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INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

On July 1, 2009, the 2009 Wisconsin Act 28, often referred to as the Working Lands Initiative, repealed and recreated Wisconsin’s farmland preservation law under Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes and related tax credits under subchapter IX of Chapter 71 of the Statutes. It also created a new program, under Section 93.73 of the Statutes, for the purchase of agricultural conservation easements. The new law requires counties to update their farmland preservation plans. As stated in Chapter 91, due to the fact that Washington County experienced an increase in population density of more than nine persons per square mile from 2000 to 2007,\(^1\) Washington County must update the 1981 Farmland Preservation Plan and have the plan certified by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) before it expires on December 31, 2011.\(^2\) Washington County was awarded a $30,000 farmland preservation planning grant to provide reimbursement for up to 50 percent of the County’s cost of preparing the plan. A Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee was established to guide plan development. This farmland preservation plan is a result of the new State laws and replaces the farmland preservation plan adopted by Washington County\(^3\) in 1981.

History of Farmland Preservation Planning in Washington County

Enacted in 1977, the original Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program was designed to preserve Wisconsin farmland by means of local land use planning and soil conservation practices and to provide property tax relief to eligible farmland owners. The program was administered by County and local governments, but the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) had to first certify that the County farmland preservation plan met the standards specified in Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes. Of the 72 counties in Wisconsin, 70 have certified farmland preservation plans. Washington County’s Farmland Preservation Plan was adopted by the Washington County Board and certified in 1981.

\(^1\) A county’s increase in population density is the number by which the county’s population per square mile based on the Department of Administration’s 2007 population estimate exceeds the county’s population per square mile based on the 2000 federal census.

\(^2\) On December 22, 2011, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection approved an extension of the certification of the Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan to December 31, 2012 (See Attachment A).

\(^3\) Documented in Farmland Preservation Plan, Washington County, Wisconsin, August 1981, prepared by the firm of Stockham and Vandewalle under the direction of the Washington County Park and Planning Commission and the Washington County Farmland Preservation Planning Technical Advisory Committee.
Farmland Preservation Areas were identified by Washington County’s 1981 Farmland Preservation Plan. The plan defined farmland preservation areas as contiguous blocks of farmland at least 640 acres in size that were relatively uninterrupted by conflicting uses, with at least 50 percent of the soils on each farm meeting Soil Conservation Service (now the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service) criteria as “Prime Farmland” or “Farmland of Statewide Importance.” Prime agricultural lands are those lands which, in terms of farm size, the aggregate area being farmed, and soil characteristics, are best suited for the production of food and fiber. Generally, prime farmlands are Class I or II soils and farmlands of statewide importance are Class III soils.

Map 70 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan shows prime agricultural lands recommended to be preserved under the County’s 1981 farmland preservation plan, with updates made as part of the 2020 Washington County Park and Open Space Plan to remove lands developed with urban uses between 1981 and 1995. Map 70 also shows prime agricultural lands in the Village of Germantown, which were not included in the County’s 1981 farmland preservation plan. The Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan was amended in 2004. The amendments included a change in the advisory guidelines for secondary farmland areas, advising that housing developments should be primarily limited to farm related dwellings, and updates to the maps identifying farmland preservation areas in the Towns of Hartford and Kewaskum. The amendments were approved by the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board on December 30, 2003.

**Overview of the Working Lands Initiative**

The preservation of Wisconsin’s working lands is critical for the health and success of the State and its residents. These lands provide homes for people, flora, and fauna, and produce food, fiber, and sources of biomass for fuels and energy. Preservation of this resource base is vital for the future of agriculture, the health of our environment, and to sustain a healthy economy in Wisconsin. Wisconsin’s farms and agricultural businesses generate $59.16 billion in economic activity and provide jobs for 353,991 people, according to a recent study conducted by University of Wisconsin.

In 2007, Wisconsin’s farms and agricultural businesses generated $59.16 billion in economic activity and provided jobs for 353,991 people.

The Working Lands Initiative (WLI) was created to protect the best agricultural lands from non-agricultural development and ensure agriculture remains a strong aspect of Wisconsin’s economy.
Wisconsin-Extension based on data for 2007. Over recent decades, Wisconsin’s working lands have been threatened by the pace and the fragmented fashion that farmland has been converted to other forms of development, often referred to as “sprawl,” as local governments approve subdivision plats according to their land use plans and comprehensive plans to accommodate a growing population. Recognizing that housing development is needed as populations increase, the Working Lands Initiative (WLI) was created to protect the best agricultural lands from non-agricultural development and ensure agriculture remains a strong aspect of Wisconsin’s economy, while encouraging strategies to increase housing density in areas outside of the farmland preservation areas.

The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) launched the WLI in 2005 and established a steering committee to develop a consensus vision on managing Wisconsin’s farm and forest lands. In August 2006, the WLI Steering Committee issued a report with a set of recommendations intended to update and expand policies and programs affecting Wisconsin farmlands and forests. The report recommended an update to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program. Proposed changes to the Farmland Preservation Program were included in DATCP’s 2007-09 budget request. The Committee’s report recommended establishing a number of new programs, including an Agricultural Enterprise Areas program and a purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) program. The main components of the WLI expand and modernize the State’s existing farmland preservation program through the development of a PACE matching grant program and tax credit incentives made eligible through the use of farmland preservation zoning or establishment of agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs). These components incorporate more specific goals of the WLI, including:

- Enabling county farmland preservation plans to meet current challenges through modern strategies and establishes minimum zoning standards to increase local flexibility and reduce land use conflicts (though local governments are entitled to apply more stringent standards).

- Helping to maintain large areas of contiguous land primarily in agricultural use and to reduce land use conflicts through AEAs, providing landowners with an opportunity to enter into farmland preservation agreements to claim income tax credits and encouraging farmers and local governments to invest in agriculture.

- Protecting farmland by providing State funds in the form of matching grants to local governments and non-profit conservation organizations for the purchase of agricultural conservation easements from willing landowners through PACE. The 2011 WI Act 32, enacted by the State on June 26, 2011 removed the bonding authority for this program. DATCP is required to evaluate the PACE program and provide a report by June 30, 2012. The program considers the value of the proposed easement for preservation of agricultural productivity, conservation of agricultural resources, ability to protect or enhance waters of the State, and proximity to other protected land while evaluating applications for PACE funds.

---

4 2011 WI Act 32, 2011-2013 State Biennial Budget Bill requires DATCP to evaluate the PACE program, including but not limited to the local administration of the program, source of funding, State participation and requirements for local match. DATCP is required to include options to replace PACE with a less costly and more efficient program for preserving farmland and report its findings to the State Joint Financing Committee and the standing agricultural committees in each house of the Legislature by June 30, 2012. Sixteen PACE easements approved in 2010 will be honored.

There are many differences between the old farmland preservation program and the new State laws. A comparison of the requirements to develop a farmland preservation plan under the old Farmland Preservation Program prior to July 1, 2009 and Wisconsin’s new farmland preservation law under Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes is displayed in Table T-1.

### Table T-1

**COMPARISON OF FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)</th>
<th>Working Lands Initiative (July 1, 2009)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan Certification Process</td>
<td>- Required certification by the Land and Water Conservation Board.</td>
<td>- Required certification by DATCP. DATCP staff have discretion to review plans or to accept self-certification by county.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DATCP staff review all submissions and make recommendations for certification, denial or certification with conditions.</td>
<td>- Certification with conditions is avoided, except where county board has not yet adopted plan at time of review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minor plan amendments are subject to same review requirements as complete plans.</td>
<td>- Staff have discretion to avoid certification review of minor plan amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- There is no deadline for turnaround of plan review.</td>
<td>- There is a 90-day turnaround time for plan review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Expiration Date</td>
<td>- No expiration date on original plans. Those submitted since 1995, and approved, were granted 10-year certification terms.</td>
<td>- May be certified for up to 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Process</td>
<td>- Public hearing under s. 59.69 required prior to plan adoption. Copies of the plan or plan amendment must be submitted, at least 60 days prior to the public hearing, to all cities, villages and towns within the county, to the Regional Planning Commission, and to all adjoining counties.</td>
<td>- Requires county to follow 66.1001(4) (comprehensive planning process) for plan adoption. This includes sending copies of the plan or amendment to all cities, villages and towns within the county, to the Regional Planning Commission, and to all adjoining counties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Plans</td>
<td>- Preservation of agricultural land.</td>
<td>- Preservation of agricultural land, and economic development of agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency Requirements</td>
<td>- Ag Preservation Plan must be consistent with and a component of county development plan under s. 59.69.</td>
<td>- Farmland Preservation Plan must be included in and consistent with county comprehensive plan under s. 66.1001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Town Ag Preservation Plans</td>
<td>- Ch. 91 recognizes only county ag preservation plans. However, the county ag preservation plan must include municipal ag preservation plans if these comply with requirements under s. 91.55 and s. 91.57, Stats. (2007)</td>
<td>- Ch. 91 recognizes only county ag preservation plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation Areas</td>
<td>- Establish minimum size of 100 acres for each contiguous agricultural preservation area, and 35 acres for each contiguous ag transition area in plan. - Areas must be devoted to agricultural use, though natural resource and open space areas are allowed.</td>
<td>- No minimum size for farmland preservation areas. - No transition areas allowed. - Areas must be devoted to either primarily ag use, primarily ag-related uses, or both, though natural resource and open space areas are allowed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for Exclusion Areas</td>
<td>- Under s. 91.05, Stats. (2007), reasons for excluding areas previously mapped for FP must be provided, and meet one of four criteria.</td>
<td>- All that is required is a general statement identifying differences from the previous plan; no specific rationale for removal of ag preservation lands in previous plan is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Assistance</td>
<td>- No grant funding available for plan development.</td>
<td>- Planning grants available to reimburse counties for up to 50% of eligible costs to develop plan, not to exceed $30,000 in State funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DATCP and Washington County.
**STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS**

Chapter 91, Subchapter II of the *Statutes* specifically identifies planning requirements to obtain State certification of a county farmland preservation plan. All plans must clearly state the county policy related to:

- Farmland preservation, and
- Agricultural development, including development of enterprises related to agriculture.

**Plan Certification Expiration**

Nearly all counties in the State have an existing county farmland preservation plan. According to Ch. 91 of the *Statutes*, certifications of all existing county farmland preservation plans are scheduled to expire by December 31, 2015. The statute establishes a staggered time frame for plan expirations based upon population growth per square mile from 2000 to 2007. Due to Washington County experiencing an increase in population density of more than nine persons per square mile, the County’s existing plan expires December 31, 2011.7

DATCP has granted Washington County’s request to extend the certification of the Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan Map for the Towns of Kewaskum and Hartford. The certifications were scheduled to expire on December 31, 2009. The certification for the Washington County plan map for the Towns of Kewaskum and Hartford will now expire on December 31, 2011 based on provisions of Wisconsin Statute 91.14(4), 2009 WI Act 28. The extension to the certification will allow Washington County to update the plan map for the Towns of Kewaskum and Hartford based on new statutes implementing the working lands initiative.

**Plan Certification Process**

Once a farmland preservation plan is developed, the county must apply to DATCP for plan certification. By completing the “County Application for Farmland Preservation Plan Certification,8” a county self-certifies to DATCP that the plan meets the applicable requirements for certification identified in State law. Based on a county’s self-certification, DATCP can certify the plan if all certification requirements are met. DATCP must make a certification decision within 90 days if the application submitted was complete. There is no requirement to seek certification from a State level board such as the Land and Water Conservation Board, and a farmland preservation plan may be certified for a period of up to 10 years.

Self-certification of the plan requires the county corporation counsel and county planning director or county chief elected official to review the farmland preservation plan and certify that it meets State law. DATCP has the authority to conduct additional review of the plan to ensure that the plan meets the Working Lands Initiative standards. If a county plan is denied certification, the county can re-submit a revised application that addresses the issues cited by the department in denying the earlier certification request.

**Key Inventory and Trends**

Statutory requirements call for a farmland preservation plan to identify, describe, and document:

- Agricultural uses of land in the county at the time that the farmland preservation plan is adopted, including key agricultural specialties, if any.
- Key infrastructure for agriculture, including facilities for processing, storage, transportation, and supply.
- Key agricultural resources, including available land, soil, and water and resources.

A farmland preservation plan must also identify, describe, and document significant trends in the county related to agricultural land use, agricultural production, enterprises related to agriculture, and the conversion of agricultural land to other uses and anticipated changes in the nature, scope, location, and focus of agricultural production.

---

6 County Farmland Preservation Planning requirements are outlined in Subchapter II of Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
7 DATCP approved an extension of certification of the Farmland Preservation Plan to December 31, 2012.
8 Available at [http://workinglands.wi.gov](http://workinglands.wi.gov).
processing, supply, or distribution. The plan must also identify, describe, and document development trends, plans, or needs that may affect farmland preservation and agricultural development in the county related to the following:

- population growth
- economic growth
- housing
- transportation
- utilities
- communications
- business development
- energy
- community facilities and services
- waste management
- municipal expansion
- environmental preservation

**Development of Farmland Preservation Areas**

A key component to development of a county farmland preservation plan is the identification of “farmland preservation areas.” A farmland preservation area (FPA) is an area where the county plans to preserve agriculture and agricultural related uses. These areas may also include natural resource areas such as wetlands. Counties must develop an objective rationale to explain the areas chosen for farmland preservation. The mapping of FPAs has direct implications for development of farmland preservation zoning ordinances since certification of farmland preservation zoning districts requires that the district be located within a FPA. Similarly, agricultural enterprise areas and PACE easements that receive DATCP grants may only be located in an area identified as a FPA.

**Development of Vision, Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs**

A farmland preservation plan must state the county's policy related to farmland preservation, agricultural development, and the development of enterprises related to agriculture. In addition, the plan must identify, describe, and document the following:

- Goals for agricultural development in the county, including goals related to the development of enterprises related to agriculture.
- Actions that the county will take to preserve farmland and actions that the county will take to promote agricultural development.
- Policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions to increase housing density in certain areas planned for non-agricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted (possibly excluding undeveloped natural resource and open space areas).
- Key land issues related to preserving farmland and promoting agricultural development and plans for addressing these issues.

**Public Participation**

As stated in Section 91.10(3) of the Statutes, “To adopt a farmland preservation plan, a county shall follow the procedures under s. 66.1001(4) for the adoption of a comprehensive plan” which includes the adoption of a public participation plan. On March 16, 2010, the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopted 2009 Resolution 74 establishing public participation procedures for the development and amendments to the Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County meeting the requirements of 66.1001(4)(a) of the Statutes. The public participation plan describes the methods the County will use to distribute proposed, alternative, or amended elements of this farmland preservation plan, and the opportunity for written comments on the plan to be submitted by members of the public to the County and for the County to respond to such comments.
Techniques to obtain public opinion included news releases, fact sheets, newsletters, a County website, local government websites, display exhibits, a landowner survey, focus groups, public open houses, a public hearing, local government meetings, and six advisory committee meetings. Initial events include:

- A joint workshop with DATCP and staff from Washington and Ozaukee Counties was held at Riveredge Nature Center on March 25, 2010 to present information and discuss the farmland preservation program requirements and updates to the two county farmland preservation plans with local officials.

- A public countywide kickoff and informational meeting was held at the Washington County Fair Park Pavilion on June 29, 2010 to present information and gain public opinion about the Working Lands Initiative programs and the County Farmland Preservation Plan planning process.

A countywide open house and public hearing was held at the Washington County Fair Park Pavilion on October 24, 2011 to solicit public comment regarding the farmland preservation plan.

**Plan Review and Adoption**

Section 91.10(3) of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that the County shall adopt the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) following the procedures under s. 66.1001(4) for the adoption of a comprehensive plan. On October 26, 2011, Washington County’s Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee (PCPC) recommended the adoption of this farmland preservation plan to the Washington County Board of Supervisors by approving a resolution and ordinance by a majority vote of the entire committee. The Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) certified the FPP on May 17, 2013. Changes based on DATCP’s recommendations were presented to the PCPC on September 30, 2013 and they recommended adoption of the FPP to the Washington County Board of Supervisors by approving a resolution and ordinance. The County’s FPP was made a part of the Comprehensive Plan by adoption of an amendment known as Amendment No. 2: Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County to A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 on December 10, 2013.

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANNING**

**Comprehensive Planning Overview**

In 1999 the Wisconsin Legislature enacted a new comprehensive planning law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes, requiring County and local governments that enforce general zoning, shoreland zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances to have an adopted comprehensive plan by January 1, 2010. To address the State comprehensive planning requirements, a multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning process was undertaken by Washington County, 11 local government partners, UW-Extension, and the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC). As a result of the multi-jurisdictional process, comprehensive plans that satisfy the planning requirements set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Statutes were developed for the County and each of the 11 local government partners.

On April 15, 2008, the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopted A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035. Washington County's Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan provides long-range goals and objectives for Washington County officials and citizens to effectively address future development and natural resource protection in the County through the year 2035.

---

9 DATCP’s certification order is included as Attachment B at the end of this plan appendix.
Farmland preservation was one of many issues identified during the comprehensive planning process in Washington County. Valuable agricultural information can be found throughout the County’s comprehensive plan including an inventory of agricultural resources (Chapter III); general goals and objectives (Chapter VII); and specific goals, objectives, policies, and programs developed for agricultural (Chapter VIII), land use (Chapter IX), and economic development (Chapter XIII) planning. This plan frequently references tables and maps found in Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

**Farmland Preservation Plan as Part of Comprehensive Plan**

Section 91.10(2) of the Statutes states that “If the county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and shall ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The county may incorporate information contained in other parts of the comprehensive plan into the farmland preservation plan by reference.” Therefore, this plan is being developed as a part of Washington County’s comprehensive plan as an appendix. The County Farmland Preservation Plan should also be consistent with local government comprehensive plans.

