VILLAGE OF SISTER BAY BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING MINUTES
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2015
SISTER BAY-LIBERTY GROVE FIRE STATION – 2258 MILL ROAD

The October 20, 2015 meeting of the Village of Sister Bay Board of Trustees was called to order by Village President Dave Lienau at 6:00 P.M.

Present: President Lienau and Trustees John Clove, Pat Duffy, Scott Baker, Kathy Enquist, and Nora Zacek.

Excused: Shane Solomon

Staff Members: Village Administrator Zeke Jackson and Assistant Administrator Janal Suppanz.

Others: Jack and Pat Wisner, Martha Coventry, Bill and Judy Wegehaupt, Greg and Carol Keneweg, Steve and Mary Musinsky, Doug and Dixie VanVorous, Tom and Jeanette Sadler, Don Howard, Judith Ross Stevenson, Mark Lippert, Jamie and Shannon Strabala, Herb Edlbauer, Alyssa Bloechl, Steve Thomas, Mark and Kathy Kunstman, Fred Landstrom, Todd Strojny, Steve Eatough, Janet Janisse, Rob Zoschke, Scott McEvoy, Barbara Meyer, Robert Brogan, Denise Bhirdo, Sharon Doersching, and seventeen other individuals.

Approval of the Agenda and Minutes as published:
A motion was made by Clove, seconded by Baker that the Agenda for the October 20, 2015 meeting of the Village of Sister Bay Board of Trustees be approved as presented. Motion carried – All ayes.

A motion was made by Clove, seconded by Baker that the minutes for the September 25, 2015 joint meeting of the Village of Sister Bay Board of Trustees, the Economic Development Committee, the Parks Committee and the Plan Commission be approved as presented. Motion carried – All ayes.

A motion was made by Clove, seconded by Baker that the minutes for the September 25, 2015 meeting of the Village of Sister Bay Board of Trustees be approved as presented. Motion carried – All ayes.

Comments and correspondence:
Lienau noted that a number of letters and e-mails were received regarding the quarry issue. All of those letters were included in the meeting packets and posted on the wall of the meeting room for everyone to view, so none of them would be read aloud. He also pointed out that a thank you letter for a donation which had been made in memory of Frank Hough, a former Village Board member, and a copy of the Door County Sheriff's Department Call Log for May, June, July and August of 2015 were included in the meeting packets, and then asked if anyone wished to comment regarding a non-agenda item.

Sharon Doersching asked how many meetings a Board member is allowed to miss before being formally removed from the Board, and Lienau responded that in order for any formal action to be taken a Trustee's absences must be "unexcused".

Judith Ross Stevenson reiterated that she does not believe a closed session should be addressed during the middle of any Village meetings.

Denise Bhirdo indicated that it is her understanding that a joint meeting of County, City, Village and Town officials will be conducted in Sister Bay on Thursday, October 22, 2015, and asked if the Agenda for that meeting was posted. Jackson responded that there is no legal requirement to post an agenda for such a gathering.

Item No. 2. Public Hearing on a request to amend §66.032(c) of the Sister Bay Zoning Code to allow quarries as a conditional use in the B-1 General Business District; Discussion on a request to amend §66.0320(c) of the Sister Bay Zoning Code to allow quarries as a conditional use in the B-1 General Business District; and consider a motion for action to approve or deny Ordinance No. 235, which amends §66.0320(c) of the Zoning Code:
Randy Nesbitt, the Village Attorney, explained that the quarry has been operated in its current location for a number of years. In 2010 blasting started to occur at the quarry, and since a number of noise and dust complaints were received the owners were cited for Zoning Code violations. The case was contested, and the Judge who was assigned made it very clear that he was not going to order the quarry to be shut down. He did order that the Village and the owners of the quarry participate in mediation sessions. The existing quarry is considered to be a pre-existing, non-conforming use, or in other words, was "grandfathered", and there is no requirement that it ever be shut down. Brandon Small, the representative of the owners of the quarry, has requested that they be allowed to expand the quarry on the condition that it must be completely closed in ten years. There will be two steps to the process which must be followed with respect to Small's request. First, a Zoning Code text amendment will be required which would allow a quarry as a conditional use in the B-1 District, and, if that amendment is approved, then another public hearing must be conducted on an application for a Conditional Use Permit to expand the quarry. The Plan Commission has recommended that the Zoning Code text amendment be approved. Nesbitt stressed that Village officials have informed him that they have no intention of allowing quarries to be operated throughout the Village. He also noted that if the text amendment is not approved by the Village Board this evening the matter will "die", but then Village officials will have no mechanism for imposing restrictions on the existing quarry operations.

