ISSUE IDENTIFICATION, FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Developing a vision for agriculture in Washington County is a key step in the farmland preservation planning process. With a clear vision, specific issues preventing the realization of the vision may be identified. Recommendations on how to overcome specific issues may be made with the accomplishment of goals, objectives, policies and programs as checkpoints. This chapter identifies a vision for agriculture in Washington County; analyzes public input related to agriculture for the identification of issues inhibiting the success of local farmers and agricultural businesses; identified farmland preservation areas; and lists recommendations, goals, objectives, policies and programs.

The vision, issues, recommendations, goals, and objectives listed in this chapter were identified by the Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (AC) utilizing information from numerous sources of public input. Information was gathered largely through AC discussion, Washington County's comprehensive planning process, various public surveys, and focus group discussions.

PART I: A VISION FOR AGRICULTURE

The following is the vision statement developed by the Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee related to farmland preservation and agricultural development and describes key characteristics and expectations for the future of agriculture as desired by the County:

Washington County strives for the preservation of sufficient amounts of prime and specialized agricultural lands to ensure farming remains viable. Productive farmlands and family-owned farms and related businesses are an important economic resource, and the presence of appropriate agricultural infrastructure is encouraged. County residents value the area’s agricultural heritage and recognize that the continued health of the industry adds to their quality of life.

PART II: PUBLIC INPUT AND ISSUE IDENTIFICATION

Over recent years, many methods have been utilized to gather the opinions of Washington County residents and results have been summarized within various documents. This section summarizes such methods, related documents, and public input regarding agriculture and farmland preservation.
A Park and Open Space Plan for Washington County (2004)

As a means of broadening citizen participation in the preparation of the 2020 County Park and Open Space Plan, the Washington County Planning and Parks Department held public informational meetings throughout the planning process and a public hearing prior to County Board adoption. Summaries of comments from all public informational meetings are included in Appendices C and E of A Park and Open Space Plan for Washington County. In general, those in attendance spoke positively on topics such as farmland preservation and the acquisition of land for protection purposes. Examples of comments regarding farmland preservation included:

- Concerns for preserving farmland.
- Provide farmland education at future nature center.
- Preserve agriculture land and crops.
- Protect farmland.
- Provide the tools available for farmland preservation.
- Have a systematic approach to preserving land.
- Expand the long-term plan to address the economic and aesthetic benefits of protecting open space—including farmland.
- Implement a PDR program to preserve farmland and open space.
- Preserve farmland for hunting purposes and “country” living.
- Preserve farmland and “country” living.
- Preserve farmland for farming and hunting, instead of creating new parks.
- Preserving farmland in Washington County still adds greatly to quality of life.

A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035

During the development of A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035, the County sought the opinions of local residents, local government officials, and several comprehensive planning committees. Several brainstorming sessions were conducted on a broad range of issues; several related to agriculture, economic development, land use, and residential development. Results of these activities were used to formulate the goals, objectives, policies, and programs identified in the comprehensive plan.

Results of a countywide comprehensive planning public opinion survey; numerous Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analyses; and public visioning workshops revealed a strong desire to preserve farmland in Washington County. A summary of key findings from these efforts related to farmland preservation are as follows:

- The public opinion survey indicated a strong desire among residents to preserve the small town character of Washington County. About 69 percent of respondents thought that preserving their community’s small town character should be given a high priority.
- Preserving farmland is a high priority among residents as found from both the SWOT analysis and the survey. Almost 85 percent of survey respondents, either strongly agreed (44 percent) or agreed (39 percent) with the need to preserve farmland in Washington County. Opportunities expressed in the SWOT analysis include a potential PDR program and promotion of family farms. A lack of farm product

1 More details regarding the specific means used to gather public input during the comprehensive planning process can be found in Chapter VII (Issues & Opportunities Element) of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
infrastructure was identified as a threat in the SWOT analysis. A common theme expressed by participants during the countywide visioning workshop was to preserve prime agricultural lands.

- With regards to the pattern of new development in the County, slightly more than half (51 percent) of survey respondents would prefer that development be concentrated rather than scattered (37 percent) in the County. The SWOT results also indicated that respondents preferred contiguous development rather than scattered in the County citing the need to control growth and limit urban sprawl. A common theme expressed by participants during the countywide visioning workshop was to concentrate urban development within the sewer service areas, promote opportunities for redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure and downtown areas and to minimize rural development.

**Focus Group Discussions**

The Planning and Parks Department partnered with UW-Extension to conduct a series of agricultural related focus groups. On January 25, 2011, a focus group study was conducted which consisted of three focus group discussions. The groups consisted of 1) livestock and dairy producers, 2) grain farmers, and 3) niche / organic farmers. The general topic was “How do we make agriculture more sustainable in Washington County?” A summary of key findings is as follows:

**Livestock / Dairy Focus Group**

- Mostly satisfied with outlets to sell and deliver products (including direct marketing opportunities), existing agricultural infrastructure, land availability, level of youth interest and education supporting agriculture, and availability of high-speed Internet.

- Concerned about decreasing farmer representation on local governing bodies; lack of intergovernmental cooperation; people from urban areas moving in and the general public’s limited knowledge about agriculture; road maintenance issues; Federal and State government programs (including CRP and effectiveness of the Working Lands Initiative) and land acquisition hurting agriculture; and an increase in large residential lots causing more land fragmentation.

- Expect a shift in Washington County of fewer dairy farmers to more grain farmers, the market and economy to rebound, production and yields to continue to increase, increased local concern and interest in locally grown foods, and bio-energy opportunities possibly increasing.

- Would like to see more opportunities for small operators to thrive by maintaining existing infrastructure, adding more dairy plants and small-scale cheese plants, and higher pay from local co-ops.

**Grain Focus Group**

- Mostly satisfied with agricultural infrastructure, quality of land, opportunities available due to proximity to Milwaukee, and availability of high-speed Internet.

