, Zoning Committee Chairman in Room #264, County Board Room of the Administration Building.

Board members present in the County Board room #264: Joe Mumm, Roger Lange, Brian Lucey, Brian Johnsrud, Lynn Kirschbaum, and Ron McKelvey, Absent. Others were present in the County Board room; Annette Lolwing, Keith Lane, Brady Bartels, Adam Reed, Shane Drinkwater, Robert Keeney, Nate Dreckman, Ben Wood, Randall Nolt, Merlin Nolt, Isaac Shanley, George Lazarus, Aaron Austin, and Tom Weigel. Those on Zoom: Tonya White, Keith Lane, Emily Schildgen, Mike Adams, Robert Keeney, County Board Room, Jim Bergles, Shane Drinkwater, Andrea Noethe, Wepking's, and Konrad Strzalka.

Certification of Open Meeting Law

Annette Lolwing sent the amended agenda to the County Clerk's office to post in the Administration Building, Courthouse, and on the County website. An amended agenda was also posted in front of the Ag Service Center Building. An amended agenda was also sent to Bob Middendorf, WGLR. Media notices were sent to the County Clerk's office, the Grant County Herald Independent, Muscoda Progressive, Fennimore Times, Boscobel Dial and Bob Middendorf.

Approval of July 2, 2026, Amended Agenda

Motion by Brian Johnsrud, seconded by Brian Lucey to approve the amended agenda. Motion carried.

Approval of June 4, 2026, Minutes

Motion by Lynn Kirschbaum, seconded by Roger Lange to approve the June 4, 2026, minutes. Motion carried.

Review & Accept the June Bills

Motion by Brian Johnsrud, seconded by Roger Lange, to accept the June bills. Motion carried.

NRCS Report – Mike Adams

Mike reported that NRCS has been working on approximately 100 CRP contracts. Re-enrolls, new signups, and CREP.

FSA Report – Emily Schildgen

See Attachment A Worksheet.

Discussion & Possible Action on Wingville Adoption of Data Center Interim Zoning

Keith mentioned that Wingville Township has adopted an Ordinance establishing Interim Zoning in the Town of Wingville, Grant County Wisconsin. Ben Wood, Corporation Council, explained that Wingville Township placed a 2-year interim zoning ordinance to preserve existing uses until a comprehensive zoning ordinance is prepared and in place within 1 year by the Conservation, Sanitation, and Zoning Department. The Grant County moratorium is good for one year, after that one year expires the moratorium may be extended. Motion by Brian Lucey, seconded by Lynn Kirschbaum to refer the decision to full county board. Motion carried.

Zoning/Sanitation Report

Keith presented the Zoning/Sanitation report.

Sanitation permits: For the month of June 2025, there were 15 sanitary permits issued including 4 reconnect/modifications. Year to date 2025, there were 58 permits issued. For the month of June 2026, there were 17 sanitation permits issued including 3 reconnect/modifications. Year to date 2026 there were 65 sanitary permits issued.

Zoning permits: For the month of June 2025, there were 46 zoning permits issued. Year to date in 2025 there were 147 zoning permits issued. Total project costs were \$3,581,223.00, of that total \$1,525,000.00 were just new homes. For the month of June 2026, there were 46 zoning permits issued. Year to date for 2026 there were 163 zoning permits issued. Total project costs were \$4,089,650.00 of that total \$2,318,000.00 were just new homes.

Discuss Previous FP Rezones

Keith was asked to do a review on how the CSZ committee voted on rezones coming out of FP between the years 2020 – 2025. These were checked for prime farmland and the percentage of prime farmland of the rezone was in prime farmland. In those 5 years there was at least one rezone that was approved with having over 50% of prime farmland soil present. It was suggested that each rezone out of FP, which is over 50% prime farmland, would be looked at by the CSZ Committee.

Public Hearing for Rezones

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

#RZ26-09 George Lazarus, Platteville Twp., is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN:050-00901-0000 (pt) & 050-00893-0000 (pt) +/- 14.06 ac. from FP to A2 for a proposed subdivision.