Counties should strive to ensure consistency between all county plans during development of a farmland preservation plan. Washington County’s Land and Water Resource Management Plan addresses issues related to soil and water conservation compliance, a requirement for claiming a tax credit under the farmland preservation program. The County has a strategy to monitor the compliance of farmland preservation participants with these standards as a part of land and water resource management workplan. County departments should communicate with each other to ensure that there is consistency between plans. County and Regional plans are discussed in Chapter V of this plan.

**COMMITTEE STRUCTURE**

The County farmland preservation planning effort was coordinated through the Washington County Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee (PCPC) of the County Board. The PCPC provided oversight of the County planning effort and approval of the recommended farmland preservation plan for consideration for adoption by the full County Board. A Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee was established by the PCPC to guide preparation of the County FPP, including:

- Development of planning goals and objectives
- Development of a vision for the future of farmland preservation in the County
- Review draft plan chapters and other plan materials
- Identification of Farmland Preservation Areas
- Development of a recommended plan for consideration by the PCPC

During the summer of 2010, Washington County staff attended Plan Commission and/or Board meetings in all Towns in Washington County and also the Villages of Richfield and Germantown to present an overview of the Working Lands Initiative and the County’s plan of action to develop its farmland preservation plan. All cities, villages, and towns within the County were invited to appoint a representative to serve on the Advisory Committee. Members of the Advisory Committee are listed in the front of this report.
This planning report consists of eight chapters, which have been adopted as Appendix T of *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter II presents population, housing and employment trends and projections. Existing recommendations for farmland preservation in Washington County follow in Chapter III. Chapter IV contains an inventory of agricultural resources while Chapter V describes trends, plans or needs that may affect farmland preservation. Chapter VI discusses tools for preserving and supporting farmland preservation. Chapter VII includes issue identification, an explanation of farmland preservation areas, and recommendations describing proposed goals and actions for preserving farmland. The final chapter, Chapter VIII, describes programs and actions to undertake for the implementation of the farmland preservation plan.

As is required by the Working Lands Initiative, the farmland preservation plan must be consistent with the County's comprehensive plan. To avoid the repetition of much information, such as the extensive inventory of agricultural resources, and to conveniently include the farmland preservation plan as an appendix to the comprehensive plan, portions of the farmland preservation plan will reference the comprehensive plan. The reference includes a general description of where the relevant information can be found within the comprehensive plan.

**FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANNING PROCESS**

**Planning Area**
The planning area includes all of Washington County and those portions of the City of Hartford and Village of Newburg that extend outside Washington County. The County is bordered on the north by Fond du Lac and Sheboygan Counties, on the west by Dodge County, on the east by Ozaukee County, to the south by Waukesha County, and by Milwaukee County to the southeast. Washington County encompasses a total of 278,756 acres, or about 436 square miles.

**Planning Process**
The farmland preservation plan presented in this report was developed through a two-year planning process consisting of the following steps: 1) start up tasks, 2) inventory, 3) issue identification, visioning, and establishment of goals, 4) identification of strategies and action, 5) preparation of implementation elements, 6) plan review, refinement, and adoption. Another key step in the farmland preservation planning process will be the implementation of the plan by Washington County and each local government. Throughout the planning process, the active participation of citizens, landowners, County and local government officials, and interest groups was essential for identifying important issues and preparing a plan with realistic goals for the County and local governments.

**PLAN IMPLEMENTATION**

While planning provides many important public benefits, it is important to recognize that an adopted plan is not an “end result,” but rather provides recommendations for future action. Plan recommendations will be fulfilled over time in generally small, incremental steps. A farmland preservation plan provides a foundation and guide for implementing numerous preservation tools, which may include community zoning ordinances and maps, subdivision ordinances, capital improvements programming, detailed facilities planning, and other County and local ordinances, programs, and policies. The implementation of new County programs identified in the plan will require the review and approval of appropriate County Board liaison committees and the County Board of Supervisors through the annual budget process.

Suggestions for local government consideration are included in various parts of this plan and under each planning element in Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Local governments will have a greater influence over farmland preservation than County government, especially with regard to providing protection for agricultural lands through local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances. Each community should consider and refine the
suggestions as they relate to their farmland preservation goals, objectives, policies, and programs in their local comprehensive plans. Local governments may also choose not to consider suggestions that are not relevant to their community’s needs, or are not consistent with their local comprehensive plan.
Appendix T – Chapter II

POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

PART 1: EXISTING POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT LEVELS AND TRENDS

This chapter summarizes information found in the County comprehensive plan as it relates to farmland preservation and includes additional information deemed relevant for the preservation of farmland. More detailed information regarding population, household, and employment trends and projections can be found in Chapters II, X, and XIII of *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*.

The Importance of Analyzing Population, Housing, and Employment Trends and Projections

Section 91.10 (1) (b) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires that a farmland preservation plan identify, describe, and document trends, plans, or needs related to population, economic growth, and housing. Section 91.10 (c) (7m) specifically requires that a farmland preservation plan include policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions to increase housing density in areas that are not planned for future agricultural use. Each of these aspects place demands on the landscape and can significantly impact land use. Since farmland loss is affected by the demand placed on land for non-agricultural purposes, preservation efforts should acknowledge the factors that promote development or otherwise affect land use.

Many of the planning recommendations set forth in the following chapters of this report are directly related to the existing and probable future population, household, and employment levels in the County. A farmland preservation plan can provide a community with the rationale to allow for development and preservation simultaneously by acknowledging the influence of population growth and housing demand on land and the need to accommodate development in areas not designated for protection.

POPULATION TRENDS

The total population of Washington County remained stable from 1860 to 1920. Between 1920 and 1940, the population increased from 25,713 to 28,430 residents. The County experienced rapid growth rates in the decades between 1940 and 1980, including population gains of over 35 percent in each of the two decades between 1950 and 1970. From 1990 to 2000, population increased by just over 23 percent, adding approximately 22,000 new residents. This rapid growth can be attributed to both the migration of new residents to Washington County and the natural increase of the existing population (more births than deaths). The historic and current population of Washington County is set forth in Table T-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Change From Preceding Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>19,485</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>23,622</td>
<td>4,137 (21.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>23,919</td>
<td>297 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>23,442</td>
<td>-477 (-2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>22,751</td>
<td>-691 (-3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>23,589</td>
<td>838 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>23,784</td>
<td>195 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>25,713</td>
<td>1,929 (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>26,551</td>
<td>838 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>28,430</td>
<td>1,879 (7.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>33,902</td>
<td>5,472 (19.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>46,119</td>
<td>12,217 (36.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>63,839</td>
<td>17,720 (38.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>84,848</td>
<td>21,009 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>95,328</td>
<td>10,480 (12.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>117,496</td>
<td>22,168 (23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010*</td>
<td>131,343</td>
<td>13,847 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2010 Wisconsin Department of Administration Population Estimate.
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Wisconsin Department of Administration, and Washington County.
According to the Wisconsin Department of Administration population estimate, although the County experienced a more modest increase in population from 2000 to 2010 in comparison to decades prior, Washington County still ranked among the five fastest growing counties in Wisconsin by percent change in population growth. Population grew by almost 12 percent, from 117,496 to 131,343 residents, between 2000 and 2010.

The change in population by community is displayed in Table T-3. When analyzing towns and other communities with large rural areas such as the Villages of Germantown and Richfield, the Town of Wayne experienced the highest increase in population between 2000 and 2010 with an increase of nearly 18 percent. The Town of Jackson (13 percent), the Village of Richfield (11 percent), and the Towns of Farmington (10 percent) and Trenton (10 percent) round out the top five rural communities that experienced the highest population growth rates.

**HOUSEHOLD TRENDS**

According to the U.S. Census Bureau 2009 American Community Survey (ACS), there were 51,473 households (occupied housing units) in Washington County in 2009 with an average household size of 2.53 persons. As stated in Chapter II of Washington County’s comprehensive plan and summarized in Table T-4, the number of households in the County has increased over the last few decades while the average number of persons per household has decreased. This trend has continued through 2009 and is typical throughout Wisconsin reflecting the fact that family sizes (average number of children per family) have decreased and unmarried persons have increasingly tended to establish their own households rather than live with family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>2000 Census</th>
<th>2010 Estimate</th>
<th>Numeric Change</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>3,341</td>
<td>3,567</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>2,663</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Erin</td>
<td>3,664</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Farmington</td>
<td>3,239</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Germantown</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>4,031</td>
<td>3,989</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>3,516</td>
<td>3,969</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>1,119</td>
<td>1,146</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>3,938</td>
<td>4,042</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>4,884</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wayne</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of West Bend</td>
<td>4,834</td>
<td>4,884</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>18,260</td>
<td>19,950</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Jackson</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>6,437</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Kewaskum</td>
<td>3,277</td>
<td>4,230</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Newburg</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td>10,373</td>
<td>11,480</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td>3,901</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td>10,895</td>
<td>13,970</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>28,152</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>117,496</td>
<td>131,343</td>
<td>13,847</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Population estimates do not include portions of communities outside of Washington County.
†Wisconsin Department of Administration Population Estimate.
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Wisconsin Department of Administration, and Washington County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Change from Preceding Census</th>
<th>Average Household Size</th>
<th>Change from Preceding Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>26,715</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>32,977</td>
<td>6,262</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>43,842</td>
<td>10,865</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009†</td>
<td>51,473</td>
<td>7,631</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*U.S. Census Bureau 2009 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates.
†Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Washington County.
Household Income
Personal income is another primary indicator of the overall economic well-being of an area. Household income is one of the primary measurements of personal income. Annual household income in the County by community in 1999 is documented in Table 9 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. The median household income in the County was $60,549 in 2009, which was $3,136 more than the Region’s median household income of $57,413, $10,556 more than the State’s median household income of $49,993, and $10,328 more than the Nation’s median household income of $50,221.

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Employment and Occupational Characteristics
The number of employed persons 16 years of age and older by occupation in Washington County is set forth in Table T-5. Employed persons are the number of residents holding jobs, regardless of the location of the employer and whether the jobs are part-time or full-time. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, of the 102,180 County residents 16 years of age and over, 74,738 (about 73 percent) were in the labor force in 2009. Of that number, 70,096 (nearly 94 percent) were employed, 4,626 (6 percent) were unemployed, and 16 (less than 1 percent) were in the armed forces at the time the estimate was taken.

In comparison, about 69 percent of County residents age 16 and over in the Region and about 69 percent in the State were in the labor force. The remaining residents age 16 years of age and older who were not in the labor force were retired or not actively looking for work.

Table T-6 shows historic employment growth in the County between 1970 and 2008. Total employment in the County, that is, the number of jobs located in Washington County, stood at 68,571 jobs in 2008, compared to about 60,694 jobs in 2000. From 2000 to 2008, Washington County had about a 13 percent increase in jobs.

Current Economic Situation
The United States is currently in an economic recession. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), the recession began in December 2007 and is the longest recession since the Great Depression of the early 1930s.

---

Table T-5
EMPLOYED PERSONS 16 YEARS OF AGE AND OLDER BY OCCUPATION IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2000-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>2000a</th>
<th>2009b</th>
<th>Change from 2000-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Professional, and Related Occupations*</td>
<td>20,805</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>25,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Occupations</td>
<td>7,244</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Office Occupations</td>
<td>16,248</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>15,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Fishing, and Forestry Occupations</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance Occupations</td>
<td>6,468</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Transportation, and Material Moving Occupations Production</td>
<td>13,569</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>12,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64,687</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70,096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2000 U.S. Census.
† U.S. Census Bureau 2009 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates.
‡ Includes farmers and farm managers.
§ Includes farm labor contractors, agricultural inspectors, animal breeders, graders and sorters, agricultural equipment operators, and farmworkers and laborers (including crop, nursery, greenhouse, and farm/ranch workers). Farmers and farm managers are included under the “management, professional, and related” occupations.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Washington County.

Table T-6
NUMBER OF JOBS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 1970-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Jobs</th>
<th>Change From Preceding Decade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>24,656</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>35,377</td>
<td>10,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>46,270</td>
<td>10,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60,694</td>
<td>14,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>68,571</td>
<td>7,877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and Washington County.
The Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development (DWD) defines “unemployment rate” as the number of unemployed\(^1\) as a percent of the labor force.\(^2\) DWD determined that Wisconsin’s unemployment rate increased from a seasonally adjusted 4.5 percent in December of 2007, when the recession began, to 8.8 percent as of August 2009, almost doubling over the period. As shown in Figure T-1, a similar trend occurred at the County and national levels during this period.

According to preliminary data released by DWD, in August 2010, Washington County was ranked 48\(^{th}\) for unemployment among the 72 counties in Wisconsin with an unemployment rate of 7.0 percent (not seasonally adjusted).\(^3\) This compares to the State’s unemployment rate of 7.7 percent in August 2010, and the Nation’s rate of 9.5 percent, both not seasonally adjusted, as shown in Figure T-2.

### Employment by Industry

Information regarding employment levels by industry provides insight into the structure of the economy of an area and changes in that structure over time. Current and historical job levels by general industry group are presented for Washington County and the Region in Table 18 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Unlike the Region and the rest of Wisconsin, Washington County has experienced an increase in manufacturing jobs. Between 1970 and 2000, manufacturing jobs in Washington County increased by 87 percent, from 9,255 to 17,307 jobs. All other job categories showed an increase in the number of employees between 1970 and 2000, with the exception of agricultural jobs. The number of agricultural jobs decreased by about 37 percent between 1970 and 2000, the only industry group in the County to lose employees.

There were 68,571 jobs located in the County in 2008, which is an increase of 7 percent from the 2004 level. Table T-7 sets forth the percent change in number of jobs by industry group in the County from 2004 to 2008.

---

\(^1\) DWD defines “unemployed” as the number of people who, during the reference week (includes the 12th of the month), had no employment but were available for work and; had engaged in any specific jobseeking activity within the past four weeks, such as registering at a public or private employment office, meeting with prospective employers, checking with friends or relatives, placing or answering advertisements, writing letters of application or being on a union or professional register; were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been laid off within the past 6 months; or were waiting to report to a new wage or salary job within 30 days.

\(^2\) The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate eliminates the influence of regularly recurring seasonal fluctuations which can be ascribed to weather, crop-growing cycles, holidays, vacations, regular industry model changeover periods, and the like, and therefore more clearly shows the underlying basic trend of unemployment.

The industry groups in Table T-7 differ from those in Table 18 of the comprehensive plan. Data in Table 18 of the comprehensive plan is based on the Standard Industry Classification (SIC) system and the data in Table T-7 is based on the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The SIC system was used for Table 18 because historical employment data is only available in this form.

As shown in Table T-8, in 2009, the median earnings of workers employed in Washington County was $45,308. This figure was 114 percent of the State average ($39,775). Jobs in information provided the highest median earnings in the County at $60,839 while jobs in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting provided the lowest median earnings in the County at $17,006.

### Table T-7

**PRIVATE AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY GROUP IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2004-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry, fishing, related activities, and other</td>
<td>Agricultural, forestry, and fishing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>Transportation, communication, electric, gas, and sanitary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,404</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>14,178</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>3,232</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>7,848</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>Transportation, communication, electric, gas, and sanitary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>Finance, insurance, and real estate</td>
<td>2,669</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>Finance, insurance, and real estate</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and technical services</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and waste services</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services 4</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>1,186</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>Services; Retail trade</td>
<td>4,297</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services, except public administration</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm employment</td>
<td>Agricultural, forestry, and fishing</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>58,586</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>62,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Government Enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal, civilian</td>
<td>Public Administration; Transportation, communication, electric, gas, and sanitary services</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>64,362</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68,571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 American Industry Classification System.
5 SIC Industry Groups are detailed in Appendix C of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
6 Detailed data is not available at the County level; however, the utilities and transportation and warehousing industry groups combined total 2,542 jobs and 3.7 percent of the total jobs located in the County.
7 The educational service category includes those employed by private schools and colleges. Public school employees are included in the local government category.
8 Subtotal includes the sum of utilities, and transportation and warehouse industry jobs.
9 Includes Washington County only. Total does not include that part of the Village of Newburg located in Ozaukee County or that part of the City of Hartford located in Dodge County.

*Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and Washington County.*

*The SIC industrial classification system is shown in greater detail in Appendix C of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.*
Farm Employment and Farm Proprietorship

Trends in the number of people employed through farming in the region from 2001 to 2008 are summarized in Table T-9. Trends in the number of farm proprietors in the region from 2001 to 2008 are summarized in Table T-10. Overall farm employment trends in Washington County from 2001 to 2008, including both the number of people employed through farming and the number of farm proprietors, is displayed in Figure T-3. All counties within the region have experienced a decrease in overall farm employment from 2001 to 2008. Washington County experienced a 7.5 percent decrease in the number of people employed through farming which was the fourth-highest decrease in the seven-county region.

Table T-9
NUMBER OF PEOPLE EMPLOYED THROUGH FARMING IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>1,259</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,241</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>1,205</td>
<td>-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>-235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>5,662</td>
<td>5,766</td>
<td>5,577</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,284</td>
<td>5,297</td>
<td>-543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table T-10
NUMBER OF FARM PROPRIETORS IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 2001-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2001</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2002</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2003</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2004</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2005</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2006</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2007</th>
<th>Number of Proprietors 2008</th>
<th>Change from 2001-2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>-98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>782</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>-188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table T-8
EMPLOYMENT AND MEDIAN EARNINGS BY INDUSTRY GROUP IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Median Earnings (dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4,881</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>48,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>16,386</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>48,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>2,553</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>42,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>7,332</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>41,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and warehousing</td>
<td>2,565</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>48,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>60,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>60,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and insurance</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>58,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>52,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
<td>3,151</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>52,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of companies and enterprises</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support and waste management services</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>42,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>5,419</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>48,838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>9,569</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>34,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>22,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>3,421</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>19,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services except public administration</td>
<td>2,838</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>33,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>50,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70,096</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>45,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 inflation-adjusted dollars for the full-time, year-round civilian employed population 16 years and over.

a Too few sample observations were available to compute an estimate.

b Includes the executive, legislative, judicial, administrative and regulatory activities of Federal, State, local, and international governments.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and Washington County.
PART 2: POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

The projection of future population, household, and employment levels is essential to properly design a farmland preservation plan for the future of agricultural preservation in the County. The future demand for land, housing, transportation facilities, and other supporting community facilities and amenities depends directly on future population, household, and employment levels.