Bob Kufrin, the former Village Administrator, who is now acting as a consultant for the Village, pointed out that the Plan Commission has deliberated this issue for several years. There were also several closed sessions conducted regarding the pending litigation Nesbitt referred to, but to date no deal has been reached between Village officials and the owners/operator of the quarry. The documents which were included in the meeting packets are simply drafts. If a Conditional Use Permit is issued Mr. Small will have to satisfy a number of specific conditions. Kufrin believes this whole process is a "gamble" for Village officials as well as the members of the public, as if the text amendment is approved and a Conditional Use Permit is granted there will be a date certain as to when the quarry will simply have to be shut down. On the other hand, if the text amendment request is denied the existing quarry could be operated for perpetuity with little or no regulation.

At 6:21 P.M. Lienau called the Public Hearing on a request to amend §66.032(c) of the Sister Bay Zoning Code to allow quarries as a conditional use in the B-1 General Business District to order.

Doug VanVorous asked what guarantee there would be that enforcement actions will be taken if a text amendment and a Conditional Use Permit is eventually approved. Nesbitt and Kufrin

responded that if violations do occur the Village Administrator would be the person who takes enforcement action.

Kathleen Kunstman noted that it is her understanding that even if enforcement action is taken the quarry would be allowed to continue to operate unless and until a Judge has made an official ruling on the charges, and Nesbitt responded that that is correct. However, if the non-compliance is severe enough an Injunction could be sought.

Scott McEvoy asked if Mr. Small would immediately have to comply with the new regulations if the proposed text amendment is approved, and Kufrin responded that the new regulations would be enforced, but the document with the "actual teeth" would be the Conditional Use Permit.

Tom Sadler read a prepared statement aloud. A copy of that document is attached and incorporated by reference.

Don Howard asked if the proposed text amendment would apply to the entire B-1 District, and Jackson responded that the Village does not have the authority to "spot zone". It would be possible to include limiting language in the text amendment.

Janet Janisse asked who will actually make the determination that the dust and noise conditions at the quarry are bad enough to warrant imposition of penalties for violations of Village regulations and/or a Conditional Use Permit, and also asked what those penalties would be. Nesbitt responded that the penalties for violations of any and all Village regulations are prescribed in the Village's Municipal Code. First the Village Administrator must issue a citation(s) to the owners/operators of the quarry, and then a Judge must find that a violation of the Village's zoning regulations or a Conditional Use Permit actually occurred. If such a finding is made the previously mentioned penalties would be imposed by the Judge who found that the violation(s) occurred. It would be possible for the Village Board to amend the penalty provisions contained within the Municipal Code.

Barbara Meyer asked who will monitor the dust and noise conditions at the quarry, and also asked what guidelines will be followed. Kufrin responded that the Conditional Use Permit would contain specific conditions pertaining to dust and noise, and the Village Administrator would be responsible for seeing that citations are issued.

Doug VanVorous pointed out that after blasting was done at the existing quarry the basement walls on his residence cracked. Unsafe Radon readings were also obtained. VanVorous suggested that all his neighbors check their residences for similar damage and conditions.

Steve Eatough asked when the existing quarry became non-conforming, and Kufrin responded that that occurred in 1974.

Scott McEvoy asked "who" the owners of the quarry would "have to make their case to" if a Conditional Use Permit is requested, and Kufrin explained that initially a presentation would have to be made to the Plan Commission, and another Public Hearing would be required. If the Plan Commission recommends that the Conditional Use Permit be issued the matter would then be referred back to the Village Board.

Pat Wisner asked if it would be possible to bring this issue to referendum. She also noted that those who live in close proximity to the quarry are "putting up with a lot".

Don Howard asked if Village officials ever considered offering a financial settlement to the quarry owners in an attempt to get him to "shut it down", and Nesbitt responded that such an offer has been made but was declined.