In Favor: Platteville Twp. approved on March 9, 2026. Isaac Shanley, Tom Weigel, Aaron Austin, Platteville Township-Tom Weigel stated that George Lazarus and Aaron Austin have been more than cooperative to work with and are in favor of the rezone. Isaak Shanley, neighbor of the subdivision, spoke in favor of the rezone.

Applicant Statement: Aaron Austin spoke on behalf of George Lazarus. Proposed 9 lots. The subdivision was approved at the Platteville Town board meeting. Lots were made a little larger. Lots are along a current road.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: None

Committee Discussion: Joe Mumm mentioned that farmland preservation is put there to preserve the farmland. The frustrating part about that is, there is no penalty to opt out of the Farmland Preservation Program.

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Brian Johnsrud, seconded by Brian Lucey, opposed by Roger Lange that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board. Motion carried. See Attachment B Worksheet

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

#RZ26-10 Keith & Ruth Nolt, Hickory Grove Twp., are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN:024-00203-0000 (pt) +/- 6.5 ac. from FP to A2 for the proposed conditional use of a school.

In Favor: Hickory Grove Twp. approved on May 5, 2026. Merlin Nolt and Randall Nolt. Randall Nolt spoke in favor of the rezone for the establishment of their private school proposal.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: Keith Lane brought up the discussion about green space for schools. There is no legal minimum green space required. Keith also reached out to the power company regarding the distance from a substation to the proposed school. There is nothing found in the CSZD ordinance, and nothing was noted with Scenic Rivers Energy Coop. This parcel of land has more than 50% prime farmland.

Committee Discussion: Brian Lucey asked if there was any other zoning bracket that they can be placed in, so they don't have to do a Conditional Use Permit? Other options were looked at but the CSZ department thought that this was the best option for the school to meet setbacks and keep it in the same ownership.

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Brian Johnsrud, seconded by Lynn Kirschbaum that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation Worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Lynn Kirschbaum. Motion carried. See Attachment C Worksheet.

Public Hearing for Conditional Use Permits

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

#CUP26-011 Keith & Ruth Nolt, Hickory Grove Twp., are requesting a Conditional use Permit on PIN:024-00203-0000 (pt) +/- 6.5 acres to allow for a school under section 3.07 (2) (C) of the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

In Favor: Hickory Grove Township approved on May 5, 2026. Merlin Nolt and Randall Nolt

In Opposition: None

In Interest: No conditions were set by the Township.

Committee Discussion: None

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Brian Johnsrud to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit with no conditions placed by the Township, however, approval will be contingent on the rezone RZ26-10 which needs to be approved by the full County Board, seconded by Brian Lucey. Motion carried. See Attachment D Worksheet.

Chairman Mumm opened the Public Hearing

#CUP26-014 John & Catherine Youngbauer, Muscoda Twp., are requesting a Conditional use Permit on PIN:042-00121-0000 +/- 2.167 acres to allow for an accessory structure prior to the establishment of a principal structure under section 3.07 (2) (a) of the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance.

In Favor: Muscoda Twp. approved on May 13, 2026.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: There were no conditions set by the Township.

Committee Discussion: Joe Mumm asked what kind of structure is being built. Adam Reed replied post frame building is approximately 40' by 36'. Adam stated that John is 40' from the west boundary line.

Chairman Mumm closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Brian Lucey, to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit with no conditions set by the Township, seconded by Lynn Kirschbaum. Motion carried. See Attachment E Worksheet.

Definition of Construction

Keith handed out a couple of different definitions of construction for the committee to review. He would like to add this to our ordinance of when construction is considered the start of construction?

This is the draft version that was discussed. For the purpose of this section, start of construction shall be when any earth disturbing activity takes place that will lead to the installation of footings, piers, posts, pilings or foundations. Earth disturbing activity for the purpose of soil evaluation or testing shall not be considered the start of construction. This is not intended to include agricultural fence installation. If the site is within the Floodplain or Shoreland setbacks, the Floodplain and/or Shoreland permits must be obtained prior to any earth disturbing activities. Keith will be setting this up in ordinance form.