- Concerned about the public’s understanding of farming, labor force shifting away from agriculture, youths’ diminished connection to agriculture, decreasing level of support from local officials to maintain the agricultural industry, limitations (prices) of the local grain market, decrease in local vegetable processing facilities, limited effectiveness of the Working Lands Initiative, and unwarranted government spending.
• Expect increase in more cash cropping, shifts of dairy farmers to more grain farmers, continued increase in average farm size, and demand for land resulting in higher land rents.

• Would like to see more agricultural education programs for the public, more meat processing options, and a stronger work ethic.

**Niche / Organic Focus Group**

• Satisfied with existing agricultural infrastructure, strength of local markets (thanks to proximity to large urban areas), local farmers’ markets, soil quality and land availability, local farming culture, and availability of high-speed Internet.

• Concerned about burdensome government regulations and permit requirements, lack of local educational opportunities for niche/organic farmers, and limited network for sharing information among local niche operators.

• Expect organic farming and community supported agriculture to become more popular as interest and demand for locally grown food increases.

• Would like to see a local vegetable processing facility, a State-certified commercial kitchen, and more business incubators focused on niche farming products.


**Countywide Farmland Preservation Survey**

The Planning and Parks Department partnered with UW-Extension to develop a survey to obtain opinions from farmers and large landowners. The primary purpose of the survey was two-fold:

1) Provide a means to foster public participation in Washington County’s farmland preservation planning process, and more specifically to gather the opinions of key stakeholders, in this case, landowners with more than 20 acres in Washington County.

2) Help local communities gauge the needs and wishes of their major landowners, especially in regard to whether landowners were interested in participating in any of the components of Wisconsin’s new Working Lands Initiative.

The survey was mailed to 1,954 landowners (all landowners with 20 acres or more) in the County's rural communities. Three hundred forty-four were returned, for a respectable 17.6 percent response rate. Key results are summarized below:

• 32 percent were interested in collecting tax credits for preserving their farmland; 28 percent were not; 35 percent responded "not sure."

• 96 percent of those who responded to the question indicated that all or most of the agricultural infrastructure they need was close enough to their operation. Agricultural suppliers and storage facilities were the two most-frequently selected types of infrastructure landowners would like to see more of.

• Of those who responded to the question, 34 percent preferred non-agricultural development to be scattered where appropriate; 28 percent stated that there should be little or no non-agricultural growth in rural areas; 16 percent prefer non-agricultural development to be concentrated in a few specified areas.

---

- Respondents most often identified the loss of prime farmlands (18 percent); traffic (17 percent); and lack of tolerance for ag-related noises, odors, and activities (16 percent) as problematic issues they have with non-ag landowners.

**Issue Identification**

The following general agricultural issues were identified through the numerous sources of public input described above. Many of these issues were previously identified and addressed in some way during development of the County’s comprehensive plan, but can be expanded upon and more specifically addressed within this farmland preservation plan. New issues have also been identified through the farmland preservation planning process.

- Land use and the preservation and protection of farmland
- Promoting agricultural development and agribusiness
  - Retain existing agribusinesses
  - More business incubators focused on niche farming products
- Preservation of rural and small town character
- Siting of residential development and housing density
  - Concentrated development rather than scattered
  - Need to control growth and limit urban sprawl
  - Concentrate urban development within the sewer service areas
  - Promote opportunities for redevelopment in areas with existing infrastructure and downtown areas and to minimize rural development
- Intergovernmental cooperation on farmland preservation efforts
  - Adjacent rural governments working together to preserve farms
  - Farmer representation in government
  - Improve government’s role in agriculture regarding ordinances, permit requirements, and environmental programs
- Education and public perception toward agriculture
  - Gearing future workforce for businesses desired by the County, specifically agricultural jobs
  - Educate people moving from urban to rural areas about what to expect when moving into a farming community (odors, noises, slow moving traffic, etc.)

**PART III: FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS**

In section 91.10(1)(d) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, a county shall adopt a farmland preservation plan that clearly identifies areas that the county plans to preserve for agricultural use and agriculture-related uses, which may include undeveloped natural resource and open space areas but may not include any area that is planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted. This is accomplished through the identification and designation of farmland preservation areas (FPAs).

The mapping of FPAs has direct implications in the development of farmland preservation zoning ordinances since certification of farmland preservation zoning districts requires that the district be located within an FPA. Similarly, agricultural enterprise areas (AEA) and PACE easements that receive DATCP grants may only be located in an area identified as an FPA.
Counties must develop an objective fact-based rationale to explain the areas chosen for farmland preservation. This rationale should include reasonable criteria such as location of existing farmland, soil type, quality and productivity, topography, drainage, potential for continued agricultural use, and proximity to incorporated areas. This rationale may not be based on landowner interest in being located in one of these designated areas.

Criteria to Delineate Farmland Preservation Areas for Washington County

During the months of December, 2010 through March, 2011, the Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (FPPAC) established six criteria that delineate FPAs for Washington County:

1. Minimum 100 acre block of at least 3 separate and contiguous farms of common ownership
2. All parcels within the block must have a LESA score of 6.8 or higher
3. All parcels must be located outside of a city or village boundary and planned sanitary sewer service area
4. All parcels must not have or be planned for non-agricultural development
5. All parcels must not be located in a non-agricultural zoning district
6. All farms must have at least 30% of land in agricultural use

Minimum 100 Acre Block of at Least Three Separate and Contiguous Farms of Common Ownership

The Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (FPPAC) considered four options for an FPA block size. Farms of common ownership were defined as contiguous parcels having identical owner names based on the County Tax Master Database. Parcels separated by a road, railroad or stream were considered contiguous. The following options were considered by the FPPAC:

- **Option 1** - All farms of common ownership that are contiguous with a minimum block size of 640 acres
- **Option 2** - A minimum of 5 separate and contiguous farms of common ownership
- **Option 3** - A minimum of 3 separate and contiguous farms of common ownership with a minimum block size of 100 acres
- **Option 4** - All farms of common ownership that are contiguous with a minimum block size of 320 acres