Steve Musinsky stated that since he spoke at the last Plan Commission Meeting people he doesn't even know have walked up to him and said things like, "We're so sorry to hear about what the Village did to you and your neighbors". Musinsky asked that the Board members "put themselves in his shoes". He also explained the provisions of NR135, and noted that the presence of a quarry in one's neighborhood could have a significant negative impact on home values and the ability of a homeowner to obtain a mortgage. It is his understanding that eventually the useful life of the existing quarry will run out, and, therefore, at some point in time operations will simply have to cease because no more useful stone can be obtained. In conclusion Musinsky urged the members of the Board to "just vote no".

Bill Wegehaupt pointed out that the Board members have been elected by the citizens, and then read the preambles of the proposed Ordinance aloud, noting that based upon the statements which were made by several citizens this evening he does not believe any of the statements made in the preambles are accurate. It is his firm contention that it is not in the best interest of the public to update the Zoning Code to allow quarries as a conditional use in the B-1 District.

Mary Musinsky asked that all those who do not want the quarry to be expanded please stand up, and several individuals did that.

Greg Kenewig pointed out that if a Conditional Use Permit is granted it would be possible for the owners of the quarry to apply for amendments at some point in the future. Kufrin acknowledged that that is a possiblity, but Village officials would have to approve any modifications which are made.

Carol Kenewig noted that it is her understanding that property values in the vicinity of the quarry could be reduced by 25% to 30%, which could result in a number of property assessments being contested.

Sharon Doersching pointed out that if citations are issued to the owners/operators of the quarry attorney fees could become very costly.

Rob Zoschke indicated that he signed the Petition which was presented this evening as he "felt sorry"for the affected property owners. After hearing the comments which were made at this Public Hearing he believes it would simply be best to "let the existing quarry die".

Shannon Strabala noted that she did not see a letter she had written to the Board posted on the wall, and, therefore, read that letter aloud. (A copy of it is attached and incorporated by reference.)

Barbara Meyer asked if any letters in favor of the text amendment have been received, and Jackson responded that he has not received any such letters but did get a call from a contractor

who was concerned that Door County stone would no longer be available if the quarry is not expanded.

Attorney Tyler Claringbole indicated that the proposal before the Board this evening has been Mr. Small's best effort to resolve this matter. He understands that nobody " likes" the quarry and is sympathetic, and has made a concerted effort to resolve the issues which have been cited. The only legal way to truly put an end to the quarry operations is to approve the proposed text amendment.

Steve Musinsky pointed out that he is nearing retirement age. It is his opinion that "ten years is a long time".

Mary Musinsky asked for a show of hands as to how many people are retirees and how many people have young children. The members of the audience again complied with her request.

Doug VanVorous stated that he can't understand why the owners of the quarry are persisting when they know the quarry "is not welcome".

Attorney Claringbole responded that there will be no time limit on the quarry operations if the text amendment is not approved. Mr. Small is making a concerted effort to take the wishes of the public into consideration and is trying to be "a good neighbor".

Bob Brogan noted that the Village has already approved a Master Plan, and believes it would be a violation of that plan if the proposed text amendment is granted.

At 7:36 P.M. Lienau asked if anyone else wished to comment regarding this issue, and when no one responded he declared that the public hearing was officially closed.

A motion was made by Lieanu, seconded by Duffy that the request to amend §66.0320(c) of the Sister Bay Zoning Code to allow quarries as a conditional use in the B-1 General Business District be denied.

Lienau pointed out that he is affected by the quarry operations at his home and his business. He is fully aware of all the noise and dust which is generated by the quarry, and was the "swing vote" on the Plan Commission, as he felt it was very important for this matter to be presented to the Village Board. It is his opinion that the quarry owners have never done anything to alleviate the issues which have been complained about, and he would have a very difficult time rewarding the lack of responsibility they have demonstrated thus far.

Duffy indicated that he owns property in close proximity to the quarry and agrees wholeheartedly with Lienau.

Clove indicated that he has heard his constituents "loud and clear", but did caution that if the proposed text amendment is not approved the existing quarry could continue to operate for an indefinite period of time.

Baker stated that he, too, has heard his constituents and agrees that the proposed text amendment should not be granted.

Zacek and Enquist indicated that they have thought long and hard about this issue. They realize that the existing quarry can continue to operate "as is", but believe whatever enforcement actions are possible should be taken if violations do occur.