Population and Household Projections\(^5\)

**Projections Under the Regional Land Use Plan**

Population and household projections for the year 2035 were prepared by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) in 2004-2005. Under the Regional Land Use Plan, the projected population for Washington County in 2035 is 157,265 persons (see Table 19 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan). This is a projected increase of 39,769 persons, or about 34 percent, over the 2000 population level of 117,496.

Changes in the number and size of households will accompany changes in the size of the resident population. Taking the assumptions from the regional land use plan into consideration with the projected average household size of 2.45 persons per household, the projected number of households for Washington County in 2035 is 62,849. This is a projected increase of 19,006 households, or about 43 percent, over the 43,843 households in 2000.

**Projections Selected by Local Governments**

Local governments in Washington County developed population and household projections for 2035 to use in local comprehensive plans that refine the systems level projections developed by SEWRPC for the Region and County. These projections form the basis used to plan for land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and other community facilities for each local comprehensive plan through the planning design year of 2035. The resultant population projection was 184,512 persons for Washington County\(^6\) in 2035. This is a projected increase of 67,016 persons, or about 57 percent, over the 2000 population level of 117,496.

---

\(^5\) See Chapter II of Washington County’s comprehensive plan for details on how projections were determined.

\(^6\) Includes the portions of the City of Hartford and Village of Newburg that extend outside of Washington County.
Using the projected average household size (as determined by local governments) of 2.54 persons per household, the population projection selected by local governments would result in 74,587 households in Washington County in 2035. This is a projected increase of 30,744 households, or about 70 percent, over the 43,843 households in 2000. The final population and household projections chosen by each local government for use in preparing local comprehensive plans is set forth in Table 25 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

**Employment Projections**

Future employment levels in the County are expected to be strongly influenced by the strength of the regional economy relative to the rest of the State and Nation. The Regional Planning Commission’s economic study, *The Economy of Southeastern Wisconsin*, concluded that the regional economy is unlikely to significantly increase or decrease in strength relative to the State or Nation over the projection period of 2000 to 2035.

**Washington County**

Projections of total employment for Washington County were prepared within the framework of the regional employment projection largely on the basis of trend analysis. The number of jobs by industry group in 2000 and the projected number of jobs in 2035 are shown in Table 169 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. The total number of jobs is projected to increase by 17,170 jobs, or by about 28 percent. Most of the job growth is expected to occur in the “General” category, which includes service jobs and jobs in finance, insurance, and real estate. The “Other” category, which includes agricultural, agricultural services, forestry, mining, and unclassified jobs is projected to experience a decline of 156 jobs or by about 7 percent.

**Southeastern Wisconsin**

As noted above, employment projections for Washington County were developed as part of the regional land use planning program. More detailed employment projections for specific industry sectors were developed for the seven-county region than for the individual counties. Projected regional employment trends on an industry-by-industry basis are summarized in Table 170 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

The region is projected to experience an increase of 4,500 jobs in the “Other” category, which includes agricultural service jobs but not agricultural jobs. Agricultural jobs are projected to decline in the region by 1,200 jobs (20 percent) between 2000 and 2035.

While the agricultural sector constitutes a small and declining share of the regional economy, it still constitutes a viable economic sector. Wisconsin agriculture is expected to hold a comparative advantage in the dairy and vegetable segments. However, due to continued technological advances in genetics and mechanization, cost pressures from national and global competition, and modern management practices, the employment levels in agriculture may be expected to continue to decline. The continued conversion of farmland to urban uses may also be expected to reduce agricultural employment in the Region.

---

7 The “Other” category includes jobs in agricultural services (crop services, veterinary services, and landscaping services), forestry, commercial fishing, mining, and unclassified jobs.

8 The “Agricultural” industry includes establishments (e.g., farms, orchards, greenhouses, nurseries) primarily engaged in the production of crops, plants, and trees, excluding forestry operations. It also includes establishments (e.g., farms, dairies, feedlots, egg production facilities) primarily engaged in raising livestock for sale or for the sale of livestock products.
Farm Income
Figure T-4 depicts average net farm income, including sales, government payments, and other farm-related income, for Wisconsin counties in 2007. A vast majority of counties in the State had a positive average net farm income. However, counties with a positive average net farm income may have contained individual farms whose net incomes were not positive. The average net farm income per farm in Washington County was $36,197 in 2007.9

Farm Demographics
The status of agriculture has evolved over recent years. As a whole, farm operators are getting older and are less likely to participate in farming as a full-time occupation. Between 1982 and 2007, the average age of principal farm operators in Washington County increased from 50 to 56. Nearly 30 percent of principle operators in Washington County are age 65 or older – a typical retirement age among other professions. More than half are age 55 or older.

In Washington County, the number of principal farm operators reporting farming as their primary occupation declined from 552 in 2002 to 437 in 2007 or by 21 percent over the last five years. This is likely due to a combination of factors, including difficulty covering operational expenses on small and mid-sized farms, a desire for more stable wages and health insurance, and an increase in residential-lifestyle farms.

In 2007, the majority of farms in Washington County, 98 percent, were owned by family or individual organizations, partnerships, or family-held corporations. Most continue to rely heavily on family labor. Slightly more than a quarter (28 percent) of Washington County farms employs hired labor. In 2007, 231 farms in Washington County employed 1,198 hired workers for a total payroll of $12,491,000. Of these farms, 13 (6 percent) reported hiring migrant labor.10 An emerging trend since 2000 is the presence of immigrant labor on dairy farms. Roughly 40 percent of hired workers on Wisconsin dairy farms are recent immigrants, primarily of Hispanic descent.11

In contrast to the hired labor force, diversity among principal farm operators in Washington County is relatively low. More than 99 percent of principal farm operators report their race as Caucasian. Sixteen percent of principal farm operators are women, an increase of 6 percent from 2002 to 2007. Women comprised 31 percent of all farm operators in 2007, a decrease of 4 percent since 2002.

9 Wisconsin Land Use Megatrends Report. Center for Land Use Education (CLUE), UW-Stevens Point (Summer 2010).
EXISTING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FARMLAND PRESERVATION IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

INTRODUCTION

The Working Lands Initiative (WLI) mandates that Farmland Preservation Plans do more than identify farmland preservation areas. Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that plans identify trends related to the conversion of agricultural land to other uses, describe actions that the County will take to preserve farmland and to promote agricultural development, describe goals related to the development of enterprises related to agriculture, and outline policies, goals, strategies and proposed actions to increase housing density outside of areas for agricultural preservation. Many of these requirements have been addressed in the goals, objectives, policies and programs described in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and local government comprehensive plans, establishing a foundation for farmland preservation.

Wisconsin Statute 66.1001, the comprehensive planning law, requires that comprehensive plans provide a statement of overall objectives, goals, policies, and programs related to nine elements, four of which are agricultural, natural, and cultural resources; land use; housing; and economic development. Recommendations outlined in these four comprehensive plan elements in the County and local government comprehensive plans provide a starting point for satisfying the requirements outlined in Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

Washington County’s multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan and the comprehensive plans developed by local governments serve as long-range guides for officials, staff, and citizens to effectively address future development and natural resource protection in the County through the year 2035. Since every city, town and village in Washington County has adopted their own comprehensive plan and enforces their own zoning ordinances, local governments will have significant influence over agricultural resources in the County, especially with regard to providing protection for agricultural lands. Therefore, it is important to consider the existing recommendations set forth in adopted comprehensive plans throughout Washington County.

This chapter summarizes the goals, objectives, policies and programs that pertain to farmland preservation as described in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and local government comprehensive plans. The chapter also examines commonalities in those adopted comprehensive plan recommendations.

COMMON RECOMMENDATIONS OF LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANS

Many local governments share common goals for the future of farmland preservation. Recommendations for each local government were developed through extensive public participation efforts. Goals and objectives were developed during separate brainstorming sessions with each local government during a joint meeting of their plan...
commission and board. Goals and objectives are designed to define a desired future for Washington County and its local governments. Recommended policies and programs directly promote the achievement of element goals and objectives.

Common Recommendations for Rural Areas of Washington County

When comparing the adopted comprehensive plans of rural communities in Washington County, including all twelve Towns and the Villages of Germantown and Richfield, many similar recommendations related to farmland preservation and agricultural development emerge. Below are common goals, objectives, policies and programs that were adopted by multiple local governments in the rural areas of Washington County.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- Preserve the rural character and small town atmosphere of the community.
- Support local farms including specialty, niche, and hobby farms.
- Establish or maintain a 5-acre minimum density for residential development to allow for adequate groundwater recharge.
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Preserve agricultural lands, especially prime agricultural lands.
- Plan long-term for agriculture by designating such areas on future land use maps, often with the use of transition areas between agricultural and non-agricultural areas.
- Consult the results of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis when planning future development.

Land Use Element
- Preserve the rural character and small town atmosphere of the community.
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Preserve prime agricultural lands.
- Direct non-agricultural development to hamlet areas or within sewer service areas.
- Utilize cluster development and conservation subdivisions when planning residential development to minimize the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.
- Establish agricultural transition areas on future land use maps to serve as buffers between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Preserve agricultural lands that weren’t necessarily designated as “prime” for orchards and specialty crops.

Housing Element
- Strive to provide housing while maintaining rural densities and rural character.
- Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the community’s land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated 2035 population.
- In cooperation with neighboring communities, provide a wide range of housing opportunities.
- Allow residential development in appropriate areas as designated on the community’s land use plan map.
- Focus limited urban development in and/or around existing hamlets or in existing sewer service areas.
- Provide safe and decent housing.

Economic Development Element
- Ensure that economic development coincides with the rural atmosphere of the community.
Plan long-term for agriculture by designating such areas on future land use maps.
Affirm and/or encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture including specialty and hobby farming.
Protect and preserve agricultural lands.
Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the community; agriculture, tourism, recreation, and residents’ needs.

Common Recommendations for Urban Areas of Washington County

When comparing the adopted comprehensive plans of urban communities in Washington County, including the Cities of Hartford and West Bend and the Villages of Kewaskum, Newburg, Slinger and Jackson, many similar recommendations related to farmland preservation and agricultural development emerge. Below are common goals, objectives, policies and programs that were adopted by multiple local governments in the urban areas of Washington County.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- Preserve prime agricultural lands (through zoning and other ordinances) within the planning area.
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Redevelop areas and utilize infill development whenever possible.
- Minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban areas.
- Encourage, develop, and promote farmers’ markets.

Land Use Element
- Redevelop areas; utilize infill and compact development whenever possible.
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Protect the natural resource base and preserve environmental quality.

Housing Element
- Provide a wide range of housing opportunities.
- Promote redevelopment, infill, compact, and cluster development.
- Locate housing development in areas where utilities and public facilities are available.
- Allow residential development in appropriate areas as designated on future land use maps to accommodate current and future populations.
- Encourage rehabilitation of existing homes.

Common Recommendations for all Communities in Washington County

When comparing the adopted comprehensive plans of Washington County and all twenty local governments, including both mainly rural and urban communities, many similar recommendations related to farmland preservation and agricultural development emerge. Below are common goals, objectives, policies and programs that were adopted by Washington County and multiple local governments in the County.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Preserve agricultural lands, especially prime agricultural lands.
- Minimize conflicts between agricultural and urban areas.
Land Use Element
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Minimize the conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses by directing non-agricultural development to hamlet areas or within sewer service areas and redevelop areas by utilizing infill and compact development whenever possible.
- Protect the natural resource base and preserve environmental quality.

Housing Element
- In cooperation with neighboring communities, provide a wide range of housing opportunities.
- Provide safe and decent housing.
- Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the community’s land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated population of the community in 2035.
- Strive to provide housing while maintaining densities appropriate to the community and its character.
- Focus limited urban development in and/or around existing hamlets or in existing sewer service areas and where utilities and public facilities are available.
- Promote redevelopment, infill, compact, and cluster development.

Economic Development Element
- Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the community.
- Strive to avoid land use conflicts whenever possible.
- Promote the expansion of the recreation and tourism sectors of the economy which may include the establishment and promotion of farmers’ markets.

SUMMARY OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO FARMLAND PRESERVATION

WASHINGTON COUNTY
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 which was adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2008 and summarize how Washington County addresses the future of agriculture in the County.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- **Goal:** Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remains viable in Washington County.
- **Goal:** Identify productive farmlands in Washington County and support their protection and management as an important economic resource.
- **Objective:** Promote the use of Tier I farmland (agricultural land with a score of 6.8 or higher in the LESA analysis) for agricultural use.
- **Objective:** Protect parcels that were determined to be most suitable for long-term agricultural use through the LESA analysis (Tier I farmland) from non-farm development.
  - **Policy:** Protect high priority farmland protection parcels identified on Map 76 of the comprehensive plan. Tier I parcels should be given the highest priority for allocation of farmland protection resources. Tier II parcels should be given the next highest priority for allocation of farmland protection resources.
  - **Policy:** Discourage land divisions on Tier I agricultural lands and in large contiguous areas of agricultural use.
  - **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.

- **Policy:** Encourage development of highways and utilities in a manner that minimizes disruption of Tier I farmlands.
  - **Program:** Assign agricultural use to agricultural lands identified as Tier I (score of 6.8 or higher) by the LESA analysis on Map 84 (Washington County Land Use Plan map).
  - **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.
  - **Program:** Work with area land trusts, such as the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT), to protect agricultural parcels through agricultural conservation easements and/or purchases.
  - **Program:** Work with appropriate organizations to develop programs that support Wisconsin’s Working Lands Initiative recommendations.
  - **Program:** Continue to work with appropriate organizations and local governments to develop programs to support farmland protection.
  - **Program:** Continue to provide technical assistance to towns on request for town farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural zoning.
- **Policy:** Implement strategies regarding the preservation of sufficient farmland to support a viable agricultural community as recommended in the Washington County Land and Water Resource Management Plan.
  - **Program:** Continue to work with UW-Extension to provide education on methods of protecting agricultural land, by working with local governments and the Washington County unit of the Towns Association.

- **Goal:** Protect farms and farming in Washington County.
  - **Objective:** Preserve the economic viability of agricultural activities in Washington County.
  - **Objective:** Retain existing farm operations outside planned sewer service areas in Washington County to the extent possible.
  - **Objective:** Retain existing agri-businesses in Washington County to the extent possible.
    - **Policy:** Encourage continued agricultural activity, particularly on lands identified for agricultural use on the County Land Use Plan Map (Map 84 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan).
    - **Policy:** Farmlands in planned sewer service areas should be encouraged to remain in agricultural use until public sewer and water services are extended to the parcel.
    - **Policy:** Support economic initiatives to ensure farming remains viable in Washington County, including funding programs, agri-tourism, and direct marketing of farm products.
    - **Policy:** Protect agricultural infrastructure in Washington County to support farm operations.
    - **Policy:** Encourage niche farming operations in Washington County, such as organic farms and orchards.
    - **Policy:** Encourage farming by younger age groups in Washington County.
    - **Policy:** Encourage retiring farmers to pass farms on to heirs or to sell farms to other farmers.
    - **Policy:** Support implementation of the Working Lands Initiative recommendation to establish a beginning farmer program to recruit and train the next generation of farmers.
  - **Program:** Implement programs recommended under the Farmland Protection Issue to preserve agricultural activity in Washington County, including support of the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative recommendations.
Program: Promote the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Washington County.

Program: Continue to market and link Washington County farms and agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants and grocery stores in Washington County and surrounding areas.

Program: Study the feasibility of providing County tax credits for agricultural parcels and agribusinesses.

Program: Continue to promote existing Federal and State programs that provide financial support for beginning farmers. In addition, study the need and feasibility of establishing County programs to support beginning farmers.

Program: Continue to promote the farm business community and work together on common issues.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve and enhance agricultural lands that are best suited for agricultural use.
- **Objective:** Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remains viable in Washington County.
- **Objective:** Encourage the preservation of agricultural uses outside planned urban service areas.
  - **Policy:** Encourage continued agricultural activity, particularly on lands identified for agricultural use on the County Land Use Plan Map (Map 84 of the County’s comprehensive plan).
  - **Policy:** Promote agricultural use on parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.8 or greater.
  - **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.
    - **Program:** Incorporate parcels designated for agricultural use by local government comprehensive plans on the County Land Use Plan Map (Map 84 of the comprehensive plan).
    - **Program:** Continue to work with local governments and appropriate organizations, including but not limited to land trusts, to develop programs to support farmland protection.
    - **Program:** Continue to provide technical assistance to towns on request to develop local farmland protection tools, such as transfer of development rights (TDR) and exclusive agricultural zoning.
- **Objective:** Encourage the preservation of soils suitable for agricultural production.
  - **Policy:** Implement strategies regarding soil sustainability and sedimentation as recommended in the Washington County Land and Water Resources Management Plan.
  - **Program:** Continue the educational program that specifically outlines the soil conservation and Best Management Practices (BMPs) resources and grants available through State agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and DNR.
  - **Program:** Continue to pursue Federal and State soil resource conservation grant funds available to County governments.
Housing Element

- **Goal:** Promote a range of safe and affordable housing choices for all income levels and age groups in the County.
- **Objective:** Encourage flexibility in zoning to accommodate a variety of housing options.
- **Goal:** Promote the addition of an adequate number of housing units to the current housing stock to meet housing demand through 2035.
- **Goal:** Allocate sufficient land for housing development and to accommodate current and future populations.
- **Goal:** Promote adequate housing choices.
  - **Objective:** Accommodate an additional 19,006 housing units\(^1\) in the County by 2035 in the areas identified for residential use on Map 84 (Washington County Planned Land Use Map: 2035) of the comprehensive plan.
    - **Policy:** In communities with sewer service areas and other urban services, encourage local comprehensive plans and ordinances that support the provision of a full range of structure types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings, at appropriate densities.
    - **Policy:** In communities without sewer service areas and other urban services, encourage local comprehensive plans and ordinances that support the provision of housing types and densities appropriate to the community.
- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all County residents.
  - **Objective:** Provide well-constructed and maintained housing with adequate services.
  - **Objective:** Provide housing within a suitable physical environment.
    - **Policy:** Seek to protect the character of residential neighborhoods by precluding the encroachment of incompatible land uses and minimizing adverse impacts on the environment.
    - **Policy:** Support the use of tax incremental financing (TIF) districts to encourage redevelopment of under-used and blighted areas for affordable housing.
- **Goal:** Support a range of housing types to meet the housing needs and preferences of Washington County residents.
  - **Objective:** Promote a variety of residential lot sizes.
  - **Objective:** Encourage more cluster development or conservation subdivision housing development with open space.
    - **Policy:** Support local government comprehensive plans and ordinances including zoning ordinances, land division ordinances, and building codes that support the provision of a full range of lot sizes and structure types and sizes including single-family, two-family, and multi-family within sewer service areas.
    - **Program:** Continue to research housing trends and provide information to local governments on innovative ways to accommodate a variety of housing types and sizes that are appropriate to the services available in various communities.
    - **Policy:** Continue to maintain the rural areas of the County through the accommodation of new residential development at appropriate densities.
    - **Policy:** Encourage the use of flexible zoning techniques by local governments to accommodate a variety of housing options. Develop model ordinances to assist local governments in amending local ordinances to include flexible zoning techniques. Examples of flexible zoning techniques include traditional neighborhood development (TNDs), infill development, planned unit developments (PUDs), and accessory apartments.