Development of Temporary Housing During Construction Phase

Keith brought up discussion of the development of temporary housing during construction phase. This would be for the construction of a primary residence. Keith will move forward to get the temporary housing during construction phase put in ordinance form.

Discussion of Minimum Acreage for FP

Keith mentioned that a while back they changed the minimum acreage to stay in FP to 3.0 acres. An acre and a half is too small to meet the state requirements. Is 3.0 acres enough to make a primary income on it? The

income is \$6,000.00 per year or a rolling average of \$18,000.00 in 3 years. Would the committee like to leave it as 3.0 acres or what acreage would you like to see? Will bring this back for further discussion.

Discussion of Minimum Acreage for Land Divisions

Keith mentioned that this falls into the CSM land split requirements. If you are doing a land division an acreage minimum should be in place. If you are splitting below that acreage minimum that the CSM must be reviewed by County and submitted by the County. Bob Keeney would like a licensed surveyor to review all the CSM's.

County Cost Sharing: Beginning Balance \$37,604.00/ Ending Balance \$37,604.00
None to report.

2025 DATCP Cost-Sharing Requests: Beginning/Ending Balance \$43,625.19
None to report.

2026 DATCP Cost-Sharing Requests: Beginning Balance \$44,236.60 / Ending Balance \$57,674.41
Brady Bartels presented final approval request for 2026 DATCP cost sharing on a grassed waterway for Karen Yelinek, Clifton Twp., \$825.59. Motion by Roger Lange, seconded by Brian Lucey to approve payment. Roll Call: 5 Yes, 0 No, 1 Excused. Motion carried.

Brady presented final approval request for 2026 DATCP cost sharing on a stream crossing & access road for Mark & Renee Vosberg, Hazel Green Twp., \$13,500.00. Motion by Roger Lange, seconded by Lynn Kirschbaum to approve payment. Roll Call: 5 Yes, 0 No, 1 Excused. Motion carried.

CSZD Report

Conservation: July 2026 overview...

Keith went through a few of the highlights from the July overview notes that were handed out.

1. Steve has completed 50 NMP site reviews out of the 98 total reviews.
2. Brady, Steve & Keith continue to work on NPRA site reviews, deadline is July 31st.
3. Is anyone going on the SAA tour in Dane County next month?

Zoning:

1. Lucas and Adam are continuing to do post and pre-construction site inspections.
2. An order for correction (OFC) has been issued on the Stitzer school house situation and on the Rockville Campground.
3. Had a Board of Adjustment meeting on June 24th. Project was approved to build inside a road setback.

Sanitation:

1. Keith mentioned that Catalyst was supposed to go live in August. They were also supposed to have a practice program site for the staff to work on but that has not happened.

The next meeting will be on August 6, 2026, at 9:00 a.m.

Motion by Roger Lange, seconded by Brian Johnsrud to adjourn the meeting at 11:35 a.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by Annette Lolwing

FSA Notes – July CSZD Meeting

Assistance for Specialty Crop Farmers (ASCF) program opened on June 8, 2026. This program is the equivalent of the FBA program we recently had, but specifically for specialty crop producers. The National office put out a list of specialty crops that are eligible for the program each at one of 4 payment levels. Producers had to have reported their 2025 crops by April 24, 2026 to be eligible for this program. Grant County will have about a dozen applications.

Supplemental Disaster Relief Program (SDRP) is for producers who suffered a crop or quality loss in calendar year 2023 or 2024 due to a disaster event. This program initially opened in August 2025 with multiple stages of the program opening throughout the last year. The deadline of August 12, 2026 for all stages of this program was recently announced.