Nesbitt cautioned that the strongest land control method the Village has is the Zoning Code. Because the existing quarry is considered a "non-conforming use" there is no control over its operations, and if the proposed text amendment is not approved the Village is basically "giving up" a very valuable enforcement tool. If the previously mentioned motion passes he will be required to inform the Judge who ordered mediation that it was not possible for the parties to reach a settlement. There is no way of knowing what type of ruling the Judge will make.

A few members of the audience asked if it would be possible for individual property owners to sue the owners of the quarry, and Nesbitt responded that they should discuss such actions with their attorneys.

A roll call vote was taken on Lienau and Duffy's motion, and the Board members voted in the following fashion:

Baker – Aye; Clove – Aye; Duffy – Aye; Enquist – Aye; Lienau – Aye; Zacek – Aye.

Motion carried.

At 8:10 P.M. a brief recess was taken and the Board reconvened at 8:22 P.M.

Item No. 1. Discussion on the Finance Committee's request to investigate potential Clean Air Act and Local Ordinance violations by Sister Bay Properties, LLC; Consider a motion for action if appropriate:

The members of the Finance Committee requested that Jackson investigate the potential for the filing of charges for Clean Air Act violations against the owners of the quarry. He subsequently contacted DNR officials, and was informed that in order for Clean Air Act charges to be filed air quality monitors and cameras would have to be utilized. He would not be opposed to utilization of such equipment, but did caution that there could be unintended consequences of taking this type of action as other business operations within the Village could also be deemed to be non-compliant. Another option would be to issue citations for any and all violations of local regulations which occur at the quarry.

It was the consensus that a draft of an Ordinance which addresses noise complaints and fugitive dust emissions, as well as potential penalties for such violations shall be presented to the applicable Committees, Commissions and Boards ASAP.

Item No. 3. Consider a motion to discuss and act on a recommendation of the Utilities Committee and adopt Resolution No. 316, which approves the 2014 Annual Compliance Maintenance Report:

Each year the DNR requires that the Utilities Department submit a report which identifies the various operating levels and maintenance activities at the Wastewater Plant and collection system. A copy of that report as well as Resolution No. 316, which approves it, were included in the meeting packets. The Utilities Committee has recommended that both documents be approved.

A motion was made by Baker, seconded by Zacek that the Village Board accepts the recommendation of the Utilities Committee and adopts Resolution No. 316, which approves the 2014 Annual Compliance Maintenance Report for the Sister Bay Wastewater Treatment Facility, as presented. Motion carried – All ayes.

Item No. 4. Consider a motion to discuss and act on a recommendation of the Utilities Committee and adopt Ordinance No. 240, amending Chapter 62 – the Village's Utilities Code:
From time to time the DNR changes administrative policies regarding the water system and how it relates to private wells. In this instance, the regulations regarding cross-connections and testing were changed, and an applicable Ordinance was included in the meeting packets. The Utilities Committee has recommended that that Ordinance be approved.

A motion was made by Clove, seconded my Baker that the Village Board accepts the recommendation of the Utilities Committee and adopts Ordinance No. 240, which amends the Village's Utilities Code, as presented. Motion carried – All ayes.

Item No. 5. Consider a motion to discuss and confirm President Lienau's Committee Appointments:
Lienau recommended that:

- Solomon be removed from the Finance Committee and Baker appointed to replace him.
- Andy Hallett be appointed to the Marina Committee.
- Chad Kodanko, Shane Solomon and Rob Zoschke be appointed to the Waterfront Oversight Committee.

A motion was made by Zacek, seconded by Clove that the Village Board accepts all of President Lienau's recommendations for Committee appointments as presented at this meeting. Motion carried – All ayes.

Item No. 9. Report on County activities from the County Supervisor, Dave Lienau:
Lienau gave the following oral report regarding Door County activities:

- The County's budget is substantially complete, but negotiations with some bargaining units have not been completed yet. Budget Hearings will be conducted on November 10, 2015 and November 12, 2015.

Item No. 10. Review of the financial statements and consideration of a motion to approve the monthly bills:
Payment Approval Reports for the period September 16, 2015 through October 20, 2015 were included in the meeting packets, and the Board members jointly reviewed those documents. During the review process Clove questioned whether one of the Marina Committee members attended all the Marina Committee Meetings he was paid for. He also asked if it would be possible to suspend the cable television service at the Boathouse for the winter months. Suppanz will check both matters out and take appropriate follow-up action.