---

1 The 2035 regional land use plan prepared by SEWRPC projects the number of households in Washington County will increase from about 43,843 in 2000 to about 62,849 in 2035, for an increase of about 19,006 households (a 43 percent increase).
– **Program:** Create a dialogue between local governments in Washington County to encourage intergovernmental cooperation in achieving a distribution of a variety of housing choices across Washington County.

**Economic Development Element**

**Goal:** Identify and encourage desirable and sustainable businesses and job development.

**Objective:** Develop methods to retain and encourage farming as a viable part of the economy.

**Goal:** Create, attract, and retain desirable businesses and industries.

**Objective:** Fuel existing growth companies and industries in Washington County for the creation of quality jobs and wealth.

- **Policy:** Support EDWC programs that fuel growth companies for the creation of quality jobs and economic prosperity countywide.

- **Program:** Support EDWC programs that develop a strategy to support agri-business within the County.

**Objective:** Protect the lands identified in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources and Land Use Elements as best suited for long-term farmland preservation, in order to provide the land base needed to maintain agriculture and associated agricultural industries.

- **Policy:** Promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries.

- **Policy:** Promote businesses that support agriculture (feed and seed stores, implement dealers, dairy processors).

- **Policy:** Promote agricultural uses on lands identified in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources and Land Use Elements as best suited for long-term farmland protection.

  - **Program:** Identify sustainable lands to be retained in long-term agricultural use in consultation with local governments, and using the results of the LESA analysis.

  - **Program:** Promote the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries.

  - **Program:** Encourage the EDWC to develop a method to market and link Washington County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants and grocery stores in Washington County and surrounding areas.

  - **Program:** Work with appropriate entities to identify and promote value-added agriculture (for example, on-farm production of yogurt, cheese, and other dairy products).

  - **Policy:** Support economic initiatives to ensure farming remains viable in Washington County, including funding programs, agri-tourism, and direct marketing of farm products.

  - **Program:** Work with NRCS and UW-Extension to establish a program to promote agri-tourism in Washington County through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms. The program could include an educational component for farmers regarding possible agri-tourism enterprises.

  - **Program:** Work with UW-Extension to create a resource log of existing programs available to support young farmers and ensure that this resource is effectively communicated to existing and potential farmers so that people are aware of available programs.

  - **Program:** Work with UW-Extension and local high schools and colleges to promote agribusiness education programs, and encourage young and beginning farmers to attend classes. Provide tuition assistance to farmers attending classes.

  - **Program:** Study the feasibility of providing County tax credits for agricultural parcels and agribusinesses.
CITY OF HARTFORD
The following goals and objectives are found in the City of Hartford 2030 Smart Growth Plan which was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Hartford on December 8, 2009 and summarize how the City of Hartford addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- **Goal:** Manage and protect the Hartford Area’s agricultural resources.
- **Objective:** Continue to enforce the City’s 3-mile extraterritorial land division jurisdiction to prevent development of agricultural lands within the 3-mile area and outside the City’s Sanitary Sewer Service Area.

Land Use Element
- **Goal:** Ensure an adequate area for each type of land use on the City of Hartford’s long-range land use map.
- **Objective:** Actively promote the redevelopment of existing properties within the City of Hartford for uses consistent with the long-range land use map.

Housing Element
- **Goal:** Provide a wide range of housing choices throughout the city that meets the needs of all persons.
- **Objective:** Encourage the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing homes in Hartford.
- **Objective:** Encourage private funds for rehabilitation efforts through coordinated marketing and education efforts with private lenders.
- **Goal:** Promote the availability of land for the development or redevelopment of low-income and moderate-income housing.
- **Objective:** Support the donation of vacant lots and structures appropriate for infill housing to organizations engaged in providing affordable housing in established neighborhoods.
- **Goal:** Maintain or rehabilitate existing housing stock.
- **Objective:** Provide a clear path to maintain existing housing through clear guidelines in the Housing Code and Construction Code.

CITY OF WEST BEND
The following objectives, principles, and standards are found in the 2020 Comprehensive Plan for the City of West Bend which was adopted by the City Council on April 12, 2004 and summarize how the City of West Bend addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- **Objective:** A spatial distribution of the various land uses which will result in the protection, preservation, and wise use of the natural resources and agricultural lands of the area, including soils, lakes and streams, wetlands, woodlands, and wildlife.
- **Principle:** The proper allocation of land uses can assist in maintaining an ecological balance between the activities of residents and the natural environment which supports them.
- **Principle:** The proper relation of urban and rural land use development to soil type and distribution can serve to avoid costly environmental and developmental problems, aid in the establishment of better settlement patterns, and promote the wise use of an irreplaceable resource.
- **Objective:** The preservation of sufficient high-quality open space land for protection of the underlying and sustaining natural resource base and enhancement of the social and economic well-being and environmental quality of the area.

The boardwalk at Albecker Natural Area in the City of West Bend meanders through several acres of wetlands.
• **Principle:** Ecological balance and natural beauty are important determinants of a community's ability to provide a pleasant and habitable environment for all forms of life and to maintain social and economic well-being. Preservation of the most significant aspects of the natural resource base, that is, primary environmental corridors and prime agricultural lands, contributes to the maintenance of ecological balance, natural beauty, and economic well-being of the City and environs.

• **Principle:** The preservation of prime agricultural lands ensures that the most productive existing farmlands will remain available to provide food and fiber, contribute to the agricultural and agriculture-related economy of the area, maximize the return on capital invested in agricultural irrigation and drainage systems and soil and water conservation practices, minimize conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban land uses, and contribute to energy conservation since prime agricultural soils require less energy to farm than do other soils.

• **Standard:** All remaining prime agricultural areas within the West Bend Planning Area not required to meet the land use needs of the forecast design year resident population and economic activity levels should be preserved for agricultural use. These areas should be protected through the application of zoning and land division ordinances which permit only agricultural uses and agriculture-related uses and which specify a relatively large parcel size, such as 35 acres.

• **Standard:** The location of non-farm residential development in prime agricultural areas in the West Bend Planning Area beyond the Urban Service Area should be discouraged. If permitted, development should be limited to densities of five acres or greater per dwelling unit, providing the locations are covered by soils suitable for the use of onsite sewage disposal systems.

**Land Use Element**

• **Objective:** A balanced allocation of space to the various land use categories which meets the social, physical, and economic needs of the resident population of the West Bend area.

• **Principle:** The planned supply of land set aside for any given use should approximate the known and anticipated demand for that use.

• **Standard:** Underutilized and "infill" lands should be considered when considering the amount of land required for accommodating forecast growth in West Bend where possible.

• **Objective:** A spatial distribution of the various land uses that is properly related to the supporting transportation, utility, and public facility systems in order to assure the economical provision of transportation, utility, and public facility services and a compatible arrangement of land uses.

• **Principle:** Development to meet the needs of the population should promote the appropriate reuse of underutilized lands and the use of currently vacant infill lands in the City prior to allowing new growth. Making use of these lands will, among others, accommodate economic growth without additional needs for future public services, promote compact development, and decrease the chance of blight.

**Housing Element**

• **Objective:** The provision of an adequate variety of housing types for varied age and income groups for households of various sizes.

• **Principle:** Adequate choice in size, cost, and location of housing units will assure equal housing opportunity.

**Economic Development Element**

• **Objective:** To promote quality growth and development of the City at a rate consistent with the ability to financially support the infrastructure and services necessary to support that growth.

• **Principle:** To provide an adequate level of public facilities and infrastructure such as streets, utilities, parks and open space and emergency services necessary to maintain a desired quality of life.

• **Principle:** To promote a balance between outer edge development and the redevelopment of existing properties.
VILLAGE OF GERMANTOWN

The following guiding principles, goals, and objectives are found in the Village of Germantown 2020 Smart Growth Plan which was adopted by the Village Board on October 4, 2004 (most recently amended on October 19, 2009) and summarize how the Village of Germantown addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Guiding Principles

Preserving and enhancing the environment.
- Preserve and enhance the unique identity of the Village.
- Mix of suburban and rural uses.
- Protect natural resources and physical features.
- Encourage infill development.
- Approve new regulations (e.g. cluster subdivision ordinance).

Investing in people, neighborhoods and communities.
- Ensure compatibility between land uses.
- Provide a balanced mix of uses.
- Agricultural preservation.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element
- **Goal:** Promote the preservation of existing natural features of the Village which add to the community identity, historic ways of life, economic base, and unique character of Germantown.
- **Goal:** Provide Village residents with access to natural areas and open spaces.
- **Goal:** Promote the preservation of agricultural land use in those areas where the most favorable environmental features will prolong the use of the land for agriculture.
  - **Objective:** Encourage the use of any organization that promotes the preservation of natural features.
  - **Objective:** Preserve and promote the registration of historic structures and farmsteads, which contribute to the cultural heritage of the Germantown area.
  - **Objective:** Identify and preserve important scenic vistas that contribute to the authenticity of the Village’s historic farmsteads and settlements.
  - **Objective:** Explore and promote the use of any techniques which facilitate the preservation of agricultural land uses and unprotected natural features from development pressure by creating a viable economic option for land owners.

Land Use Element
- **Goal:** Locate future land uses in the Village in a logical and coherent pattern, which maximizes the resources of the Village.
- **Goal:** Plan the intensity of future land uses in keeping with the existing land use types of the Village.
  - **Objective:** Promote preservation and mitigation land use control techniques, which will minimize the impact suburban land uses have on existing natural features.

Housing Element
- **Goal:** Develop and maintain high quality residential neighborhoods that are safe, attractive, and instill pride and a sense of identity and place in residents.
  - **Objective:** Encourage the use of cluster or conservation subdivisions in areas where environmentally sensitive lands should be protected.
- **Goal:** Provide a diversity of housing opportunities.
- **Objective:** Encourage rehabilitation and reuse of older housing stock.
- **Objective:** Encourage developers and land owners to provide a range of housing types within large developments.
- **Goal:** Assure that housing development in the Village does not outpace the capacity of public services, including roads and the public school system.
- **Objective:** Locate housing development in areas where utilities and public facilities services are available.

**Economic Development Element**
- **Goal:** Maintain a balanced community with a mixture of agricultural, residential, commercial and industrial/office development.

**VILLAGE OF JACKSON**
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in the *Village and Town of Jackson Comprehensive Plan: 2035* which was adopted by the Village Board on August 10, 2009 and summarize how the Village of Jackson addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs**
- **Goal:** The Village works to retain and promote the feeling of a “small town” atmosphere.
- **Objective:** Once a slow-growing farming community, Jackson has become one of the fastest-growing communities in Wisconsin; in population, housing, and in value. Many of the residents in the Village of Jackson have remained in the Village or have relocated to the Village because of its small town feel.
  - **Policy/Program:** The Plan Commission and Village Board shall work to improve the central “downtown” South Center Street district to design and provide areas for community participation, such as performances and farmers’ markets in a “Village Square” environment.
  - **Policy/Program:** The Village will develop and keep updated a “branding” and promotional package consistent with the small town philosophy.
- **Goal:** The Village will provide for more effective planning and maintenance to ensure a safe, informed, and attractive community.
- **Objective:** Developing and maintaining healthy neighborhoods, properties, and structures within the community will continue to be a priority in order to allow the continued status of the Village of Jackson as “small town USA.”
  - **Policy/Program:** The residential character on Main Street shall be retained either through residential occupancy or adaptive reuse of non-retail uses.

**VILLAGE OF KEWASKUM**
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Kewaskum: 2035* which was adopted by the Village Board on November 5, 2009 and summarize how the Village of Kewaskum addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**
- **Goal:** Encourage the protection, preservation, and thoughtful use of the natural resources and prime agricultural lands in the Village and its extraterritorial area, understanding that the preservation of sufficient high-quality open space lands for protection of the underlying and sustaining natural resource base may enhance the social and economic well-being and environmental quality of the area.
- **Objective:** The proper relation of urban and rural land use development to soils can serve to avoid costly environmental and developmental problems, aid in the establishment of better settlement patterns, and promote the wise use of an irreplaceable resource.

  - **Policy:** Thoughtful consideration for the preservation of prime agricultural lands should be given, thereby minimizing conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban land uses, and contribute to energy conservation since prime agricultural soils require less energy to farm than do other soils.

  - **Policy:** Agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e. native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf/grass, and rain gardens should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability. The use of conservation subdivision design that results in less street and driveway pavement and provides more open space than a conventional subdivision design is also encouraged.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** A balanced allocation of space to the various land use categories in order to meet the social, physical, and economic needs of Village residents.

- **Goal:** Preserve high-quality open space lands to protect the underlying natural resource base and enhance the social and economic well-being and environmental quality of the area.

- **Objective:** The planned supply of land set aside for any given use should approximate the known and anticipated demand for that use.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** Provide adequate location and choice of housing and housing types for varied age and income groups of different size households.

- **Goal:** Accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.

- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Village residents.

- **Objective:** Allow residential development in appropriate areas as designated on the Village land use plan map.
  - **Policy:** Housing units in the Village of Kewaskum should include a full range of housing types, sizes, and costs, including single-family homes, two-family homes, multi-family townhouses, multi-family apartments, and condominiums.
  - **Policy:** Lands developed or proposed to be developed for urban residential use should be located in areas that can be served by the Village public sanitary sewerage system.
  - **Policy:** All lands developed or proposed to be developed for urban residential use should be located in areas that can be served by the Village water supply system.

**Economic Development Element**

- **Goal:** Maintain, enhance, and continue to diversify the economy consistent with other Village goals and objectives in order to provide a stable economic base.

- **Goal:** Develop strategies to promote business retention, expansion, and recruitment.

- **Objective:** Promote adequate supporting infrastructure for business creation, retention, expansion, and attraction.
- **Objective:** Promote redevelopment of underutilized commercial and industrial land.
  - **Policy:** Provide supporting infrastructure, public services, and recreational facilities that promote a high quality of life for Village residents in an effort to attract and retain desirable businesses in the Village.
  - **Program:** Identify suitable areas for commercial and industrial development on the Village land use plan map.

**VILLAGE OF NEWBURG**
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Village of Newburg* which was adopted by the Village Board on January 9, 2009 and summarize how the Village of Newburg addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

**Farmland Protection and LESA Analysis Programs**
- **Program:** Consider the LESA analysis as the Village expands in the future. Guide future urban development away from high priority farmland protection parcels. Parcels with LESA scores of 8.0 and higher should be given the highest priority for farmland protection and parcels with scores of 7.0 to 7.9 should be given the next highest priority for farmland protection in Ozaukee County while in Washington County, Tier I farmlands should be protected.
- **Program:** Support County efforts to implement strategies regarding the preservation and protection of farmland and other working lands recommended in the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2005 – 2010*, and subsequent updates.

**Protection of Farming and Farms Programs**
- **Program:** Assist the Counties with implementing its educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for youth programs, including 4-H Clubs and Future Farmers of America (FFA).
- **Program:** Assist the Counties with implementing its program to market and link Ozaukee County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants, stores, schools, and group residential facilities (nursing homes, for example) in the Village.
- **Program:** Assist the Counties with implementing its program to promote agri-tourism in Counties through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farmers markets, farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms.
- **Program:** Provide incentives for activities such as produce stands and farmers markets within the Village through an expedited permitting process and reduced permitting fees.

**Community Character Goal**
- **Goal:** To preserve and enhance the traditional Village character of Newburg; while at the same time accommodating new growth and development.
- **Objective F.8:** Support the viability of agriculture on those lands currently being farmed within the Village’s extraterritorial planning jurisdiction.

**Natural Impediments to Urban Development Programs**
- **Program:** Implement the County model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural and natural resource areas if appropriate.

**Land Use Element**

**Land Use and Implementation Issue Programs**
- **Program:** The Village does not support the continued proliferation of urban sprawl and the premature, and sometimes arbitrary, conversion of farmland into rural residential lots.
Economic Development Issue Programs
- **Program:** Allocate parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or greater to agricultural uses on the Village Planned Land Use Map: 2035.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Issue Programs
- **Program:** Assign agricultural use to parcels identified as orchards, nurseries, and special agricultural and agriculture-related uses in the 2000 land use inventory and inventoried as agricultural use in the 2007 land use inventory update on the Village Planned Land Use Map: 2035.
- **Program:** Study participation in the proposed Ozaukee and Washington County purchase of development rights (PDR) program to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis.
- **Program:** Study the use of the Ozaukee and Washington County model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural areas.