COC Election nominations opened on June 15, 2026 and run through August 3, 2026. This year LAA #2 is up for election which is the northeastern part of the county and includes Waterstown, Muscoda, Castle Rock, Hickory Grove, Marion, Mount Ida, Fennimore, Wingville, Clifton, Liberty, and North Lancaster townships. Currently Mark Loy is the representative for LAA 2 and he has agreed to run for another term.

Important dates to remember (previously discussed):

May 15 – August 1: Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) – Primary Nesting Season (PNS)

July 15, 2026: Spring crop reporting deadline

August 3, 2026: COC election nominations due for LAA #2

August 7, 2026: Assistance for Specialty Crop Farmers (ASCF) signup deadline

August 12, 2026: SDRP signup deadline

Attachment B Worksheet

Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 6/4/26 Landowner: George Lazarus

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

☐ No

Explain: 8.9 ac in Prime farmland

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

☐ No

or

☐ N/A

Explain: This ± 14.06 ac are planned to be used for a subdivision & lots would not meet the 3.0 ac minimum for FP

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

3.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes ☐ No

3.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes ☐ No

3.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes ☐ No

3.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☒ Yes ☐ No

3.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☒ Yes ☐ No

- 4 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

4.1 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

4.2 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

4.3 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

4.4 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

☐ No

Explain: 8.9 acres in this rezone are listed as prime farmland

- 5 The CSZC ☒ recommends ☐ does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

Date: 6/4/26 Landowner: Keith & Ruth Nolt

The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:

1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain: 3.6 acres in prime farmland

2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.

☒ Yes

or

No

or

N/A

Explain: This ± 6.5 ac are planned to be used for a private school to meet dimensional & setback requirements.

3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.

3.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. ☒ Yes No

3.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. ☒ Yes No

3.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. ☒ Yes No

3.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. ☒ Yes No

3.5 Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. ☒ Yes No

- 4 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

4.1 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district

4.2 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement

4.3 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement

4.4 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development

☒ Yes

or

No

Explain: 3.6 acres in this rezone are listed as prime farmland

- 5 The CSZC ☒ recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors

(Circle one)

BEFORE GRANT COUNTY
CONSERVATION, SANITATION AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
FOR KEITH & RUTH NOLT
PIN:024-00203-0000(Pt), HICKORY GROVE TOWNSHIP, GRANT COUNTY, WI

FINDINGS OF FACT

The agency finds that:

1. Keith & Ruth Nolt own property located within the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 10, T7N, R2W in Hickory Grove Township, Grant County, WI. Such property consists of tax parcel numbers PIN:024-00203-0000(pt).
2. On April 15th, 2026, the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Department (CSZD) discussed onsite the permitting required for a school house on PIN:024-00203-0000(pt) which included obtaining a Rezone, Conditional Use Permit, and Zoning Permit.
3. On May 5th, 2026, the Hickory Grove Township Town Board recommended approval for the CUP. 3 were in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained. No conditions were placed by the Town Board on the permit.
4. On May 13th, 2026, the CSZD office received the completed application.
5. On May 21st, 2026 and May 28th, 2026, a public notice was published in the County's official newspaper for the CUP request.
6. On July 2nd, 2026, the CSZC reviewed the CUP request through a public hearing and determined the findings of fact to **approve** or **deny** the CUP application.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION

1. The CSZC (hereinafter referred to as the agency) has the authority pursuant to the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) to issue or deny conditional use permits. Prior to granting or denying a conditional use, the agency shall make a findings of fact based on evidence presented, issue a determination whether the standards of the ordinance are met, and require additional conditions, as needed. Based upon the above findings and information provided at the public hearing, the CSZD finds that the conditional use **does or does not** meet the following criteria:
2. The agency under Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) (c) shall consider the following criteria:

- (1) That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare;
- (2) That the conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood;
- (3) That the establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district;
- (4) That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided;
- (5) That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets;
- (6) That adequate prevention and control of water pollution including sedimentation are being provided;
- (7) That adequate measures will be taken to sustain existing topographic and drainage features and vegetation cover on the site;
- (8) That adequate location of the site with respect to flood plains and floodways of bodies of water;
- (9) That adequate consideration of erosion potential of the site based upon degree and direction of slope, soil type and vegetation cover;
- (10) That location factors are considered which address:
 - (a) Domestic uses shall be generally preferred;
 - (b) Uses not inherently a source of pollution within an area shall be preferred over uses that are or may be a pollution source; and
 - (c) Use locations within an area tending to minimize the possibility of pollution shall be preferred over use locations tending to increase the possibility.
- (11) That the conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee; and
- (12) In the case of nonmetallic mining, the Conservation, Sanitation, & Zoning Committee shall also consider any reclamation plan submitted for the property and the reclamation plan's provisions for maintaining lateral support and for depth of the quarry pursuant to the standards set forth in Wisconsin Administration code Chapter NR 136.

BEFORE GRANT COUNTY
CONSERVATION, SANITATION AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT
FOR JOHN & CATHERINE YOUNGBAUER
PIN:042-00121-0000, HICKORY GROVE TOWNSHIP, GRANT COUNTY, WI

FINDINGS OF FACT

The agency finds that:

1. John & Catherine Youngbauer own property located within the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 02, T8N, R1W in Muscoda Township, Grant County, WI. Such property consists of tax parcel number PIN:042-00121-0000.
2. On April 14th, 2026, the Conservation, Sanitation and Zoning Department (CSZD) discussed the permitting required for an accessory structure prior to a principal structure on PIN:042-00121-0000 which included obtaining a Conditional Use Permit and Zoning Permit.
3. On May 13th, 2026, the Muscoda Township Town Board recommended approval for the CUP. 3 were in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstained. No conditions were placed by the Town Board on the permit.
4. On May 15th, 2026, the CSZD office received the completed application.
5. On June 18th, 2026 and June 25th, 2026, a public notice was published in the County's official newspaper for the CUP request.
6. On July 2nd, 2026, the CSZC reviewed the CUP request through a public hearing and determined the findings of fact to **approve** or **deny** the CUP application.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSION

1. The CSZC (hereinafter referred to as the agency) has the authority pursuant to the Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) to issue or deny conditional use permits. Prior to granting or denying a conditional use, the agency shall make a findings of fact based on evidence presented, issue a determination whether the standards of the ordinance are met, and require additional conditions, as needed. Based upon the above findings and information provided at the public hearing, the CSZD finds that the conditional use **does or does not** meet the following criteria:
2. The agency under Ch. 315 Subsection 3.27 (5) (c) shall consider the following criteria:
 - (1) That the establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use will not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals, comfort, or general welfare;
 - (2) That the conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, nor substantially diminish and impair property values within the neighborhood;
 - (3) That the establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district;
 - (4) That adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and/or necessary facilities have been or are being provided;
 - (5) That adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed as to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets;
 - (6) That adequate prevention and control of water pollution including sedimentation are being provided;
 - (7) That adequate measures will be taken to sustain existing topographic and drainage features and vegetation cover on the site;
 - (8) That adequate location of the site with respect to flood plains and floodways of bodies of water;
 - (9) That adequate consideration of erosion potential of the site based upon degree and direction of slope, soil type and vegetation cover;
 - (10) That location factors are considered which address:
 - (a) Domestic uses shall be generally preferred;
 - (b) Uses not inherently a source of pollution within an area shall be preferred over uses that are or may be a pollution source; and
 - (c) Use locations within an area tending to minimize the possibility of pollution shall be preferred over use locations tending to increase the possibility.
 - (11) That the conditional use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located, except as such regulations may, in each instance, be modified by the Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee; and
 - (12) In the case of nonmetallic mining, the Conservation, Sanitation, & Zoning Committee shall also consider any reclamation plan submitted for the property and the reclamation plan's provisions for maintaining lateral support and for depth of the quarry pursuant to the standards set forth in Wisconsin Administration code Chapter NR 136.