Option 3 was chosen by the FPPAC as providing the most opportunity for landowners located in rural local governments. The Figure T-13 depicts three separate and contiguous farms of common ownership. A farm of common ownership contains one or more separate parcels owned by the same landowner. Each farm is owned by different landowners based on the County Tax Master Database.
All Parcels Within the Block Must Have a LESA Score of 6.8 or Higher

A Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis was completed as part of the development of *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035* to help identify areas that should be designated for farmland protection. The LESA analysis included all parcels outside of planned sanitary sewer service areas with at least 2 percent of the parcel in agricultural use. For the land evaluation (LE) component, soils in Wisconsin were rated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and placed into groups ranging from the best to the least suited for cropland. Soils were rated based on soil type, slope, agricultural capability class, and soil productivity for producing corn and soybeans. A relative value was then determined for each soil type. The site assessment (SA) component rated non-soil factors affecting a parcels’ relative importance for agricultural use.

Each parcel analyzed was scored on a scale of 1 to 10, with 10 being the best score. The median score was 6.8. Lands scoring 6.8 or higher were considered Tier I farmlands, which are the best suited for long-term protection. Lands scoring below 6.8 were defined as Tier II farmlands, which are areas that should be considered for long-term protection by County and local officials on a case-by-case basis. For a description and maps of the soil suitability for agricultural production and the LESA analysis, see pages 56-61 and pages 299-301 of *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*. For a detailed report of the LESA process, please consult the *Description of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Analysis of Farmlands in Washington County: 2007* available online at www.co.washington.wi.us/pln.

All parcels within the FPAs must have a LESA score of 6.8 or higher. Where a farm was completely surrounded by an FPA, but was not included as part of that FPA due to a LESA score between 6.0 and 6.79, that farm was included in that FPA.

All Parcels Must be Located Outside of a City or Village Municipal Boundary and Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Area

Section 91.10(1)(d) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* describes that any area that is planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted may not be included in an FPA. All parcels located within a city or village municipal boundary were not included in the FPA, with the exception of the rural portions of the Villages of Richfield and Germantown.

Planned sanitary sewer service areas refers to areas that are planned to be included in a sewer service area and served with public sanitary sewers, based on sewer service area plans approved as of December 2010. For a description and map of the planned sanitary sewer service areas and areas served by sanitary sewer in Washington County, see pages 185 – 187 of *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*. All parcels located within planned sanitary sewer service areas were not included in the FPAs.

Farmland preservation area boundaries must follow parcel lines. Therefore, for parcels where a planned sanitary sewer service area split the parcel, the entire parcel was eliminated from the FPA.

All Parcels Must Not Have or be Planned for Non-agricultural Development

Chapter 91.10 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires that areas for farmland preservation may not include any area that is planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted. Agricultural use and agricultural-related uses may include undeveloped natural resource and open space areas. Subdivision plats and condominium development completed...
since the LESA analysis was completed in 2006 were excluded from the FPAs. In addition, a number of preliminary plats have since been approved by the Washington County Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee. All land within approved preliminary plats was excluded from the FPAs. Pre-preliminary plats or concept plans were not considered in this analysis.

The land use plan (Map 84), on page 354 in *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*, is a patchwork of local government land use plan maps. The land use plan categories shown on each local land use plan map were standardized to the categories shown on Map 84. As part of an on-going County comprehensive plan amendment, Washington County and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) requested all comprehensive plan amendments adopted by local governments in the County. An updated Washington County Land Use Plan: 2035, prepared by SEWRPC was based on local government amendments current to December 2010 and was used in this analysis\(^3\). The planned land use categories included in the FPAs were Farmland Protection, Agricultural and Rural Residential, Primary Environmental Corridor, Secondary Environmental Corridor, Isolated Natural Resource Areas, Wetlands Outside of Environmental Corridor and Isolated Natural Resource Areas and Other Conservancy Lands to be Preserved. All nonagricultural development land use categories were excluded from the FPAs.

**All Parcels Must Not Be Located in a Non-agricultural Zoning District**

The delineation of FPAs has direct implications for development of farmland preservation zoning ordinances. The certification of farmland preservation zoning ordinances requires that the district be located within an FPA and be substantially consistent with the Certified County Farmland Preservation Plan. To determine whether a farmland preservation zoning ordinance is “substantially consistent” with the County’s certified farmland preservation plan, DATCP will be comparing the ordinance map to the County farmland preservation area map.

Chapter 91.44 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* outlines the permitted uses in a certified farmland preservation (FP) zoning district. Chapter 91.46 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* outlines allowable uses by conditional use permit in a certified farmland preservation zoning district. Local governments may consider using the FPAs to adopt farmland preservation zoning districts. Therefore, current local government zoning districts were considered in this analysis.

In Washington County, all Towns, Cities and Villages have general zoning authority. Although the foundation for the development of the Farmland Preservation Areas was the LESA analysis, it was imperative in the development of the FPAs that locally adopted zoning maps were analyzed to remove all nonagricultural zoning districts from the analysis. Zoning is only one of the criteria used to weed out the developed areas to meet the requirements of Chapter 91.10(1)(d) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*.

All residential, commercial/business, industrial/manufacturing, institutional, quarrying/extractive, park/recreation, planned unit development and agricultural transition zoning districts were excluded from the FPAs. All exclusive agricultural and general agricultural districts, along with most conservancy districts and those Towns where agriculture and rural residential are in one zoning district were included in the FPAs.

Each city, town, and village in Washington County has adopted and enforces its own zoning ordinance. In towns, town zoning applies in all areas of the town. In addition, the County enforces shoreland and floodplain zoning regulations in shoreland areas in the towns. Current Town and Village Zoning maps were used for this analysis\(^4\). All parcels with a LESA score of 6.8 or higher in the zoning districts identified in Table T-36 were included in the FPAs.

\(^3\) Several local government adopted comprehensive plans have different plan years: the City of West Bend and the Village of Germantown Comprehensive Plans have a plan year of 2020 and the Village of Slinger, Village of Richfield, and Town of West Bend have a plan year of 2025.