General Land Use Goal
- **Goal:** To ensure that the character and location of land uses maximizing the potential for economic benefit and the enjoyment of natural and man-made resources by citizens, while minimizing the threat to the public health, safety, and welfare posed by hazards, nuisances, incompatible land uses and environmental degradation.
- **Objective A.3:** Future development and redevelopment activities should be directed to appropriate areas as delineated on the Land Use Plan Map. Such development should be consistent with sound planning principles and the goals, objectives and policies set forth by this Plan.
- **Objective A.4:** All development activities should be conducted in a manner that will ensure the protection of natural and historic resources.

Housing Element
- **Goal:** To provide affordable, safe and sanitary housing in a variety of neighborhoods to meet the diverse needs of the present and future residents of the Village.
- **Objective C.2:** To encourage housing developments that enhances community livability, increases walkability and decreases auto dependence within the Village.

Economic Development Element
- **Goal:** Diversify and broaden the economic base of the Village through planning and development activities that attract new businesses and expand existing businesses.
- **Objective A.5:** Promote the eventual expansion of the Village’s economic base and employment opportunities.
  - **Policy A.5.1:** Promote the expansion of the recreation and tourism sectors of the local economy
  - **Program:** Promote the Establishment a Farmer’s Market/Art Fair in the Village.

Fiscal Performance Goal
- **Goal:** To promote the Village's fiscal well-being by embracing Village growth opportunities.
- **Objective J.2:** Promote infill development.
VILLAGE OF RICHFIELD

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in Richfield: 2025 20-Year Smart Growth Comprehensive Plan which was adopted by the (then) Town Board in November 2004 (most recently amended on February 18, 2010) and summarize how Richfield addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- **Goal:** Preserve the rural character and support country living by maintaining open space, natural areas and farmland.
- **Objective:** Using the Future Land Use Map as a guide, seek to direct residential and commercial development to certain areas, including those areas least suited for farming, with soils that support foundations and septic systems.
  - **Policy:** Preserve the most significant aspects of the natural resource base, that is, primary environmental corridors, which contribute to the maintenance of the ecological balance, natural beauty, and economic well being of the Town and environs.
  - **Policy:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations and small specialty farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.
  - **Policy:** Maintain the Town’s rural character.
- **Program:** Communicating with local farmers who want to sell their property about options available through land trusts and conservation development design techniques.
- **Objective:** Establish an Agriculture Committee.
  - **Program:** Educate local landowners about the potential for conservation subdivisions, land trusts, development rights options, etc.
  - **Program:** Coordinate with local farmers to consider consolidated strategies for efficient niche farming (e.g. local farmers market, specialty farming, equipment sharing, education seminars, insurance/benefit consolidation programs, etc.).

Land Use Element

- **Goal:** Protect the Town’s abundant and high quality natural resource areas to maintain Richfield’s natural atmosphere and community character.
- **Objective:** Encourage the development of cluster or conservation subdivisions to maintain open spaces, wildlife habitat, scenic vistas, and perhaps some farmland.

Housing Element

- **Goal:** Enhance the environmental assets and residential atmosphere of the Town so that it continues to be an attractive place to live.
- **Goal:** Encourage a greater variety of housing types, designs and densities to meet the needs of residents of varying incomes, ages and lifestyle preferences and to support economic development.
- **Objective:** Consider revisions to zoning ordinance to establish provisions for smaller dwelling sizes and smaller garages as conditional uses in mixed use and infill developments adjacent to walkable hamlets to provide a greater variety of single-family housing choices.
- **Objective:** Revise the zoning ordinance to allow for townhomes, triplexes and quadplexes by conditional use permit in the walkable hamlet areas as shown on the Future Land Use Maps upon showing a compatibility with adjacent uses and the needs of the community.
- **Objective:** Coordinate with local developers to establish a variety of local housing choices.
  - Using the Future Land Use Maps as a guide, prepare an inventory of potential infill sites in and adjacent to local hamlets. Distribute this list to developers.

---

*Richfield’s comprehensive plan was developed and adopted prior to the Town of Richfield incorporating into a village on February 13, 2008. The comprehensive plan was adopted in November 2004.*
Create a new Planned Unit Development Zoning District to accommodate a blend of commercial, multiple and single-family development on a single property. This district would include performance standards, as opposed to strict setback requirements, to provide flexibility for developers interested in smaller properties with mixed housing type uses.

**Economic Development Element**
- **Goal:** Encourage local economic development opportunities that exist in harmony with the Town’s rural residential atmosphere.
- **Objective:** Seek to limit economic development to the identified districts shown on the Future Land Use Maps.
- **Policy:** Support local agriculture as an integral part of the Town’s economy.

**VILLAGE OF SLINGER**
The following goals, objectives, and policies are found in the *Village of Slinger Comprehensive Plan – Conservation, Connectivity, Walkability: A Plan for 2025* which was adopted by the Village Board on August 6, 2007 and summarize how the Village of Slinger addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**
- **Goal:** The Village should assist in the preservation of agricultural lands for long-term agricultural use.
- **Objective:** Communicate and coordinate with adjacent Towns that certain areas should be preserved for long-term agricultural use.
- **Objective:** Implement the preservation of certain lands for long-term agricultural use through the Village’s extraterritorial land division authority.
- **Policy:** The Village of Slinger encourages development within its corporate limits, connected to Village sanitary and water systems, to promote efficient urban development patterns that maximize available services. Accordingly, to protect farmland and natural areas, the Village will discourage land divisions or subdivision development outside of the Village limits in certain areas designated on the Village’s Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
- **Policy:** It is the policy of the Village to preserve the most significant aspects of the natural resource base, that is, primary environmental corridors and surrounding agricultural lands, which contribute to the maintenance of the ecological balance, natural beauty, agricultural production and economic well being of the Village and environs.

**Land Use Element**
- **Goal:** Protect the Village’s abundant and high quality natural resource areas to maintain the Village’s natural atmosphere and community character.
- **Objective:** Require the development of cluster or conservation subdivisions adjacent to environmental corridors to maintain open spaces, wildlife habitat, scenic vistas and to create a buffer between Slinger and Hartford and a buffer between Slinger and nearby agricultural areas.
- **Policy:** Promote compact development served by public sanitary sewer and water service where such services are cost-effective.

**Housing Element**
- **Goal:** Enhance the environmental assets and residential atmosphere of the Village so that it continues to be an attractive place to live.
- **Objective:** Direct future residential development to areas where infrastructure is readily available or easily extended, in accordance with the *Recommended 2025 Village of Slinger Land Use Map*.
- **Policy:** Promote medium and high-density infill development to maintain a walkable community atmosphere.
**Economic Development Element**

- **Goal:** Develop and maintain a physical, cultural, educational, and recreational environment in the Village that is conducive to business and residential development.

- **Objective:** Through appropriate zoning, seek to concentrate new commercial and industrial development around existing development in areas identified on the Recommended Land Use Plan for 2025.

- **Goal:** Revitalize the Historic Downtown.

- **Objective:** Conduct a market study to understand the customer base and develop a strategy for revitalization that can draw in customers, identify a specialty local market and point of community pride that is able to compete by offering a different environment, products, and services than available elsewhere in the Village or region.

- **Policy:** The Village of Slinger will continue to utilize the Village’s Capital Improvement Program to anticipate future budget expenses and support infrastructure investments that are necessary for economic development.

- **Policy:** The Village of Slinger will support development proposals that provide a mix of uses in the downtown, including residential, retail, and service establishments.

**TOWN OF ADDISON**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Addison: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on June 18, 2009 (most recently amended on March 18, 2010) and summarize how the Town of Addison addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

- **Goal:** Allow for the continuation of agriculture as a distinct land use and a viable sector of the economy.

- **Goal:** Preserve suitable land areas for agricultural uses and to reduce conflict with development and the inefficiencies of urban sprawl.

- **Objective:** Preserve in agricultural use those lands best suited for agricultural uses within the Town to protect both the rural character and the economic base.

- **Objective:** Protect existing farm operations and farmland from fragmentation by discouraging the encroachment of non-agricultural uses.

- **Policy:** Preserve productive farmland to provide food and fiber; contribute to the agricultural and agricultural-related economy of the area; maximize the return on capital invested in agricultural irrigation and drainage systems and soil and water conservation practices; and minimize conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban and suburban land uses.

- **Policy:** Discourage the conversion of agricultural lands, particularly those scoring 7.0 or above in the LESA analysis, to non-farm uses.

- **Policy:** Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e., native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf/grass, rain gardens, and bioswales should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability.

- **Program:** Maintain agricultural zoning requiring a large minimum lot size to reduce conflicts caused by adjacent development that is incompatible with agricultural uses.

- **Program:** Review the Town zoning ordinance, and amend if necessary, to provide opportunities for appropriate agri-business activities.
- **Program:** Encourage the continuation of agricultural uses in areas designated for agriculture on the Town land use plan map through administration of the Town’s zoning and land division ordinances.

- **Program:** Designate suitable areas on the Town land use plan map for residential and business development where such uses will not conflict with agriculture or agri-business needs.

- **Program:** Create transitional areas on the Town land use plan map that will preserve agricultural uses while providing for future development needs near existing development and infrastructure and services and where there is increasing development pressure.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve suitable land areas for agricultural uses and to reduce conflict with development and the inefficiencies of urban sprawl.

- **Goal:** Allow for the continuation of agriculture as a distinct land use and a viable sector of the economy.

- **Goal:** Reduce conflict from incompatible adjacent land uses.

- **Goal:** Focus development into the hamlets where urban services are readily available.

  - **Objective:** Direct development to areas served by sewer now or within the timeframe of the Plan.

  - **Objective:** Provide for smaller lot sizes in sewered areas to allow for affordable single-family and multi-family housing.

- **Policy:** Protect existing farm operations and farmland from fragmentation by discouraging the encroachment of non-agricultural uses.

  - **Program:** Provide, through the land use plan map and the Zoning Ordinance, land and zoning opportunities for appropriate agri-business activities within the Town.

  - **Program:** Provide suitable areas for residential, commercial, and business development on the land use plan map where such uses will not conflict with agricultural or agri-business uses.

  - **Program:** Create transitional areas that will preserve agricultural uses while providing for future development needs near, or adjacent to, existing development and where there is increasing development pressure.

  - **Program:** Residential development at higher densities will be allowed in the area currently served by sanitary sewer and public water or which is expected to be served by sewer and water in the lifetime of the Plan. Development of these areas will be allowed only when sewer service is available. Residential densities in these areas will range from one to four units per acre, and in those cases where adjacent sewered residential development already exists; the new development will be required to match existing densities along the boundaries.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** Assure the availability of safe and affordable housing for residents and allocate sufficient land area to accommodate current and future populations.

  - **Objective:** Provide well-constructed and maintained housing with proper urban services.

  - **Policy:** Provide sufficient land on the land use plan map for residential development that will allow a range of market values for the creation of housing for various income levels.

  - **Policy:** Provide for smaller lot sizes in sewered areas to allow for affordable single-family and multifamily housing.

  - **Policy:** Provide low- to medium-density suburban and rural residential development in specified areas on the land use plan map.

  - **Policy:** Allow residential development outside the Allenton area in specified areas and only at densities compatible with the basically rural character of the Town, as designated on the land use plan map.
Policy: Maintain the rural atmosphere and provide for open space needs by encouraging cluster type residential development in areas where it is appropriate.

Policy: Protect the character of residential neighborhoods by precluding the encroachment of incompatible land uses, and minimizing adverse impacts on the environment.

Program: Residential development at higher densities will be allowed in the area currently served by sanitary sewer and public water or which is expected to be served by sewer and water in the lifetime of the Plan. Development of these areas will be allowed only when sewer is available. Residential densities in these areas will range from one to four units per acre, and in those cases where adjacent sewered residential development already exists; the new development will be required to match existing densities along the boundaries.

Economic Development Element

- Goal: Preserve agricultural lands and protect farming operations.
- Objective: Preserve in agricultural use those lands best suited to agricultural uses within the Town to protect both the rural character and the economic base.

TOWN OF BARTON

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Barton: 2035 which was adopted by the Town Board on April 15, 2008 and summarize how the Town of Barton addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- Goal: Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining farmland.
- Policy: The preservation of prime agricultural lands ensures that the most productive existing farmlands will remain available for the provision of food and fiber; contributes to the agricultural and agricultural-related economy of the area; maximizes the return on capital invested in agricultural irrigation and drainage systems and soil and water conservation practices; minimizes conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban and suburban land uses; and contributes to energy conservation, since prime agricultural soils require less energy to farm than do other soils.
- Policy: Agricultural lands not classified as prime agricultural lands or farmland of statewide or local significance may be protected.
- Policy: General agricultural lands of local significance, although not meeting criteria for prime agricultural lands, constitute an important part of the agricultural base of the Town and thereby warrant preservation in agricultural use. Farms with soils having limited agricultural capability which are devoted to orchards and specialty crops typify this category of farmland. The preservation of such farmland also serves to maintain the local economic base, preserves the rural life-style and community character, controls urban and suburban sprawl, and controls the public costs typically associated with urban and suburban sprawl.
- Program: Provide agricultural zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms, in addition to exclusive agricultural zoning for prime agricultural lands, to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.
- Program: Designate suitable lands for agricultural use on the Town Land Use Plan Map.

- Goal: Protect, preserve, and wisely use the Town’s natural resources.
- Objective: Encourage the preservation of natural resources as part of future development proposals.
- Policy: Open rural lands contribute to the preservation of non-agricultural environmental areas by providing an important open space buffer around urban and suburban development. The
preservation of agricultural lands, including open rural lands of marginal agricultural value, promotes a compact and efficient form of urban and suburban development and discourages diffused urban and suburban growth, thus avoiding the potential adverse impacts of urban and suburban sprawl development.

Land Use Element

- **Goal:** Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining farmland.
  - **Policy:** The preservation of prime agricultural lands ensures that the most productive existing farmlands will remain available for the provision of food and fiber; contributes to the agricultural and agricultural-related economy of the area; maximizes the return on capital invested in agricultural irrigation and drainage systems and soil and water conservation practices; minimizes conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban and suburban land uses; and contributes to energy conservation, since prime agricultural soils require less energy to farm than do other soils.
  - **Policy:** Agricultural lands not classified as prime agricultural lands or farmland of statewide or local significance by the USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service may be protected.
  - **Policy:** General agricultural lands of local significance, although not meeting criteria for prime agricultural lands, constitute an important part of the agricultural base of the Town and thereby warrant preservation in agricultural use. Farms with soils having limited agricultural capability which are devoted to orchards and specialty crops typify this category of farmland. The preservation of such farmland also serves to maintain the local economic base, preserves the rural life-style and community character, controls urban and suburban sprawl, and controls the public costs typically associated with urban and suburban sprawl.
  - **Program:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.
- **Goal:** Protect, preserve, and wisely use the Town’s natural resource base.
  - **Policy:** Open rural lands contribute to the preservation of non-agricultural environmental areas by providing an important open space buffer around urban and suburban development. The preservation of agricultural lands, including open rural lands of marginal agricultural value, promotes a compact and efficient form of urban and suburban development and discourages diffused urban and suburban growth, thus avoiding the potential adverse impacts of urban and suburban sprawl development.
- **Goal:** Foster compact development patterns.
  - **Objective:** The planned supply of land set aside for any given use should approximate the known and anticipated demand for that use.
  - **Policy:** The appropriate allocation of uses to land, through the use of transitional land uses, open space, clustering, or distance and landscaped buffer areas between land uses of differing land use intensities to enhance the quality of life.

Housing Element

- **Goal:** Encourage a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of Town residents.
  - **Objective:** Encourage flexibility in zoning to accommodate a variety of housing options.
    - **Policy:** Allocate sufficient land area for housing to accommodate current and future Town residents.
- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Town residents.

Economic Development Element

- **Goal:** Encourage economic development desired by the Town in appropriate areas.
- **Policy:** Encourage continued agricultural uses on lands identified in the Land Use Element of this report as best suited for long-term farmland preservation, in order to maintain an agricultural economy in the Town.
- **Program:** Identify lands to be retained in long-term agricultural use on the Town land use plan map.

**TOWN OF ERIN**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Erin: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on June 16, 2008 and summarize how the Town of Erin addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Issues and Opportunities Element**

- **Goal:** To maintain the unique beauty of the Town.
  - **Objective:** Recognize and preserve the critical role that farmland, open space, historical architecture, scenic vistas and landscapes, natural resources and features, rustic roads, the Loew Lake Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest, the Ice Age Trail, Holy Hill, and the archaeological and cultural features play in defining and enhancing the Town’s historic and rural character.
  - **Objective:** Design to preserve open space.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

- **Goal:** Encourage voluntary conservation measures.
  - **Objective:** Affirm and encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture.
  - **Objective:** Recognize and preserve the critical role that farmland, open space, historical architecture, scenic vistas and landscapes, natural resources and features, rustic roads, the Loew Lake Unit of the Kettle Moraine State Forest, the Ice Age Trail, Holy Hill, and the archaeological and cultural features play in defining and enhancing the Town’s historic and rural character.
  - **Policy:** Preserve and enhance the landscape. All development and land divisions should be configured to preserve the natural landforms, woodlands, and environmental features. Try to preserve existing hedgerows and woodlands surrounding farming areas and homesteads.
  - **Policy:** Encourage the reuse of older structures that reflect the historic rural character of the area such as farmsteads, barns, silos, fences, and similar items, and do not categorize them as non-conforming.
  - **Program:** Amend the Town Land Division Ordinance to require land divisions to be designed to preserve natural landforms, woodlands, and environmental features, and existing hedgerows and woodlands surrounding farming areas and homesteads.
  - **Program:** Conserve agricultural structures. Many traditional agricultural barns and structures do not conform to conventional zoning regulations and development patterns, yet many of the structures are definitely part of a rural landscape and reflect the history of the Town. Such structures should be conserved and allowed to be utilized in accordance with land use guidelines where possible.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** To preserve both the rural character and economic base of the Town.
- **Goal:** To achieve a logical relationship between existing and new land uses.
  - **Objective:** Affirm and encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture.
  - **Objective:** Limit residential development to densities and locations compatible with the rural character of the Town.
- **Objective**: Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the Town: agriculture, tourism, recreation, and residents’ needs.
  - **Policy**: To limit residential development to densities and in locations compatible with the rural character of the Town, and therefore avoid the need to provide urban facilities and services to such development.