A motion was made by Baker, seconded by Duffy that the monthly bills depicted on the reports which were included in the meeting packets totaling $1,515,367.90 are all approved. Motion carried – All ayes.

Item No. 11. Report by the Village Administrator on Village activities and projects:
Jackson gave the following oral report:

- Progress continues to be made on the Beach Project. Some of the sub-contractors who are working on the project have not completed their work yet, but Mike Kahr assured him that all the work will be done before winter. The Board members cautioned that molding issues could arise if seeding is done in fall.

- The estimate for the Waterfront Park sprinkler system repair/installation project came in much higher than anticipated. (Approximately $65,000.) The Parks Committee approved installation of the sprinkler system this year in hopes that the park would be ready for use in spring.

  It was the consensus that the Waterfront Park sprinkler system shall be installed ASAP. The Finance Committee will determine what accounts the necessary funds shall be withdrawn from.

- Work is progressing on the Bay Shore Drive Reconstruction Project. Vinton Construction intends to utilize a "quick cure" concrete so road closures should be significantly reduced. One intersection will be open at all times, but detours will be in effect.

- At the present time the Village is hindered on its ability to receive grant money because the Beach Project must be completed to a "punch list" standard before the funds will be released.

Committee Reports:

(1) Administrative Committee:
The Administrative Committee met and formulated the previously mentioned Committee appointment recommendations.

(2) Bay Shore Drive Reconstruction Oversight Ad Hoc Committee:
The Bay Shore Drive Reconstruction Oversight Ad Hoc Committee has not met recently.

(3) Communication and Technology Committee:
The Communication and Technology Committee has not met recently.

(4) Door County Coastal Byways Commission:
The Coastal Byways Commission met on September 23, 2015 and is recommending that the Peninsula State Park Tower be repaired. Some of the signage for businesses which have been closed will be removed ASAP. The next meeting of the Commission will take place tomorrow.

(5) DCEDC:
The DCEDC met on October 12, 2015. Many of the former employees of Palmer Johnson's have already found employment elsewhere. The Bass Master Tournament was a resounding success and it sounds like the organizers of that event would like to return next June.

(6) Economic Development Committee:
The Economic Development Committee has not met recently.

(7) Finance Committee:
The Finance Committee has been meeting on a regular basis and work is ongoing on preparation of the 2016 Budget. Lienau noted that an error was made on the sentence which begins on Line 9 – Page 1 of the October 14, 2015 Finance Committee Meeting Minutes. (That sentence should read, "Lienau noted that Shane Solomon, the Chair of the Finance Committee, has submitted a letter of resignation, and, therefore, he would be serving as Acting Chair.")

(8) Fire Board and Fire District Exploratory Committee:
No action based on the minutes which were included in the meeting packets.

The Fire District Exploratory Committee has not met recently.

(9) Historical Society:
The Historical Society Board of Directors met on October 1, 2015, but those minutes have not been completed yet.

(10) Library Commission:
The Library Commission met on October 13, 2015 but those minutes have not been completed yet.

(11) Marina Committee and Marina Fest Committee:
No action based on the minutes which were included in the meeting packets. Clove noted that there is an error on Line 19 – Page 2 of the minutes for the October 13, 2015 meeting of the Marina Committee. That sentence should read, "Duffy then informed Krauel that the Marina Committee had decided to offer her the newly created Marina Manager position. Jackson will be discussing the terms of employment with her in the near future.".

The Marina Fest Committee will be meeting after the work is completed on the 2016 budget.

(12) Marketing Committee:
The Marketing Committee has been eliminated.

(13) Parks:
No action based on the minutes which were included in the meeting packets.

(14) Personnel Committee:
The Personnel Committee will be meeting on Thursday.

(15) Plan Commission:
No action based on the minutes which were included in the meeting packets.

(16) SBAA:
The SBAA Board of Directors met on October 1, 2015 but those minutes have not been completed yet. In 2016 the Paddlefest activities will be expanded. The SBAA Annual

Meeting and Dinner will be conducted at JJ's on October 22, 2015. It will start at 6:00 P.M. The SBAA Board of Directors has requested that from now on only their approved minutes be included in the Village Board meeting packets.

A motion was made by Lienau, seconded by Baker that the quarterly support for the SBAA shall be released ASAP. Motion carried – All ayes.