\(^4\) Washington County used local government zoning maps that were current to January 2011.
All Farms Must Have at Least 30 Percent of Land in Agricultural Use

The Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (FPPAC) determined that only farms with at least 30 percent of land in agricultural use or agricultural-related uses would be included in the FPA. Although there is no specific requirement for the percentage of a farm in agricultural use that should be included in a FPA, there are useful guidelines identified in several grant programs. The Wisconsin Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) program grant requires at least 50 percent of the property must be cropland, pasture, or grassland. The Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) grant requires at least 50 percent prime, statewide important, unique or other productive farmland, or important historical or archaeological sites on the property.

The LESA analysis conducted in 2007 analyzed all parcels with at least 2 percent agricultural use as defined by SEWRPC’s 2006 land use inventory of Washington County. The FPPAC expressed concern about including parcels with 2 percent agricultural use in the FPA since they would be used to delineate farmland preservation zoning districts by some local governments. The FPPAC decided that a farm with at least 30 percent of land in agricultural use or agricultural-related use would satisfy the intent of the Farmland Preservation Law.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Zoning Districts Included in Farmland Preservation Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Agricultural District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy Overlay District – C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>Exclusive Agricultural Preservation District – EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Agricultural District – GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Erin</td>
<td>Agricultural District – A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural No Development – AN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Conservancy – UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy – LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Farmington</td>
<td>Agricultural – AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Germantown</td>
<td>Agricultural District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conservancy District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>Agricultural District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural District – A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>Agricultural Preservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Conservancy (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>Agricultural/Rural Residential District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusive Agricultural District – A-2 (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy District – C-1 (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Conservancy District – C-2 (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>Agricultural Preservation District – EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural / Open Space District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy Overlay District – C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>General Agricultural District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Conservancy Overlay District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Conservancy Overlay District (includes shorland-wetlands)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td>Exclusive Agricultural District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Agricultural District – A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Conservancy District – UC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy District – LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floodland District – F-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>Exclusive Agricultural District – EA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural District – A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wayne</td>
<td>Exclusive Agricultural District – A-1 (none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural/Rural Residential District – A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland Conservancy District – C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upland Conservancy District – C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of West Bend</td>
<td>Conservancy Overlay District – C-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Local governments and Washington County.
Draft Farmland Preservation Areas

Utilizing the County Geographic Information Systems (GIS), an analysis of parcels in Washington County was completed based on the six criteria listed above to determine the draft farmland preservation areas. Map T-7 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for Washington County.

Town of West Bend

The Town of West Bend Comprehensive Plan: 2025 land use map does not designate any land within the Town for agricultural protection and preservation. Existing agricultural land is recommended to remain in production until the land owners decide to use the land for development purposes. In addition, there is no agricultural zoning district identified on the Town of West Bend Zoning Map. Based on the non-agricultural planned land uses and non-agricultural zoning districts adopted by the Town of West Bend, it was determined that no FPAs could be delineated in the Town.

Local Government Discussion of Farmland Preservation Areas

Since the mapping of FPAs has direct implications for development of farmland preservation zoning ordinances and much of the implementation of the Working Lands Initiative Programs will take place at the local level, it is imperative that rural local governments within Washington County understand the Working Lands Initiative programs and have an opportunity to comment on the draft Farmland Preservation Area Map T-7.

A thorough understanding of the Working Lands Initiative including the tax credit incentives made eligible through the use of farmland preservation zoning or establishment of agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs) and the PACE matching grant program is essential for local governments that must determine their participation in these programs. County staff met with fourteen rural local governments during April, May and June 2010, presenting information on the Working Lands Initiative programs.

As required by Section 91.10(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes, a county’s farmland preservation plan and comprehensive plan must be consistent. Consistency between the comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan will ensure that planned development does not overlap with areas planned for farmland preservation. The County 2035 land use plan, Map 84 in A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035, is a patchwork of local government land use plan maps. The County land use plan map does not include city and village land use plan designations for areas outside city or village boundaries. See pages 346 – 349 of the County comprehensive plan for a description of the inclusion of City, Town and Village Plans in the County Comprehensive Plan.

County staff met with thirteen rural local governments from April to July 2011, requesting a joint plan commission and board meeting to present the draft farmland preservation area map. The County sent out postcard invitations to all landowners within the draft farmland preservation areas providing the date and time of their local government meeting.

A presentation was provided at each local meeting describing the progress of the FPPAC, presenting the draft farmland preservation areas and the delineation criteria, reviewing the three Working Lands Initiative programs and requesting that they determine their intent to participate. To simplify the decision making process, the presentation identified two separate decisions that the local government needed to resolve.

1. By incorporating the Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs) into their Comprehensive Plans, local governments would be providing an opportunity for these landowners within an FPA to voluntarily participate in either the AEA or PACE programs. Local governments had to the end of July 2011 to adopt a resolution of intent.

---

1 There are some instances where a parcel appears to be a separate stand alone parcel within an FPA that are actually part of another nearby parcel.
Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map updated November 2013 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
stating that they will incorporate the FPA map as an amendment to their Comprehensive Plan after the FPP is certified by DATCP and adopted by the County Board.

The resolution describes the Town's intent to pursue incorporating the FPAs into its comprehensive plan as an overlay map after DATCP has certified the County's Farmland Preservation Plan and the County Board adopts the plan as Appendix T into the County comprehensive plan.

2. Those local governments that decided to incorporate the FPAs into their comprehensive plans, have until December 31, 2012 to determine if they want to enact a farmland preservation zoning district to match the FPA map they adopted into their Comprehensive Plans, amend their zoning ordinance, update their zoning map and obtain DATCP certification.

As described earlier in this chapter, the updated Washington County Land Use Plan 2035 map used in this analysis was current to December 2010. During meetings with some local governments, several minor errors due to recent rezonings or certified survey maps (CSM’s) were discovered and corrected prior to the local government determining if they would participate in the Working Lands Initiative by adopting the resolution of intent. The Towns of Trenton and Barton requested changes to their FPA map based on reasonable rationale as described below.