**Housing Element**
- **Goal**: In cooperation with neighboring communities, support a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.
  - **Policy**: Limit residential development to densities and locations compatible with the rural character of the Town. Multi-family housing should occur in nearby communities that provide public sanitary sewer and public water supply services.
  - **Policy**: Allocate sufficient land area for housing to accommodate current and future Town residents.
    - **Program**: Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the Town land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated population of the Town in 2035.
    - **Program**: Work with agencies, organizations, and developers to implement creative ideas for providing low and moderate income housing in the Town while maintaining rural densities.

**Economic Development Element**
- **Goal**: Preserve both the rural character and economic base of the Town.
- **Objective**: Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the Town; agriculture, tourism, recreation, and residents’ needs.
  - **Policy**: Affirm and encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture.

**TOWN OF FARMINGTON**
The following goals, objectives (actions), policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Farmington: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on January 19, 2010 and summarize how the Town of Farmington addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Issues and Opportunities Element**
- **Goal**: Respect a farmer’s “right to farm.”
- **Goal**: Preserve rural character, which are those qualities that make it feel as though one is living in the “country” as opposed to an “urban” setting. Rural qualities include farming operations, undeveloped open space, lakes, minimal public lighting, low traffic volume, and quiet surroundings.
- **Objective (Action)**: Enforce the “right to farm” language in the Town’s Subdivision Ordinance that requires a warning to be placed on the face of a CSM or plat that there are implications of living next to farming operations.
- **Objective (Action)**: The Town of Farmington’s Plan Commission and Town Board will strive to be good stewards of prime farmland.
**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve as much as possible open- and agriculturally-utilized lands, which will continue to enhance the character and desirability of the Town of Farmington, and is in the best interests of all residents.
  - **Objective (Action):** Preserve farmland.
  - **Objective (Action):** Strive to preserve open space.
  - **Objective (Action):** Cooperate with the DNR to identify additional lands that the DNR may acquire for the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area.
    - **Policy:** Create Hamlet Growth areas on the Town land use plan map that will preserve agricultural uses while providing for future development needs near, or adjacent to, existing development and where there is increasing development pressure.
    - **Policy:** The Town will strive to preserve open space through the application of density standards, as described in the Land Use Element and implemented through Town ordinances.
    - **Policy:** Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities.
    - **Program:** As a way of preserving agricultural and open space lands, consider adoption of Development Impact Fees, Property Transfer Rights, Purchase of Development Rights, and conservation easements.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve open and agriculturally-utilized lands, which will continue to enhance the character and desirability of the Town of Farmington, and is in the best interests of all residents.
  - **Policy:** Encourage the protection of agricultural and high-quality open space lands through public and non-profit conservation organization (NCO) fee simple purchase and conservation easements.
  - **Policy:** Buffer new development from adjacent rural uses by requiring the use of berms and landscaping to help maintain rural character.
  - **Program:** Apply the Town zoning and subdivision ordinances to maintain a 1.5-acre residential density in the Hamlet areas and a three-acre residential density in the Country Estates areas designated on the land use plan map.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town as much as possible.
- **Goal:** Strive to accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.
  - **Objective (Action):** To focus limited urban residential development in and around existing hamlets, and other areas designated on the Town land use plan map.
  - **Objective (Action):** Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the Town land use plan map to accommodate anticipated population growth by 2035.
  - **Objective (Action):** Consider proposals by government agencies and developers to implement creative ideas for providing low- and moderate-income housing in the Town while maintaining appropriate rural densities.
Economic Development Element

- **Goal:** Provide suitable locations for commercial and industrial development.
- **Objective (Action):** The Town prefers small-scale economic development with limited impacts on the Town’s rural character and natural resources.
- **Objective (Action):** Encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture.

**TOWN OF GERMANTOWN**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035* and summarize how the Town of Germantown addresses the future of agriculture in its community. The Germantown Town Board adopted Washington County’s comprehensive plan as the Town’s comprehensive plan on May 14, 2008.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- **Goal:** Preserve agricultural lands and protect farming operations as long as they remain viable in the Town.
- **Objective:** Develop methods to protect and preserve productive agricultural lands.

Land Use Element

- **Goal:** Guide the proper distribution and location of population and of various land uses.
- **Objective:** Encourage land use decisions that would reduce conflict from incompatible adjacent land uses.

Housing Element

- **Goal:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, provide for a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of residents.
- **Objective:** Encourage flexible zoning to accommodate a variety of housing options.
- **Objective:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, promote affordable housing choices for people who work in the Town of Germantown.

Economic Development Element

- **Goal:** Continue to conserve and stabilize the economic values of the community.
- **Objective:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, promote affordable housing choices for people who work in the Town of Germantown.

**TOWN OF HARTFORD**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Hartford: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on April 13, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Hartford addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

Issues and Opportunities Element

- **Goal:** Maintain and preserve the Town’s overall rural character.
- **Objective:** Strive to preserve agricultural lands, environmental resources, and other open spaces.
- **Objective:** Allow farm-related and farm family residences in agricultural areas.
- **Objective:** Strive to preserve and protect the scenic and aesthetic resources of the Town.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- **Goal:** Protect environmental resources.
- **Objective:** Preserve agricultural lands, environmental resources, and other open spaces.
- **Objective:** Retain agricultural lands for exclusive agricultural use, concentrating on productive farm attributes and areas that are free from nonfarm development.
- **Objective:** Maintain adequate distance between nonfarm development and farming operations to reduce potential conflicts.
  - **Policy:** Preserve productive farmlands, particularly those parcels scoring 7.0 or above in the LESA analysis and designated for Agricultural Preservation on the Town land use plan map, to ensure they will remain available for the provision of food and fiber; contribute to the agricultural and agricultural-related economy of the area; maximize the return on capital invested in agricultural irrigation and drainage systems and soil and water conservation practices; and minimize conflicts between farming operations and activities associated with urban and suburban land uses.
  - **Policy:** Support private initiatives to protect rural lands through the use of conservation strategies such as easements, covenants, and deed restrictions.
  - **Policy:** Allow farm-related and farm family residences in agricultural areas. New residential lots in areas designated for Agricultural Preservation that are created for a farm owner, operator, worker, or parent or child of a farm operator must meet the requirements of the Town zoning and land division ordinances, and the following requirements: the lot will not convert land that has been devoted primarily to agricultural uses; the lot will not limit or detract from the surrounding land’s potential for agricultural use; the lot will not conflict with farming operations on other properties; the lot will make use of existing access roads if practical or is part of an existing farmstead; and will be designed in a way to maintain a rural setting.
  - **Policy:** Create transitional areas on the Town land use plan map that will preserve agricultural uses while providing for future development needs near, or adjacent to, existing development and where there is increasing development pressure.
  - **Policy:** Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e. native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf/grass, rain gardens, and bioswales should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability. The use of conservation subdivision design that results in less street and driveway pavement and provides more open space than a conventional subdivision design should also be encouraged.

- **Program:** Encourage the continuation of agricultural uses in areas designated for agriculture on the Town land use plan map through administration of the Town’s zoning and land division ordinances. Lands designated for Agricultural Preservation on the land use plan map should be placed in the Agricultural Preservation (AP) zoning district. Lands designated as Agricultural Transition on the land use plan map should be placed in the Agricultural Transition (AT) zoning district.

- **Program:** Consider amending the Town zoning ordinance to establish a maximum number of residences that may be constructed for family members on parcels zoned AP or AT.

**Land Use Element**

- **Goal:** Limit development to maintain and preserve the Town’s overall rural character.
- **Objective:** Strive to preserve and protect the scenic and aesthetic resources of the Town.
- **Objective:** Urban development should not detract from the Town’s rural nature or conflict with environmental objectives.
- **Program:** Implement the programs recommended in the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element (Chapter V) to protect agricultural lands and natural resources, and to accommodate nonmetallic mining (extractive) uses.

- **Program:** Continue to work with the City of Hartford and the Villages of Richfield and Slinger to develop boundary and/or cooperative agreements to provide for orderly growth, appropriate services, and the protection of productive agricultural lands and natural resources.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, support an appropriate range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.

- **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town outside planned sewer service areas.

- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Town residents.

  - **Objective:** Allow residential development in appropriate areas as designated on the Town land use plan map.

  - **Policy:** Consider allowing multi-family housing, including condominium and rental units, in areas contiguous to existing urban development and in areas that are served or will be served by sanitary sewer and public water prior to development.

  - **Program:** Work with government agencies and developers to implement creative ideas for providing low and moderate income housing in the Town while maintaining appropriate densities.

**Economic Development Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve agricultural lands and protect farming operations.

  - **Objective:** Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the Town; agriculture, recreation, and residents’ needs.

  - **Objective:** Maintain the economic stability of the farming community to help preserve the rural character and open spaces of the Town.

  - **Policy:** Support economic development organizations that act to retain and create employment opportunities, including agricultural-related jobs and businesses, for residents of the Town.

**TOWN OF JACKSON**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in the *Village and Town of Jackson Comprehensive Plan: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on August 10, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Jackson addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

- **Goal:** The Town supports productive agricultural activities.

  - **Objective:** The Town of Jackson benefits from a vibrant agricultural sector and an open farm landscape. Farm products and the processing of farm products can still be a significant local source of income and employment.

  - **Objective:** When Town residents were asked on the 2006 Comprehensive Planning Community Survey how they would like to describe the Town in the future, a total of 80% of respondents chose either “Mixed agricultural/residential area” or “Predominantly open space, agricultural area.”
- **Policy/Program:** Discourage additional new subdivisions in agricultural areas by supporting a low growth scenario in which most residential construction occurs within or adjacent to the Village of Jackson or within pre-existing subdivisions in the Town.

- **Policy/Program:** Strive to create awareness of the importance of agriculture through a variety of methods that may include a “buyer/seller beware” conflict policy protecting the right to farm in the Town of Jackson.

- **Policy/Program:** Consider distributing, either directly or through area realtors, a “Rural Code of Conduct” that outlines the traditional community norms and expectations for residents.

- **Goal:** Hobby farms are appropriate in designated districts.
  - **Objective:** This goal does not mean the Town is encouraging hobby farms. Nevertheless, hobby farms would be preferred over non-farm development in certain agricultural areas of the Town.
  - **Policy/Program:** Strive to periodically review the Town of Jackson Zoning Ordinance to ensure that the specialized and sometimes changing needs of hobby farm operations are considered.

- **Goal:** Distinctive open space/green space is very important in the Town of Jackson.
  - **Objective:** Such lands help create the Town’s rural character and also provide outdoor recreation, vegetative buffers, flood and stormwater management, habitat preservation, air and surface water quality improvement, aesthetics and community focal points.
  - **Policy/Program:** Strive to help landowners become aware of potentially tax deductible options for land preservation offered by the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust.
  - **Policy/Program:** Continue encouraging clustering and conservation designs for future residential developments in order to preserve open space and natural areas.

**Land Use Goals, Objectives, Policies, and Programs**

- **Goal:** Agricultural productivity and distinctive open space within the Town shall be a high priority in land use decision-making.
  - **Objective:** When asked about their preference for the future of the Town of Jackson, 80% of respondents to the 2006 Comprehensive Planning Community Survey favored either a “Mixed agricultural/residential area” or a “Predominantly open space, agricultural area.” Further, 81% of respondents to the 2007 Town of Jackson Vision Statement and Goals Survey agreed with this goal. This is not surprising, since agriculture is a significant part of the economy of the Town and influences the character of the Town as much as any other land use. Further, these responses are supported by the findings in the Town’s comprehensive plan related to vacant subdivision lots and groundwater contamination susceptibility.
  - **Policy/Program:** In the white area designated as “Agricultural/Open Space” on the Projected Land Use Map, deny rezoning requests for non-agricultural development unless an amendment to the Town’s comprehensive plan is adopted. A limited number of new or expanded non-agricultural uses may be allowed if the developer submits compelling evidence that the proposed use is in harmony with the vision, goals, policies, and programs of the Town’s comprehensive plan.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** The Town prefers low-density, owner-occupied housing.
  - **Objective:** In the 2007 Vision Statement and Goals Survey, 89% of respondents agreed with this goal in favor of single-family housing. While there was some small support for other housing types in the 2006 Comprehensive Planning Community Survey, the Town is rural and in most areas lacks public water and sewer. In general, multi-family and specialized housing types are better suited to nearby cities and villages.
- **Policy/program:** The Town’s 2025 Projected Land Use Map will favor single-family housing. Developers with proposals for non-single-family housing will generally be referred to nearby cities and villages, but some provision may be made for a limited number of other housing types under the existing R-2 Two-Family Residential District or the R-3 Multi-Family Residential District of the Town of Jackson Zoning Ordinance.

- **Policy/program:** The Town may allow limited higher density single-family development adjacent to the Village of Jackson.

- **Goal:** The Town favors a low growth scenario in which most residential development occurs adjacent to the Village of Jackson or within pre-existing subdivisions in the Town.

- **Policy/program:** To encourage most future growth to be concentrated in or adjacent to the Village, the Town will continue to abide by the policies within the Village of Jackson and Town of Jackson Revenue Sharing Agreement and Cooperative Boundary Plan.

- **Policy/program:** Since infrastructure is already in place, and services such as snowplowing must be done even though there may be only a handful of houses on a street, it makes sense to encourage the build-out of existing subdivisions to reduce the number of vacant lots in the Town. Therefore, the Town should consider requiring that the construction of housing in new subdivisions be done in phases.

- **Goal:** The Town will continue to explore ways of managing growth that are respectful of private property rights.

- **Policy/program:** The Town of Jackson will explore and generally give precedence to incentive based growth management tools over restriction based tools.

- **Goal:** The Town strongly encourages quality residential development that maintains the natural amenities of the Town.

- **Policy/program:** The Town may provide an incentive to developers of well-designed conservation subdivisions that make preservation of on-site amenities a priority.

- **Goal:** The Town will work with the Village of Jackson and nearby communities to meet the need for low and moderate income housing. *(This goal required by statute.)*

- **Objective:** The first dwellings for young families are seldom high-end homes. Such families typically rely on apartments, condominiums, or modest homes on small lots. None of these housing options are well suited to a rural area like the Town of Jackson with large lots and little or no public water or sewer.

- **Policy/program:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, generally encourage initiatives to provide an appropriate number of quality low and moderate income housing options.

**Economic Development Element**

- **Goal:** The Town supports economic development that is compatible with the Town’s rural atmosphere.

- **Objective:** While some major economic development may be beneficial, 80% of respondents to the 2006 Comprehensive Planning Community Survey preferred a mixed agricultural, residential, and open space landscape. Future economic development would likely be compatible with this preference.

- **Policy/Program:** The Town will continue to work with developers to approve compatible hours of operation, signage, lighting, parking, and landscaping requirements to meet the Town’s desire for well-planned growth and rural character preservation.

**TOWN OF KEWASKUM**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Kewaskum: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on October 9, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Kewaskum addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Issues and Opportunities Element**

- **Goal:** Protect the Town of Kewaskum's agricultural lands and farming operations.

- **Objective:** Identify agricultural soils (Class I and II soils)
- **Objective**: Discourage non-farm related residential and commercial development in areas designated for agricultural use.
- **Objective**: Encourage the development of hobby farms on areas with agricultural soils.
- **Objective**: Require 10 acre minimum density in farmland areas.
- **Goal**: Protect the Kettle Moraine State Forest from encroaching development.
- **Objective**: Allow agriculture, forestry, and similar activities on lands adjacent to the State Forest.
- **Goal**: Accommodate residential development only in areas designated for Residential Use.
- **Objective**: Discourage non-farm residential development in areas designated for agricultural use.

### Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- **Goal**: Maintain and enhance the rural landscape of the Town of Kewaskum.
- **Goal**: Protect the Town of Kewaskum's agricultural lands and farming operations.
- **Objective**: Identify prime (Class I and II) agricultural soils.
- **Objective**: Encourage the development of hobby farms on areas with agricultural soils.
  - **Policy**: Require 10-acre minimum density in farmland areas.
  - **Policy**: Discourage non-farm related residential and commercial development in areas designated for agricultural use.
  - **Policy**: Allow agriculture, forestry, and similar activities on lands adjacent to the State Forest.
  - **Policy**: Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities.

### Land Use Element

- **Goal**: Protect the Town of Kewaskum's agricultural lands and farming operations.
- **Goal**: Maintain and enhance the rural landscape of the Town of Kewaskum.
- **Goal**: Protect the Kettle Moraine State Forest from encroaching development.
- **Goal**: Accommodate residential development primarily in areas designated for Residential use.
- **Objective**: Encourage the development of hobby farms on areas with agricultural soils.
- **Objective**: Require 10 acre minimum density in farmland areas.
- **Objective**: Discourage non-farm residential development in areas designated for agricultural use.
- **Objective**: Require residential development standards and designs which protect and maximize natural, scenic and open space qualities.
  - **Policy/Program**: Discourage non-farm related residential and commercial development in areas designated for agricultural-open space use.
  - **Policy/Program**: Allow agriculture, forestry and similar activities on lands adjacent to the State Forest.
  - **Policy/Program**: Land use of properties adjacent to State Forest lands shall be restricted to the Agricultural-Open Space category, including residential development at a density of no more than one home per five acres.
  - **Policy/Program**: Land divisions in the Agricultural Preservation category shall have a minimum 10 acre density.
- **Policy/Program:** The following criteria shall be considered when creating a residential lot for a farm owner, operator, or worker:
  - The proposed lot shall be no more than one acre in size, while maintaining an overall density of no more than one home per 10 acres of land.
  - The proposed lot will not convert land that is tillable, unless no other land is available for such use.
  - The proposed lot will not limit or detract from the surrounding land's potential for agricultural use.
  - The proposed lot will not conflict with farming operations on other properties.
  - The proposed lot makes use of existing access roads where practical, and/or is part of an existing farmstead, or the site is designed in a way to maintain a rural setting.
  - Businesses which are related to or compatible with farming operations may be permitted if the following criteria are met:
  - The proposed business and use presents a minimal impact to farming operations and agricultural land.
  - Areas identified as environmental corridors within the Agricultural Preservation category shall be restricted to agricultural and open space uses.