(17) Teen Center:
The Teen Center Board has not met recently. Britt Maltby has expressed interest in volunteering for youth activities, and Enquist will be contacting her soon.

(18) Tourism Zone Commission:
No action based on the minutes which were included in the meeting packets.

(19) Utilities – Water, Sewer, and Storm Sewer Committees:
The Utilities – Water, Sewer, and Storm Sewer Committee has not met recently.

(20) Administration/Compensation Oversight:
The Administration/Compensation Oversight Committee has not met recently.

(21) Waterfront Oversight
The members of the Waterfront Oversight Committee have not met yet.

Item No. 12. Discussion regarding matters to be placed on a future agenda or referred to a committee, official or employee:
The Board members gave the following directives:

- *The estimate of approximately $65,000 for the Waterfront Park sprinkler system work is accepted. The Finance Committee will determine what allocations shall be made for that expenditure at a future meeting.*
- *Staff shall investigate the purchase of cameras and air quality monitors for use near the quarry.*
- *Staff shall investigate the purchase of a bank building.*
- *Staff shall investigate the possibility of suspending the television service at the Boathouse for the winter months.*
- *Staff shall confirm that the Marina Committee members actually did attend all the meetings they were paid for.*
- *Based on comments which were made at this meeting staff shall review the financial reports which were included in the meeting packets and see that necessary revisions are made.*

At 9:13 P.M. another brief recess was taken and the Board reconvened at 9:19 P.M.

Item No. 6. Consider a motion to convene into Executive Session pursuant to Wis. Stats., §19.85(1)(c) to discuss personnel and employee benefits and §19.85(1)(e) to deliberate or negotiate the purchase of public properties, the investment of public funds, or conduct other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session:

At 9:21 P.M. a motion was made by Lienau, seconded by Baker that the Village Board convene into executive session pursuant to Wis. Stats., §19.85(1)(c) to discuss personnel and employee benefits and §19.85(1)(e) to deliberate or negotiate the purchase of public properties, the investment of public funds, or conduct other specified public business, whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session.

A roll call vote was taken on that motion and the Board members voted in the following fashion:

Baker – Aye; Clove – Aye; Duffy – Aye; Enquist – Aye; Lienau – Aye; Zacek – Aye.

Motion carried.

Item No. 7. Consider a motion to reconvene into open session:

At 10:07 P.M. a motion was made by Lienau, seconded by Baker that the Village Board reconvene into open session. Another roll call vote was taken and the Board members voted in the following fashion:

Baker – Aye; Clove – Aye; Duffy – Aye; Enquist – Aye; Lienau – Aye; Zacek – Aye.

Motion carried.

Item No. 8. Consider a motion to take action if required:

No formal action was taken.

Adjournment:

A motion was made by Clove, seconded by Baker to adjourn the meeting of the Board of Trustees at 10:12 P.M. Motion carried – All ayes.

Respectfully submitted,

Janal Suppanz,
Assistant Administrator

Tom and Jeanette Sadler
10503 Fieldcrest Road
Sister Bay, WI 54234-9188

Comments to the Sister Bay Village Board of Trustees on October 20, 2015

I was walking past the new music center, admiring the new beach, the new brick walk and the connection to the expanded marina. My teenage grandchildren were frolicking in the new beach water with many others on a day of 3 and 4 foot waves. I had to coax them to leave after hours of fun. In driving down the hill into the Village this weekend the view of the distant fall colors was especially nice due to the absence of utility poles and wires. You and those before you participated in the project work necessary to bring those ideas into reality. The majority of your work in recent years has been focused on making Sister Bay an inviting place to live work and play.

There is not an industrial area zoned in Sister Bay. I doubt that anyone would give credence to the idea of an industrial area in light of the work that has been done to create the new, unique Sister Bay image.
Have you been reading letters in the local papers about the new Sister Bay or have you been reading letters about the "black hole" in Sister Bay?

Quarries belong in industrial areas. We have been stuck with a decades old rock pit that has been made into a full quarry operation. Nobody wants it, but we are stuck with it for reasons beyond our control. This one operation has caused more angst due to its owners' adversarial relationship with both the residents and Village government than all of the new projects combined. It certainly has taken away the positive focus on all the good things that have been happening here and will only continue to do so. No one can predict what new issues there will be in five years let alone ten years if you allow a new quarry.