**Town of Addison**

County staff met with the Town of Addison on April 7, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-8 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Addison. The Town of Addison declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs based on lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs.

**Town of Barton**

County staff met with the Town of Barton on April 13, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. Map T-9 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Barton. Staff met with several Town Board members on April 14, 2011 to review parcels that were not included in the FPAs. At the July 11, 2011 Town Plan Commission meeting, the Town requested changes to the FPAs including incorporating only those parcels within their designated exclusive agricultural zoning district into the FPAs. The reasoning behind the Town of Barton’s request is that the Town has a large block of land currently zoned Exclusive Agriculture and a lower LESA score on several of the parcels was preventing that block from staying together. Map T-10 and T-11 depict the changes requested by the Town. There are several instances where a portion of a parcel is designated as a non-agricultural planned land use or located within a non-agricultural zoning district. At the July 19, 2011 Town Plan Commission and Board meetings, the Town approved the FPA map with the intent to pursue amendments to their comprehensive plan and/or their zoning map to allow those parcels identified on Maps T-10 and T-11 to be included in the FPA. Map T-12 depicts the final draft farmland preservation area map for the Town of Barton. The Town of Barton adopted the resolution of intent on June 21, 2011. A copy of the Town minutes along with the signed resolution is located at the end of this plan appendix.

**Town of Erin**

County staff met with the Town of Erin on May 2, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-13 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Erin. The Town of Erin declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs based on lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs and concerns expressed by residents regarding future restrictions on their land.

**Town of Farmington**

County staff met with the Town of Farmington on May 24, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-14 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Farmington. The Town of Farmington declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs
Map T-8
DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF ADDISON

DRAFT Farmland Preservation Areas
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Municipal Boundary
PLSS Section
Parcel Boundary Outside Sewer Service Area
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Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced August 9, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
Map T-10

CHANGES REQUESTED TO THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS BY THE TOWN OF BARTON - EAST SIDE

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced July 14, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.

Young America
Smith Lake
Ridge Rd
Salisbury Rd
Milwaukee River

T2_0275
For this parcel to be included in the FPA, the Town of Barton needs to amend Zoning from R-2 to EA and amend 2035 Land Use Map in the Comp Plan from R-2 to EA

T2_0485
Added 26% Ag
Part of Adjoining Farm

T2_0273
Added
LESA - 6.52

T2_0284
Added
LESA - 6.073

T2_0486
Added
LESA - 6.498

T2_0487
Added
LESA - 6.56

T2_0275
For this parcel to be included in the FPA, the Town of Barton needs to amend Zoning from AT to EA and amend 2035 Land Use Map in the Comp Plan from R-6 to EA

T2_0486
Added
LESA - 6.499

T2_0527
For this parcel to be included in the FPA, the Town of Barton needs to amend Zoning from R-6 to EA

T2_0275
For this parcel to be included in the FPA, the Town of Barton needs to amend Zoning from R-2 to EA and amend 2035 Land Use Map in the Comp Plan from R-2 to EA
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CHANGES REQUESTED TO THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS BY THE TOWN OF BARTON - WEST SIDE

Proposed Farmland Preservation Areas

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced July 14, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced July 14, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
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FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF BARTON PROPOSED BY TOWN OF BARTON

Final draft Farmland Preservation Areas
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Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced July 26, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
based on lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs and concerns expressed by residents regarding future restrictions on their land.

**Town and Village of Germantown**

County staff met with the Town of Germantown on May 9, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. County staff met with the Village of Germantown on April 11, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation area. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-15 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town and Village of Germantown. The Town of Germantown adopted the resolution of intent on June 13, 2011. The Village of Germantown adopted the resolution on July 18, 2011.

The County submitted the Farmland Preservation Plan to DATCP for certification on November 2, 2011. Based on DATCP’s review of the FPP, County staff met with the Village of Germantown in March 2012 to discuss the land use conflict of having proposed FPAs located within lands proposed for future Agricultural and Rural Residential land uses as identified in their comprehensive plan. The County proposed several options for the Village to resolve the conflict. In the fall 2012, the Village of Germantown decided to develop a community survey to gather public opinion about farmland preservation. Washington County notified the Village of Germantown that the County would be submitting the Farmland Preservation Plan to DATCP for certification without the Farmland Preservation Areas for the Village. In the future, if the Village decides to participate in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, the County will consider amending the map to incorporate proposed Farmland Preservation Areas for the Village and submit to DATCP for recertification. A copy of the Town of Germantown signed resolution is located at the end of this plan appendix.

**Town of Hartford**

County staff met with the Town of Hartford on April 18, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-16 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Hartford. The Town adopted the resolution of intent on June 15, 2011. A copy of the signed resolution is located at the end of this plan appendix.

**Town of Jackson**

County staff met with the Town of Jackson on May 25, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-17 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Jackson. The Town of Jackson adopted the resolution of intent on July 7, 2011. The County submitted the Farmland Preservation Plan to DATCP for certification on November 2, 2011. Based on DATCP’s review of the FPP, County staff met with the Town of Jackson in March 2012 to discuss the land use conflict of having proposed FPAs located within lands proposed for future Agricultural and Rural Residential land uses as identified in their comprehensive plan. The County proposed several options for the Town to resolve the conflict. Town of Jackson Board took action on June 14, 2012 not to proceed with Farmland Preservation Areas for the Town.

**Town of Kewaskum**

County staff met with the Town of Kewaskum on April 20, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-18 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Kewaskum. The Town of Kewaskum declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs based on lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs.

**Town of Polk**

County staff met with the Town of Polk on April 19, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-19 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Polk. The Town of Polk declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs based on lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs and concern expressed by residents regarding farmers entering 15-year agreements.
Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced October 25, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department. All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
Map T-18
DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF KEWASKUM

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced August 10, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
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DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF POLK

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced August 10, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
Village of Richfield

County staff met with the Village of Richfield on May 5, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-20 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Village of Richfield. The Village of Richfield declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs.