**Housing Element**

- **Goal:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, support a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.
- **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town.
- **Goal:** Accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.
- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Town residents.
  - **Program:** Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the Town land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated population of the Town in 2035.

**Economic Development Element**

- **Goal:** Encourage the preservation of agricultural lands.
  - **Policy:** Identify lands for agricultural-open space use on the Town land use plan map in order to maintain an agricultural economy in the Town.

**TOWN OF POLK**
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Polk: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on September 8, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Polk addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Issues and Opportunities Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining viable farmland.
  - **Objective:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element**

- **Goal:** Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining viable farmland.
  - **Policy:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.
- **Policy:** The Town of Polk does not support the use of regulatory tools to preserve farmland. The Town believes that farmland preservation should be on a volunteer basis. If the agricultural landowner chooses to be a working land enterprise area or participate in a purchase of development rights program, the Town would encourage such programs, provided they are funded by Federal, State, or County funds.

- **Policy:** Encourage the protection of high-quality agricultural lands and natural resource areas through public and non-profit conservation organization (NCO) fee simple purchase and purchase of conservation easements.

- **Policy:** Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, rain gardens, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e. native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf or grass should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability.

- **Program:** Continue to allow a wide variety of agricultural uses in the Town in accordance with the requirements of the A-1 (General Agricultural) district in the Town zoning ordinance.

**Land Use Element**
- **Goal:** Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining viable farmland.
  - **Policy:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.

**Housing Element**
- **Goal:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, support a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.
- **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town.
- **Goal:** Accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.
- **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Town residents.
  - **Objective:** Allow residential development in appropriate areas as designated on the Town land use plan map.
    - **Program:** Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the Town land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated population of the Town in 2035.

**Economic Development Element**
- **Goal:** Preserve rural character and support country living by retaining viable farmland.
  - **Policy:** Provide zoning that supports local family farm operations, small specialty farms, and hobby farms to maintain agriculture as a part of the rural landscape.

**TOWN OF TRENTON**
The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Trenton: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on April 21, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Trenton addresses the future of agriculture in its community.
Issues and Opportunities Element

- Goal: Preserve high-quality open space lands to protect the underlying natural resource base and enhance the social and economic well-being and environmental quality of the area.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- Goal: Preserve prime agricultural lands in order to provide an agricultural reserve for future generations, to protect the agricultural resource base of the Town, and to preserve the rural character of the Town.
- Objective: The proper relation of urban and rural land use development to soil type and distribution can serve to avoid costly environmental and developmental problems, aid in the establishment of better settlement patterns, and promote the wise use of an irreplaceable resource.
- Policy: Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e., native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf/grass, and rain gardens should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability. The use of conservation subdivision design that results in less street and driveway pavement and provides more open space than a conventional subdivision design is also encouraged.

Land Use Element

- Goal: A spatial distribution of various yet compatible land uses which are properly related to supporting transportation, utility, and public facility systems.
- Goal: Encourage residential development outside the West Bend and Newburg sewer service areas only at densities and in locations compatible with the basically rural character of the Town and thus avoid the need to provide costly urban facilities and services to such development.
- Objective: Encourage new intensive urban development—residential development on small lots, commercial development, and industrial development—in planned urban service areas where essential urban services, including municipal sanitary sewer and public water systems, already are available or are planned to be provided in the near future. Some of the current services provided by the Town of Trenton are fire protection, police, and normal public works services such as road maintenance and snow plowing.
- Policy: Prime agricultural lands located outside planned urban service areas that are included in parcels at least 35 acres in size and in aggregates of 100 acres or more should be preserved for agricultural use.
- Program: Agricultural uses should be preserved through the application of zoning and land division regulations that allow only agricultural or agriculturally-related uses to occur in areas designated as “Prime Agricultural” on the Land Use Plan Map, and require a minimum parcel size of at least 35 acres.

Housing Element

- Goal: Provide opportunities for the adequate location and choice of housing and housing types for all residents, regardless of age, income, or household size.
- Goal: In cooperation with neighboring communities, support a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.
• **Goal:** Encourage new intensive urban development, including residential development on small lots, in planned urban service areas where essential urban services, including municipal sanitary sewer and public water systems, already are available or are planned to be provided in the near future.

• **Goal:** Encourage safe and decent housing for all Town residents.

• **Objective:** Housing development in the Town of Trenton area should include a full range of housing types, sizes, and cost.

  - **Policy:** All lands developed or proposed to be developed for urban residential use should be located in areas that can be served by an existing public sanitary sewerage system.

  - **Policy:** All lands developed or proposed to be developed for urban residential use should be located in areas that can be served by an existing or planned public water supply system.

  - **Policy:** Residential densities in the Town of Trenton should generally be allocated as follows:

    1. Approximately 14 percent of all housing units in the Town of Trenton should consist of single-family housing units located on lots with an area of at least five acres or an equivalent overall density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres in areas designated as Country Estates or Rural Density Residential on Map 11 of the Town’s comprehensive plan.

    2. Approximately 5 percent of all housing units should consist of suburban-density, single family housing units on about one and one-half to five-acre lots, or 0.2 to 0.6 dwelling units per net acre, in areas designated as Suburban Density on Map 11 of the Town’s comprehensive plan.

    3. Approximately 50 percent of all housing units should consist of low-density, single-family housing units on about one to one and one-half acre lots, or 0.7 to one dwelling units per net acre, in areas designated as Low Density on Map 11 of the Town’s comprehensive plan.

    4. Approximately 30 percent of all housing units should consist of medium-density, single family housing units on about 6,500 square feet to one-acre lots, or 1.1 to 6.9 dwelling units per net acre, in areas designated as Medium Density on Map 11 of the Town’s comprehensive plan. These lots should be developed and infilled in existing developments or within the planned sanitary sewer service areas of either the City of West Bend or the Village of Newburg.

    5. Approximately 1 percent of all housing units should consist of two-family and multi-family housing units at densities ranging from seven to 17.9 dwelling units per net acre, in areas designated as Medium Density on Map 11 of the Town’s comprehensive plan. These lots should be developed and infilled in existing developments or within the planned sanitary sewer service areas of either the City of West Bend or the Village of Newburg.

  - **Program:** Continue to include zoning districts in the Town zoning ordinance that accommodate a full range of housing structure types, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwelling units, in appropriate locations to provide affordable housing options for households of all income levels, ages, and special needs.

  - **Program:** Begin/continue discussions with the City of West Bend and Village of Newburg to develop boundary agreements between the Town and each municipality that would address the extension of public sanitary sewer and other services to Town residents.

**Economic Development Element**

• **Goal:** Preserve prime agricultural lands in order to provide an agricultural reserve for future generations, to protect the agricultural resource base of the Town, and to preserve the rural character of the Town.

• **Objective:** Preserve in agricultural use those lands best suited to agricultural uses within the Town to protect both the rural character and the economic base.

**TOWN OF WAYNE**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Wayne: 2035* which was adopted by the Town Board on March 18, 2009 and summarize how the Town of Wayne addresses the future of agriculture in its community.
Issues and Opportunities Element

- **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town.
- **Objective:** Limit residential development to densities and locations compatible with the rural character of the Town.

Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element

- **Goal:** Encourage the preservation of agricultural lands.
- **Goal:** Maintain the existing landscape and natural beauty of the Town.
- **Objective:** Preserve in agricultural use those lands best suited to agricultural uses within the Town to protect both the rural character and the economic base.
  - **Policy:** Discourage the conversion of agricultural lands, particularly those scoring 6.8 or above in the LESA analysis, to non-farm uses.
  - **Program:** Continuation of agricultural uses, preservation of natural resources, or residential development at an average density of at least five acres per home are recommended in areas identified as having very high or high groundwater recharge potential, in order to preserve groundwater recharge capabilities. If urban-density development is allowed, land development and stormwater management practices such as the use of permeable pavement, set-aside open space, landscaping with drought-tolerant plants (i.e. native plants) and landscape mulch versus turf/grass, rain gardens, and bioswales should be integrated into the site design and development to help preserve groundwater recharge capability. The use of conservation subdivision design that results in less street and driveway pavement and provides more open space than a conventional subdivision design should also be encouraged.

Land Use Element

- **Goal:** Maintain the existing landscape and natural beauty of the Town.
- **Goal:** Achieve a logical relationship between existing and proposed land uses.
- **Goal:** Accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.
  - **Objective:** To focus limited urban development in and around existing hamlets, including Wayne, Kohlsville, and St. Kilian, areas that scored below 6.8 on the LESA analysis (less productive agricultural areas), and other areas designated on the Town land use plan map.
  - **Objective:** Protect farmable lands by using conservation subdivision techniques specific to preserving agriculture.
    - **Policy:** Encourage site layouts that preserve soils best suited for agricultural use, and locate homes, driveways, and other structures on less productive soils.
    - **Program:** Consider amending the Town land division ordinance to require the submittal of soils maps with preliminary plats that indicate agricultural soil capability classes for soils on the site. Similar amendments to the Town zoning ordinance will be considered for proposed conditional uses and rezoning applications.
    - **Program:** Amend the Town zoning ordinance to include an option for conservation subdivisions that preserve that portion of the parent parcel not included in new lots or streets for agricultural use. The Town Board may require use of this option, at its discretion.

Housing Element

- **Goal:** In cooperation with neighboring communities, support a range of housing types to serve the varied and special needs of area residents.
• **Goal:** Maintain the rural character of the Town.
• **Goal:** Accommodate new residential development at appropriate densities.
• **Goal:** Provide safe and decent housing for all Town residents.
  - **Program:** Allocate sufficient area for residential development on the Town land use plan map to accommodate the anticipated population of the Town in 2035.

**Economic Development Element**

• **Goal:** Communicate with existing local businesses and work to retain them, if possible.
• **Goal:** Encourage economic development desired by the Town in appropriate areas.
  - **Objective:** Allow and attract businesses that support the primary economic activities in the Town; agriculture, tourism, recreation, and residents’ needs.
  - **Objective:** Maintain the economic stability of the farming community to help preserve the rural character and open spaces of the Town.
  - **Objective:** Preserve in agricultural use those lands best suited to agricultural uses within the Town to protect both the rural character and the economic base.
    - **Policy:** Discourage the conversion of agricultural lands, particularly those scoring 6.8 or above in the LESA analysis, to non-farm uses in order to maintain an agricultural economy in the Town.
    - **Policy:** Affirm and encourage traditional and alternative forms of agriculture.
      - **Program:** Identify suitable areas for commercial and industrial development on the Town land use plan map.

**TOWN OF WEST BEND**

The following goals, objectives, policies, and programs are found in the *Town of West Bend Comprehensive Plan: 2025* which was adopted by the Town Board on October 12, 2005 and summarize how the Town of West Bend addresses the future of agriculture in its community.

**Issues and Opportunities Element**

• **Goal:** Limit growth and development to the identified districts and policies.
  - **Objective:** Preserve and protect the scenic and traditional resources of the Town.
  - **Objective:** Support private and public initiatives to protect natural features through the use of conservation strategies such as easements, covenants, and deed restrictions.

**Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources**

• **Goal:** Protect environmental resources.
  - **Objective:** Encourage the use of natural resources as visual and physical amenities for development.

**Land Use**

**Issue:** Open Space Preservation

The Town has numerous natural features which should be preserved. Additional open space features should be incorporated with new development, both in residential and commercial areas. The undeveloped areas will maintain the natural character of the Town.

**Issue:** Agricultural Land

Existing agricultural land shall remain in production until the landowner decides to use the land for development purposes. When the land is developed it should follow the Rural Residential Development standards\(^3\) and have a minimum open space of 60 percent of total land area.

---

\(^3\) *Rural Residential Development entails an overall density of 1 unit per 3.5 acres (Comprehensive Plan: 2025, p. 28-30.)*
**Issue:** Environmental Resources

- The Town has numerous environmental features which should be preserved. Areas for preservation are identified, including the lakes, natural features, scenic views and roads. Limited development may be allowed in selected areas as determined in the land use plan.

### Environmental Conservancy

#### Land Management and Control

- Design to preserve open space.
- Use preservation techniques to protect the land.
  - Require deed restrictions, covenants, and easements that guarantee land control and management of natural resources.
  - Create restrictions that are difficult to change without broad public approval (such as referenda, unanimous agreements, and so forth).

#### Visual Character

- Protect all identified environmental corridors and conservancy areas.
- Development should not occur in any of the identified areas, and surrounding development should not negatively affect the visual connection to the natural feature.
- Surrounding development should not affect the growth of the landscape in the environmental corridor or increase the erosion of surrounding soils.

### Rural Residential Development

#### Activities and Uses

- Include shared open spaces.
- Design shared open spaces and natural features which will attract home buyers who value direct connection to rural landscape elements, natural element features, fields and woodlands, walking and hiking trails, horseback riding and (where feasible) agricultural uses.

#### Visual Character

- Locate houses to minimize disruption to the natural character.
  - Locate houses such that the houses are sited around open spaces that include environmental areas, fields, woodlands, pastures, or farmland.
  - Locate houses such that the houses will be visually overshadowed by important natural features such as woodlands, hedgerows, hills, or other key features of the landscape.

### Housing

- **Goal:** Permit limited residential development in the Town.
- **Objective:** Encourage open space development plans to be used for residential development to preserve the natural character of the Town.

### Economic Development Element

- **Goal:** Provide for limited commercial, retail and office development in select locations.
- **Objective:** Accommodate neighborhood-scale commercial development, which serves local residents and is consistent with the capacity of Town infrastructure.
- **Objective:** Direct retail centers and other high-intensity commercial development, other than those identified in the Land Use Plan districts, to existing urban communities.

### SUMMARY

Goals, objectives, policies, and programs adopted by Washington County and local governments often reveal the importance of the County's farmland, open space, and rural character. When comparing the adopted comprehensive plans of rural communities in Washington County, including all twelve Towns and the Villages of...
Germantown and Richfield, many similar recommendations related to farmland preservation and agricultural development emerge. Some key common goals, objectives, policies and programs that were adopted by multiple local governments in the rural areas of Washington County include:

- Preserve the rural character and small town atmosphere of the community.
- Support local farms including specialty, niche, and hobby farms.
- Establish a balanced spatial allocation of land uses between agricultural and non-agricultural land uses.
- Preserve agricultural lands, especially prime agricultural lands.
- Plan long-term for agriculture by designating such areas on future land use maps, often with the use of transition areas between agricultural and non-agricultural areas.
- Consult the results of the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis when planning future development.
- Direct non-agricultural development to hamlet areas or within sewer service areas.
- Utilize cluster development and conservation subdivisions when planning residential development to minimize the conversion of agricultural land to non-agricultural uses.
- Ensure that economic development coincides with the rural atmosphere of the community.

In terms of farmland preservation and related planning efforts, not only do local governments in the rural areas of the County share similar common goals, but there is much common ground among the goals of all communities and the County itself. Preservation of natural resources, which may include farmland, is important throughout Washington County. Many local comprehensive plans of both rural and urban communities identify ways to control expanding non-agricultural development such as redevelopment of existing areas and infill, compact, and cluster development as a means of preserving natural resources and farmland, especially prime farmland. Providing safe and decent housing is a common goal as well as providing a wide range of housing types and opportunities, which may be accomplished through cooperation with neighboring communities. Increased economic development is also important to many rural communities as long as it coincides with the community’s rural character and atmosphere.
INVENTORY OF AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The conservation and wise use of agricultural resources is fundamental to achieving strong and stable physical and economic development. Furthermore, agriculture is considered an essential aspect of community identity throughout the County. Information on the characteristics and location of agricultural resources in the County is needed to help properly locate future land uses. Since agricultural resources are limited and very difficult or impossible to replace if destroyed or converted to other uses, an inventory of these resources is necessary to ensure their protection and to avoid serious environmental problems. A clean and healthy environment contributes to the overall quality of life for the citizens of Washington County. It is therefore critical to the prosperity of Washington County that the use and management of resources be carefully tailored to their capacity.

This chapter provides inventory information on existing agricultural resources in Washington County. Additional relevant information regarding soil types, existing farmland, farming operations, topography and geology, and water resources is available in Chapter III of A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 which was adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2008. Chapter III also includes information on woodlands, natural areas and critical species habitats, environmental corridors, park and open space sites, and cultural (historical and archaeological) resources, areas and aspects which may be of consideration when determining which land should be preserved for agricultural use.

AGRICULTURAL LAND USE

In 2000, agricultural lands were identified by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) as part of the regional land use inventory conducted in conjunction with the regional planning program. The land use inventory identified croplands, pasture lands, orchards, nurseries, specialized farming, and non-residential farm buildings. Farm residences, together with a 20,000 square foot dwelling site, are classified as single-family residential land uses.¹

¹ See Chapter IV of Washington County's Comprehensive Plan for more information about the SEWRPC 2000 land use inventory.
Based on the land use inventory, about 141,755 acres, or about 222 square miles, were in agricultural use in 2000. Agricultural land made up 62 percent of all nonurban land uses and almost 51 percent of the County, making agriculture the predominant land use in Washington County. This measure includes lands actually used for agriculture, primarily cultivated lands and lands used for pasture, excluding the wetland and woodland portions of farm fields. As of 2000, much of the existing agricultural land was outside of urban service areas in the County, with the Towns of Addison, Wayne, Farmington, Jackson, and Trenton having the most land in agricultural use. Table T-11 sets forth the number of acres occupied by farmland in each local government and the County in 2000.