If you vote to approve the text amendment for a new quarry in the area adjacent to the present one, you are creating an industrial area within the Village. If you vote to approve the text amendment for a new quarry you are voting against the mission statements that were created to define this Village.

If you vote to approve the text amendment fora new quarry you are failing to listen to the 214

people who took the time and effort to sign a petition against it. There are many others who share the same opinion. A referendum would provide the answer as to number of those that oppose this process. Changing the zoning code to allow a quarry within the Village is not just a Fieldcrest Road issue, it is not a B-1 zoning district issue, it is an entire Village issue and the entire Village should have been sent the same notices that were sent to those in specific areas.

We, who have lived though this ugly experience, do not want a second quarry. We are ready to continue on with the one and only existing quarry. Return the focus to the good things in Sister Bay and let us enjoy them. Vote No to the the Text Amendment.

Shannon Strabala
10529 Fieldcrest Rd.
Sister Bay, WI 54234
319-325-7181
shanana2326@gmail.com

10/20/15

Village President & Board of Trustees
2383 Maple Dr.
Sister Bay, WI 54234

Members of the Village of Sister Bay Board of Trustees:

This letter is in regards to tonight's meeting about the quarry expansion. I would like this letter read into the meeting minutes in its entirety. I object to the proposed zoning change to allow a quarry in the B-1 zoning district, specifically on Fieldcrest Road in my backyard. I urge the Board of Trustees to VOTE NO on this zoning amendment to allow a quarry into the B-1 district.

I apologize for getting sentimental, but you have heard the facts from all the other neighbors' letters in opposition to the quarry expansion so I will refrain from any repetition in my letter. My husband and I moved to Door County in November, 2013 with our 2 children who were 5 and 7 years old at the time. We moved 400 miles from Iowa City, IA to Door County because I fell in love with this County as a young child spending my summers here. I have no family up here. We moved up here solely because I wanted to live in my version of paradise- Sister Bay, WI. We purchased our home at 10529 Fieldcrest Rd. in August, 2014. We were looking to purchase a home specifically in Sister Bay because of everything this town has to offer our young family. My husband and I both work in the village. Sister Bay is known as the "hub" of Northern Door County. It is peaceful, quiet, and serene; a huge change from the bustling college town we moved from. My kids were thrilled to see turkeys, squirrels, birds, and deer in our wooded backyard. We thought Sister Bay would be the perfect place to raise our family. When we bought this house I thought I was purchasing a slice of heaven. I had no idea about the proposed quarry in my backyard. I found out in the fall of 2014 when my daughter and I were delivering Girl Scout cookies to the neighbors, many of which I was meeting for the first time. I was shocked to find out about the current quarry behind

Shopko and the proposed one in my backyard. Brandon Small's property boarders my property on the west end of my backyard.

I am extremely concerned for myself, my family, my neighbors, the residents of Sister Bay, and the thousands of visitors who come here every year. Our home that we put our whole life's savings into when we purchased it only 14 months ago will be worth practically nothing if you approve this quarry expansion. We will be stuck. We wouldn't be able to sell this house and move even if we wanted to if the quarry is expanded into our backyard. Instead of the quiet, serene, peaceful environment I moved my family here for, my children will be playing in our backyard amongst dust clouds, rock-crushing noises, back up beeping noises, digging, traffic noises of trucks coming and going,... the list goes on and on. My kids can say "so long" to the wild animals they come running downstairs to see every morning out the windows to our backyard. Just yesterday a mother turkey followed by her 2 "children" came wandering through our backyard. I've never seen my daughter so excited. She said that if the new quarry comes to our backyard it will scare the turkeys away. I wish you could have seen the look on her face. If you are a parent, I'm sure you understand.

I fell in love with this village many years ago, and I want to raise my children and spend the rest of my life here. This past summer on 8/2/15 I witnessed something amazing. The power went out in the entire county. My kids were driving me nuts with boredom. We walked downtown to find that Zeke Jackson was planning to put up the movie screen and play movies for all the residents and tourists who had nothing else to do. He got out the generator and made popcorn. A local restaurant donated their fast-melting ice cream. The town came together to support each other. I've never been lucky enough to witness a small town come together like that before. At that moment I knew this is where my family and I belonged. Don't make me regret my decision to move here. You'd think the Village of Sister Bay would want to encourage young families to move here. Yet if you approve the quarry expansion, you are driving us, and many others, away.

Shannon Strabala