Town of Trenton

County staff met with the Town of Trenton on May 10, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. Map T-21 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Trenton. After the May 10, 2011 meeting, a resident requested two parcels be added to the draft FPA map. Map T-22 identifies the additional parcels to the FPA. Map T-23 depicts the final draft FPAs for the Town of Trenton. The Town of Trenton declined participation in the Working Lands Initiative programs based lack of landowner interest in participating in the programs and the perception that the tax credit is too low. The Town stated that they would reconsider in the future if there was more interest by landowners.

Town of Wayne

County staff met with the Town of Wayne on April 14, 2011 to present the draft farmland preservation areas map. No changes to the FPA map were requested. Map T-24 depicts the draft farmland preservation areas for the Town of Wayne. The Town of Wayne adopted the resolution of intent on June 15, 2011. The County submitted the Farmland Preservation Plan to DATCP for certification on November 2, 2011. Based on DATCP’s review of the FPP, County staff met with the Town of Wayne in March 2012 to discuss the land use conflict of having proposed FPAs located within lands proposed for future Agricultural and Rural Residential land uses as identified in their comprehensive plan. The County proposed several options for the Town to resolve the conflict. Town of Wayne Board took action on April 18, 2012 not to proceed with Farmland Preservation Areas for the Town.

The Farmland Preservation Areas for Washington County

In keeping with the development of *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*, Washington County accepted all local government decisions to participate in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program. Each local government interested in participating in the program adopted a resolution of intent stating that they would take the necessary steps to amend their comprehensive plans to incorporate the proposed Farmland Preservation Areas into their comprehensive plans.

Initially, there were six local governments that adopted resolutions of intent including the Towns of Barton, Hartford, Jackson, Germantown and Wayne and the Village of Germantown. After DATCP’s review of the FPP, County staff met with the Town of Wayne, Town of Jackson and the Village of Germantown to discuss the land use conflicts. Based on the decisions of the Town of Wayne, Town of Jackson and Village of Germantown, the FPAs were removed. Map T-25 depicts the final farmland preservation area map for Washington County. Landowners within these areas are eligible to voluntarily participate in either the AEA or PACE programs. After DATCP certifies the FPP and it has been adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors, the Towns of Hartford, Barton and Germantown will pursue incorporating the FPAs as an overlay map amendment to their comprehensive plans. Any town interested in enacting Farmland Preservation zoning will need to incorporate the FPAs as a separate land use category in their future land use map.

PART IV: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, PROGRAMS, AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR FARMLAND PRESERVATION; AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT; AND ENTERPRISES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE

Chapters VI (Existing Plans and Ordinances), VIII (Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element), IX (Land Use Element), XIII (Economic Development Element), and XIV (Intergovernmental Cooperation Element) of Washington County’s comprehensive plan identify numerous issues related to agriculture, land use and economic development, intergovernmental cooperation, education and public perception, and the preservation and
Map T-21
DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF TRENTON

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map produced May 10, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
As requested by a Town resident, this parcel with a LESA score of 6.052 was added.

As requested by a Town resident, this parcel with a LESA score of 6.576 was added.

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.

Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.

Map produced July 26, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.

All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
Map T-24
DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF WAYNE

Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011. Map produced August 10, 2011 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department. All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
Map T-25
FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2035

Note: Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas reflect plans adopted as of December 2010.
Note: Municipal and parcel boundaries current as of January 1, 2011.
Map updated November, 2013 by the Washington County GIS and Planning Divisions of the Planning and Parks Department.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
protection of farmland. The comprehensive plan also identifies key land use issues related to preserving farmland and to promoting agricultural development and plans for addressing those issues and suggests actions that local governments can take to achieve goals. This section references goals, objectives, policies, programs (serving as actions)\(^6\) and suggested local government actions as identified in the comprehensive plan; and identifies new, more specific issues related to agriculture. Goals, objectives, policies, and programs have been identified to address these agricultural issues.

**Farmland Preservation Issues as Addressed in Washington County’s Comprehensive Plan**

Many issues relating to farmland preservation have been addressed within Washington County’s comprehensive plan. These issues, goals, objectives, policies and programs and where they are addressed within the comprehensive plan are listed in Table T-37.

**Table T-37**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and the Preservation and Protection of Farmland Issue</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Issue</td>
<td>302-305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management of Productive Agricultural Areas Issue</td>
<td>305-306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land Use Issue</td>
<td>363-364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Issue</td>
<td>364-368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Agricultural Development and Agribusiness Issue</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Viability of Agbusiness Issue</td>
<td>306-308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creating, Attracting, and Retaining Desirable Businesses Issue</td>
<td>559-566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Rural and Small Town Character Issue</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regional Land Use Plan - Other Agricultural and Rural-Density Residential Lands</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Park and Open Space Preservation Issue - Natural Resources and Rural Character</td>
<td>331-332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Public Perception Toward Agriculture Issue</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creating, Attracting, and Retaining Desirable Businesses Issue</td>
<td>559-566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shared Services and Facilities Issue</td>
<td>604-606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Cooperation Issue</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Viability of Agbusinesses Issue</td>
<td>306-308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creating, Attracting, and Retaining Desirable Businesses Issue</td>
<td>559-566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cooperative Planning and Ordinance Administration Issue</td>
<td>606-607</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Farmland Preservation Issues, Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs**

The level to which issues listed in Table T-37 are addressed in regards to farmland preservation can be enhanced through the updating of existing and addition of new goals, objectives, policies and programs. The following new or updated issues, goals, objectives, policies and programs (actions) should also be considered when addressing farmland preservation and the issues listed in Table T-37.

**Land Use and the Preservation and Protection of Farmland Issue**

- **Policy:** Encourage local governments to preserve farmland identified in Farmland Preservation Areas as shown on Map T-7. *(New-2\(^{nd}\) policy on page 365)*

- **Policy:** Encourage local governments to continue and protect existing agricultural activities within planned sanitary sewer service areas until their orderly transition into urban use is completed. *(New-7\(^{th}\) policy on page 303; and New-4\(^{th}\) policy on page 365)*

- **Policy:** Support implementation of the Working Lands Initiative recommendation to establish working land enterprise areas outside planned sewer service areas. As proposed in the Working Lands Initiative Final Report (August 2006), Working Lands Enterprise Areas would cluster active farms and slow farmland conversion by preventing annexations within enterprise areas and targeting funding and other resources, such as a recommended State Purchase of Development Rights program, to farmlands within enterprise areas programs including the purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) program, establishing of agricultural enterprise areas

\(^6\) Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires goals, objectives, policies and programs be identified for each comprehensive planning element.
Program: Update the County Farmland Preservation Plan to reflect the recommendations of the comprehensive plan, including the LESA analysis, and any changes to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program approved by the State Legislature in response to the Working Lands Initiative report. Encourage local governments to participate in developing and implementing the updated County Farmland Preservation Plan as determined by the local government. (Update-2nd program on page 303; Update-2nd program on page 365; Update-2nd program on page 613; and Update-5th program on page 622)

Program: Encourage local governments to participate in the update to the County Farmland Preservation Plan at least every ten years. (New-program on page 303; and New-program on page 365)

Program: Continue to promote the Farm and Ranch Protection Program (Federal PDR matching grant program) and PACE program and assist communities, nongovernment organizations, and the DNR in identifying appropriate areas to apply for Farm and Ranch Protection program grants. (Update-4th program on page 304; and Update-13th program on page 613)

Program: Continue to provide technical assistance to towns on request for towns to develop local farmland protection programs/tools, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural farmland preservation zoning. (Update-6th program on page 304; Update-4th program on page 365; Update-7th program on page 607; Update-15th program on page 613; Update-7th program on page 622; and Update-29th program on page 636)

Program: As requested, educate local governments that have farmland preservation zoning districts on how to follow the nonmetallic mining requirements identified in State Statute 91.46(6). (New-2nd program on page 368)

Promoting Agricultural Development and Agribusiness Issue

- Objective: Encourage development of new agricultural enterprises and retain existing agribusinesses in Washington County to the extent possible. (Update-3rd objective on page 306)

  - Policy: Support implementation of a culinary business incubator as a means of encouraging value added farm products. (New-4th policy on page 307)

  - Program: Work with the EDWC to prepare and distribute a business retention survey to businesses throughout Washington County. A portion of the survey should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the County regarding attracting and retaining businesses including those related to agriculture. (Update-1st program on page 561; and Update-9th program on page 634)

- Objective: Promote adequate supporting agricultural infrastructure for agribusiness creation, retention, expansion, and attraction. (New-Objective on page 563)

  - Policy: Promote businesses that support agriculture (feed and seed stores, implement dealers, dairy processors and food processing facilities). (Update-1st policy on page 564)

  - Policy: Promote community supported agriculture. (New-2nd policy on page 564)

- Goal: Promote tourism in the County by capitalizing on tourism amenities, including historic, cultural, recreational, agricultural and natural resources. (Update-1st goal on page 564)
Intergovernmental Cooperation Issue (New issue-add as new bullet on page 302)

(Add the following new goals, objectives, policies and programs to page 308 after Viability of Agribusiness Issue)

- **Goal:** Assist rural local governments as requested with farmland preservation implementation tools.
  - **Objective:** Encourage local governments to cooperate with neighboring communities to preserve large farm blocks.
    - **Policy:** Encourage local governments to look at future land use plans of neighboring communities and cooperatively designate areas for farmland preservation.
    - **Policy:** Encourage local governments to designate farmland preservation areas within the County’s certified farmland preservation plan to provide farmland owners with the opportunity to participate in Working Lands Initiative programs.
    - **Policy:** Emphasize the importance of preserving smaller farm tracts within or adjacent to urban communities and their potential to be utilized for niche agriculture and a source of locally grown foods.
    - **Program:** Encourage local governments to utilize regulatory and incentive based farmland preservation techniques in addition to the Working Lands Initiative programs as identified in Part 2 of Chapter VI in this plan and the Farmland and Open Space Preservation Tools report.\(^7\)
    - **Program:** Encourage local governments to utilize methods of supporting farmland preservation as identified in Part 3 of Chapter VI in this plan.
    - **Program:** Encourage local governments to review permitting processes and consider ways to expedite the processes.
    - **Program:** Continue to encourage locally elected or appointed officials and those who aspire to hold office to attend educational seminars, training programs, and workshops to learn about issues related to agriculture and ways that local communities can make agriculture more viable.
    - **Program:** Continue to provide opportunities to farmers to serve on planning related advisory committees such as the Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee and Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Planning Advisory Committee.

Education and Public Perception Toward Agriculture Issue (New issue-add as new bullet point on page 302)

(Add the following new goals, objectives, policies and programs to page 308 after Viability of Agribusiness Issue)

- **Goal:** Continue to encourage efforts to improve the public’s perception of agriculture.
- **Objective:** Continue to encourage efforts to educate youth about Washington County’s agricultural heritage and the significance of agriculture in our local and State economy.
- **Objective:** Continue to encourage efforts to educate people that move from urban to rural areas of the common conditions of farming including odors, sounds, dust, and wide and/or slow moving vehicles.

\(^7\) Copies of Farmland and Open Space Preservation Tools (Washington County 2005) are available at the office of the Washington County Planning & Parks Department and on-line at: [www.co.washington.wi.us/pln](http://www.co.washington.wi.us/pln).
Policy: Continue to encourage efforts to educate people moving from urban to rural areas about Washington County’s agricultural heritage and the significance of agriculture in our local and State economy.

Policy: Continue to encourage efforts to educate people moving from urban to rural areas about Wisconsin’s “Right to Farm” law.

Program: Continue to encourage efforts to publicize the “Living in the Country” guide to owning property and living in rural Washington County.

New Farmland Preservation Suggestions for Local Governments

The following new/updated suggestions for local governments should also be considered when addressing farmland preservation issues through the County’s comprehensive plan.

• Page 305, 1st paragraph in Suggestions for Local Governments
  The Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources elements of local comprehensive plans should identify lands for agricultural use. Towns should consider the use of the County LESA analysis to help identify areas most suitable for long term agricultural use and identify these same areas on the local planned land use map and productive agricultural soils map in the land use element of the comprehensive plan. Zoning ordinances in the Towns should be reviewed and revised if necessary to be consistent with the local planned land use map. An exclusive agricultural farmland preservation zoning district should be considered by those Towns that do not have an exclusive agricultural farmland preservation zoning district as part of the local zoning ordinance revisions. Other farmland protection ordinances and techniques described in the Washington County Farmland and Open Space Preservation Tools report should also be reviewed and considered by local governments.

• Page 305, 3rd paragraph in Suggestions for Local Governments
  Cities and villages should use the County LESA analysis and Farmland Preservation Area analysis (Map T-7) to direct future growth away from highly rated parcels where possible. Cities and villages should promote the protection of agricultural lands in the County by accommodating urban development at medium or higher densities within their adopted sanitary sewer service areas. Cities and villages should also grow in a logically planned manner and attempt to keep their boundaries as compact as possible to limit urban development adjacent to agricultural areas. Cities and villages should also consider limiting the use of Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) districts to potential use of redevelopment and infill areas within developed portions of the city or village, rather than using TIFs to stimulate new development that converts land on the outskirts of communities from agricultural to urban uses.

• Page 565, 2nd paragraph in Suggestions for Local Governments
  Towns that wish to remain primarily agricultural in nature should focus on protecting land for long-term agricultural use through local zoning and other development policies including Working Lands Initiative programs, and on attracting businesses and industries that support agriculture. Rural towns are also more suitable than urban areas for nonmetallic mines.

PART V: GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES, PROGRAMS, AND RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO INCREASE HOUSING DENSITY IN AREAS OUTSIDE OF FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

Chapters VI (Existing Plans and Ordinances), IX (Land Use Element) and X (Housing Element) of Washington County’s comprehensive plan identify numerous issues related to land use, residential development strategies and housing. The comprehensive plan also suggests actions that local governments can take to achieve housing goals. This section references goals, objectives, policies, programs (serving as actions) and suggested local government

---

8 Copies of Living in the Country, written by Kevin Struck (UW-Extension, 2009), can be obtained at the office of UW-Extension Washington County or on-line at: http://washington.uwex.edu.
actions as identified in the comprehensive plan and identifies new, more specific issues related to goals, objectives, policies, and programs to increase housing density in areas outside of farmland preservation areas. These issues, goals, objectives, policies and programs and where they are addressed within the comprehensive plan are listed in Table T-38.

### Table T-38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siting of Residential Development and Housing Density Issue</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recommendations of the Regional Land Use Plan – Other Agricultural and Rural-Density Residential Lands</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land Use Issue</td>
<td>363-364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Issue</td>
<td>364-368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Issue</td>
<td>369-370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Supply and Quality Issue</td>
<td>443-445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Cost / Workforce Housing Issue</td>
<td>445-448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Preference Issue</td>
<td>451-452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Housing Distribution Issue</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Residential Development and Housing Density Goals, Objectives, Policies and Programs

The level to which the issue listed in Table T-38 is addressed in regards to farmland preservation can be enhanced through the updating of existing and addition of new goals, objectives, policies and programs related to housing. The following new or updated policies and programs (actions) should also be considered when addressing issue listed in Table T-38.

- **Policy:** Support implementation of the Working Lands Initiative recommendation to establish working land enterprise areas outside planned sewer service areas. As proposed in the Working Lands Initiative Final Report (August 2006), Working Lands Enterprise Areas would cluster active farms and slow farmland conversion by preventing annexations within enterprise areas and targeting funding and other resources, such as a recommended State Purchase of Development Rights program, to farmlands within enterprise areas within Farmland Preservation Areas. *(Update-3rd policy on page 303; and Update 3rd policy on page 365)*

- **Program:** Update the County Farmland Preservation Plan to reflect the recommendations of the comprehensive plan, including the LESA analysis, and any changes to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program approved by the State Legislature in response to the Working Lands Initiative report. Encourage local governments to participate in developing and implementing the updated County Farmland Preservation Plan. *(Update-2nd program on page 303; Update-2nd program on page 365; Update-2nd program on page 613; and Update-5th program on page 622)*

- **Program:** Continue to provide technical assistance to towns on request for tools to develop local farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights (TDR) and exclusive agricultural farmland preservation zoning. *(Update-6th program on page 304; Update-4th program on page 365; Update-7th program on page 607; Update-15th program on page 613; Update-7th program on page 622; and Update-29th program on page 636)*

- **Policy:** Promote housing outside of farmland preservation areas identified on Map T-7. *(New-2nd policy on page 369; New-3rd policy on page 444)*
New Residential Development and Housing Density Suggestion for Local Governments

The following new/updated suggestion for local governments should also be considered when addressing residential development and housing density issues through the County’s comprehensive plan.

- Page 369, 1st paragraph on in Suggestions for Local Governments
  Each local comprehensive plan should identify the number of additional housing units required to meet the projected housing demand for 2035\(^9\) and allocate an adequate amount of land on the local land use plan map outside of farmland preservation areas (identified on Map T-7) to accommodate that number of housing units. Communities with urban service areas should provide for a range of residential land use categories, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family residential. These communities should also ensure that the land use categories provided for on the Land Use Plan Map can accommodate flexible zoning districts or regulations, such as mixed use, traditional neighborhood, and planned unit development districts or regulations.

---

\(^9\) Population and household projections for each local government are listed on Table 25 in Chapter II in the comprehensive plan.