### Table T-11

**EXISTING AGRICULTURAL LANDS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Cultivated Lands (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Pasture Land and Unused Agricultural Land (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Orchards, Nurseries, and Specialty Crops (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Farm Buildings (acres)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Total (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnering Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>13,426</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>15,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>5,279</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>6,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Erin</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>4,052</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Farmington</td>
<td>11,789</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>14,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Germantown</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>10,152</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>11,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>6,058</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Kewaskum</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>9,072</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>10,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>9,353</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>11,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wayne</td>
<td>12,014</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partnering Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>7,349</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Jackson</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Newburg</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>11,281</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>1,499</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>13,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Richfield</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of West Bend</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>115,662</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>22,408</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2,753</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>141,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Lands</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SEWRPC and Washington County.

Map T-1 and Table T-11 show the area devoted to farmland use in 2000, categorized as follows:

- Cultivated Lands, which includes lands used for the cultivation of crops including row crops, grain crops, vegetable crops, and hay.

In 2000, 115,662 acres of agricultural land were used for cultivation, which includes row crops, grain crops, vegetable crops, and hay.
Map T-1
EXISTING AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2000

Ag land and environmental corridor data source: SEWRPC
Municipal boundary current as of January 1, 2011.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
• Pasture Land and Unused Agricultural Lands, which includes lands used as pasture, or lands which were formerly cultivated or used for pasture which have not yet succeeded to a wetland or woodland plant community.

• Orchards, Nurseries, and Specialty Crops, which includes lands used for orchards, nurseries, sod farms, and specialty crops such as mint, ginseng, and berry fields. Greenhouses are not included in this category, but are shown as commercial on the land use map in Chapter IV of the comprehensive plan.

• Farm Buildings, which includes barns, silos, and other buildings used to store farm equipment or supplies or house farm animals.

The 2006 land use inventory for the County is shown on Map 80 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan and is quantitatively summarized in Table T-12 while Figure 11 in the comprehensive plan presents a comparison of the percentage of the County devoted to various types of land uses in 2006. The 2006 generalized land use inventory differs somewhat from the detailed land use inventories conducted by SEWRPC in 2000 and prior years and is therefore not directly comparable to earlier inventories. Based on the 2006 inventory, 71,463 acres, or about 26 percent of the County, were in urban uses. A similar percentage, 25 percent or 70,189 acres, were encompassed in natural resource areas (woodlands, wetlands, and surface waters). Almost half of the County, about 47 percent or 129,754 acres, was in agricultural use.

In 2000, 932 acres were used for orchards, nurseries, and specialty crops in Washington County.

In 2000, the County had 22,408 acres of pasture land and unused agricultural lands.

In 2006, about 25 percent of the County was encompassed in natural resource areas (woodlands, wetlands, and surface waters).

In 2006, about 26 percent of the County was encompassed in urban uses.

\[2\] For a description of these differences see Existing Land Uses on page 340 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
### Table T-12
**EXISTING LAND USES IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Category</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent of Subtotal (Urban or Nonurban)</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>35,845</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>37,996</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>2,954</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>15,073</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Transportation and Utilities</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>16,538</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental and Institutional</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lands (Urban)</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lands in Conservation Subdivisions</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Subtotal</td>
<td>71,463</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonurban</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>22,948</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>42,739</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>70,189</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>129,754</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Lands (Rural)</td>
<td>5,935</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonurban Subtotal</td>
<td>207,293</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>278,756</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table, and the accompanying map, is more general than the land use inventory conducted in 2000. The two inventories are therefore not directly comparable, due to the inclusion of farmlands as an agricultural use on parcels of 20 acres or larger, the identification of certain parcels in the inventory conducted in 2000 as a commercial or industrial use on a property of 20 acres or larger, and the identification of all parcels as residential areas if a house was on the property in 2006, and the identification of all parcels as commercial or industrial if the majority of a parcel was developed with a commercial or industrial use (in prior inventories, areas devoted to landscaping and other open space on commercial and industrial parcels would have been coded as "open lands."). Also, areas under development in 2006 are included in the underlying category. For example, lands platted for residential use but not yet developed are included in the residential category.

### Table T-13
**FARM SIZE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th>State of Wisconsin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 acres</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 179 acres</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 499 acres</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 acres or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Farms</strong></td>
<td>831</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Farm Size (acres) 156 194

Median Farm Size (acres) 65 95


Table T-13 sets forth the number of farms by size category in Washington County and Wisconsin. There were 831 farms in the County in 2007. Most farms in the County were between 10 and 49 acres or 50 and 179 acres (68 percent combined). Only about 7 percent of farms were more than 500 acres in size. Nearly the same proportion of farms was between 10 and 500 acres Statewide (86 percent) as Countywide (nearly 84 percent). However, a greater percentage of the State's farms ranged from 180 to 499 acres in size than did County farms. Furthermore, the average farm size for Washington County was 156 acres compared to 194 acres for farms in the State. The median farm acreage for Washington County was 65 acres while Statewide the median farm size was 95 acres.

**Farmland Drainage Districts**

Midwestern farmlands can often become inundated with water; therefore, establishing proper drainage systems is a primary concern for farmers in Wisconsin. Farm drainage districts are special-purpose units of government authorized under Chapter 88 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. The majority of the existing drainage districts in the State were formed in the early 1900s. Farm drainage districts are formed to plan and carry out area-wide drainage improvements to correct problems of high water tables and poor drainage that interfere with agricultural uses and practices. Drainage systems also protect structures built below grade, such as basements and septic tanks, from periodic flooding. Landowners who benefit from drainage must pay assessment fees to cover the cost of constructing, maintaining, and repairing the district drains. A drainage district may lie in more than one local government and may also cross county boundaries.

---

1 Data included in this section includes lands owned by the farmer, not lands the farmer may rent.
There are two active drainage districts in Washington County, the Hartford-Addison Drainage District located in the southern portion of the Town of Addison and the northern portion of the Town of Hartford, and the Jackson-Germantown Drainage District located in the Town and Village of Jackson and northern portions of the Town and Village of Germantown. The Hartford-Addison District, which is shown on Map T-2, encompassed an area of 1,630 acres in 2011, with 1,052 acres located in the Town of Hartford and 578 acres located in the Town of Addison. The district, established in 1918, is governed by landowners in the district. The Jackson-Germantown District, which is shown on Map T-3, encompassed an area of 5,238 acres in 2011, with 3,184 acres located in the Town of Jackson, 348 acres in the Village of Jackson, 300 in the Town of Germantown, and 1,406 in the Village of Germantown. Presumably established in 1916, the district is still considered active by DATCP, but no activity, assessments or maintenance have taken place in several decades.

Wisconsin Act 121, enacted on March 20, 2008, amends Section 66.1001(2)(g) of the Statutes to require that the Intergovernmental Cooperation Element of the comprehensive plan analyze the relationship of the Town to any drainage districts located in the Town. The act also requires the Town notify the drainage district before taking action that would allow the development of a residential, commercial, or industrial property that would likely increase the amount of water that the main drain of the drainage district would have to accommodate. Drainage districts are required under this act to file with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP); the town board or town zoning committee; the city council, plan commission, or plan committee; and the county zoning administrator in which the district is located, a separate report for the preceding year stating the practices and policies of the district.

Drainage districts must also, beginning in 2009, and every three years thereafter, provide written notice to every person who owns land in the district that such land is in the district, along with contact information for every member of the drainage board. Drainage districts are also required to annually provide contact information for every member of the drainage board to the State drainage engineer and to the clerk of every city, village, town, and county in which the drainage district is located, and also to provide the clerk of each taxation district in which the drainage district is located a list of every assessment issued by the district from November 1 of the previous year to October 31 of the current year, specifying the assessment amount for every parcel in the district.

**AVAILABLE LAND RESOURCES**

**Topography and Soils**

Topography and soils are tied to agricultural productivity in a variety of ways. Slope steepness affects the velocity and erosive potential of runoff, placing moderate to severe limitations on urban development and agricultural activities. The operation of agricultural equipment on slopes can be difficult or hazardous while the cultivation of sloped lands can negatively impact surface water quality through related erosion and sedimentation. A soil survey can play an important role in land use decisions. For example, by identifying saturated or wet soils, which can restrict or prevent the use of land for crops, surveys may help to determine which areas of the County are suitable for agricultural use.

---

4 See Chapters III, IV, VIII, and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan for more information on agricultural and general land uses.
Agricultural Soil Capability
The NRCS has classified the agricultural capability of soils based on their general suitability for most kinds of farming. These groupings are based on the limitations of the soils, the risk of damage when used, and the way in which the soils respond to treatment. Generally, lands with Class I and II soils are considered “National Prime Farmlands” and lands with Class III soils are considered “Farmlands of Statewide Significance.” Class I soils have few limitations, the widest range of use, and the least risk of damage when used. The soils in the other classes have progressively greater natural limitations. Class II soils have some limitations that reduce the choice of plants that can be grown, or require moderate conservation practices to reduce the risk of damage when used. Class III soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices, or both, and Class IV soils have very severe limitations. Class V, VI, and VII soils are considered suitable for pasture but not for crops, and Class VIII soils are so rough, shallow, or otherwise limited that they do not produce economically worthwhile yields of crops, forage, or wood products.

The location and amount of Class I, II, and III soils, as set forth in Map 9 and Table 29 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan, were an important consideration when farmland preservation areas were identified in the existing County farmland preservation plan (adopted in 1981) and town land use and master plans adopted prior to the preparation of town comprehensive plans. The County Farmland Preservation Plan used the following criteria to designate Primary Farmlands: farms with at least 50 percent of soils classified as Class I, II, or III, located within a farming block of at least 640 acres, and having a minimum farm size of 35 acres. Farms less than 35 acres were included if used for the production of specialty crops or livestock, provided the soil criteria and minimum farming block criteria were met. The Towns of Barton, Hartford, Kewaskum, Trenton, and Wayne used the presence of Class I, II, and III soils to help identify prime agricultural lands in Town land use plans adopted prior to 2008.

LAND EVALUATION AND SITE ASSESSMENT (LESA)
During development of Washington County’s comprehensive plan, the Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources (ANCR) Workgroup formed a subcommittee to develop a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis to determine parcels in Washington County that are most suitable for long-term agricultural use. The results of the analysis are intended for County and local government use to help identify areas that should be designated for farmland protection. The LESA process was developed in 1981 by the USDA—Soil Conservation Service (now the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)) and is an analytical tool designed to provide a systematic and objective procedure for rating and ranking the agricultural importance of a parcel. LESA is a numeric system for rating potential farmland preservation areas by evaluating soil quality (LE or land evaluation) and geographic variables (SA or site assessment). The first step in the analysis was to identify parcels to be analyzed. Parcels within an adopted sewer service area and parcels with less than 2 percent of the parcel in agricultural use were excluded from the analysis.

Land Evaluation Component
The land evaluation component of the LESA rating system was determined by the NRCS, which rated each soil in Washington County (and all other counties in Wisconsin) based on soil type, slope, agricultural capability class, and soil productivity for producing corn and soybeans. The resulting ratings were then placed into groups ranging from the best to the worst suited for cropland production, with the best soil group assigned a value of 100. Map T-4 depicts the land evaluation ratings for agricultural soils in Washington County. Acres within each range in each local government are listed in Table T-14. Soil values have been “normalized” for Washington County, so that each soil is rated in relative value to other soils in the County, rather than to soils in the State. The site assessment component of the LESA rating system is based on geographic variables such as distance from major highways, proximity to urban development, and proximity to public sewer and water.

---

5 Farmland Preservation Plan, Washington County, Wisconsin; prepared by the firm Stockham & Vandewalle, Madison, Wisconsin.
6 All of the Towns listed adopted comprehensive plans in 2008 or 2009, which updated previously adopted land use plans.
7 See Chapters III and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan for more information on the LESA analysis.
Map T-4
SOIL PRODUCTIVITY FOR CROPS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY

Land Evaluation Rating
- 95 - 100
- 90 - 94.9
- 85 - 89.9
- 80 - 84.9
- Less than 60
- No Rating
- Surface Water

Note: Higher ratings are associated with greater soil productivity for corn and soybeans.

Soil productivity data source: SEWRPC
Municipal boundary current as of January 1, 2011.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
The Site Assessment (SA) component rates non-soil factors affecting a parcel’s relative importance for agricultural use and is separated into three classifications. The LESA subcommittee selected the following nine SA factors to be used in the Washington County LESA analysis:

**SA-1 Factors (agricultural productivity)**
- Size of farm in contiguous management by one farm operator
- Compatibility of surrounding land uses within one-half mile
- Percent of farm in agricultural use

**SA-2 Factors (development pressures impacting a site’s continued agricultural use)**
- Distance from adopted sewer service area
- Distance from selected hamlets
- Distance from interchanges along USH 41 and 45

**SA-3 Factors (other public values of a site supporting retention in agriculture)**
- Primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, natural areas, or critical species habitat outside environmental corridor areas present on farm
- Floodplains present on farm
- Proximity to permanently protected land 20 acres or more in size

---

Table T-14
SOIL PRODUCTIVITY RATINGS FOR CROPLAND (LAND EVALUATION RATINGS) IN WASHINGTON COUNTY COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>95 to 100 (acres)</th>
<th>90 to 94 (acres)</th>
<th>85 to 89 (acres)</th>
<th>80 to 84 (acres)</th>
<th>70 to 79 (acres)</th>
<th>60 to 69 (acres)</th>
<th>Less than 60 or Soil Not Rated (acres)</th>
<th>Surface Water (acres)</th>
<th>Total (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnering Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>7,726</td>
<td>1,356</td>
<td>2,763</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>5,168</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>12,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Erin</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>3,818</td>
<td>8,613</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>23,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Farmington</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td>3,061</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>2,410</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>23,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Germantown</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>2,424</td>
<td>1,612</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3,033</td>
<td>3,015</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>18,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1,417</td>
<td>5,650</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>14,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Kewaskum</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>3,067</td>
<td>2,752</td>
<td>3,830</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>1,571</td>
<td>7,364</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>20,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>3,844</td>
<td>3,396</td>
<td>7,377</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>20,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wayne</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>4,696</td>
<td>2,594</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>3,975</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Partnering Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartforda</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>9,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>3,442</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>3,438</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>22,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Jackson</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Newburgb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>5,942</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>2,652</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Richfield</td>
<td>1,294</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>3,434</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>3,348</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>23,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of West Bend</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>10,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>46,706</td>
<td>34,336</td>
<td>42,862</td>
<td>18,605</td>
<td>39,111</td>
<td>84,221</td>
<td>4,507</td>
<td>278,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total Lands</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Excludes the 300 acres of the City of Hartford lying within Dodge County.
* Excludes the 53 acres of the Village of Newburg lying within Ozaukee County.
* Includes the 14 acres of the City of Milwaukee lying in the extreme southeastern corner of Washington County.
* Site is less than 0.5 acres.

Source: Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

**Site Assessment Component**

The Site Assessment (SA) component rates non-soil factors affecting a parcel’s relative importance for agricultural use and is separated into three classifications. The LESA subcommittee selected the following nine SA factors to be used in the Washington County LESA analysis:

SA-1 Factors (agricultural productivity)
- Size of farm in contiguous management by one farm operator
- Compatibility of surrounding land uses within one-half mile
- Percent of farm in agricultural use

SA-2 Factors (development pressures impacting a site’s continued agricultural use)
- Distance from adopted sewer service area
- Distance from selected hamlets
- Distance from interchanges along USH 41 and 45

SA-3 Factors (other public values of a site supporting retention in agriculture)
- Primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, natural areas, or critical species habitat outside environmental corridor areas present on farm
- Floodplains present on farm
- Proximity to permanently protected land 20 acres or more in size
Parcel Scoring

The LESA system recognizes that some of the factors used to rank agricultural parcels are more important than others. To account for this, the LESA subcommittee assigned the LE component a weight of 0.34, or about one-third of the total weight. The remaining 0.66 weighting “points” were divided among the nine SA factors, with the first two SA-3 factors given to lowest weight (0.01) and the other factors weighted between 0.05 and 0.13. Each parcel analyzed was scored on a scale of one to 10, with 10 being the best score. The average score of the parcels analyzed was 7.0, and the median score was 6.8 (half of all parcels received a higher score and half received a lower score than 6.8). The LESA subcommittee defined lands scoring 6.8 or higher as 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. The subcommittee agreed that setting the benchmark at 6.8 left adequate amounts of acreage for development in the next 30 years, yet also protected a suitable amount of land for future agricultural production. The results of the LESA analysis are shown on Map T-5 and the acreages of Tier I and Tier II farmlands are as follows:

- 117,481 acres, or 42 percent of the County, were designated as Tier I farmlands, scoring 6.8 or higher. Of this, 94,709 acres are in agricultural use.
- 43,724 acres, or 16 percent of the County, were designated as Tier II farmlands, scoring less than 6.8. Of this, 23,865 acres are in agricultural use.

The ANCR Workgroup recommended that each municipality use the final LESA map as a guide to help identify farmland protection areas that best reflect their local agricultural resource goals.

AGRICULTURAL TRENDS

Agricultural Land Use

Farming in Wisconsin has undergone considerable change in the last few decades. According to the Wisconsin Agricultural Statistical Service, the State has seen an 18 percent decline in the number of acres of land in farmland production between 1980 and 2007. Washington County saw about a 38 percent decline in the number of acres of land in farmland production between 1972 and 2007. Figure T-5 illustrates the decline in the number of acres of land in farmland production.

Table T-15 illustrates farm size in Washington County from 1987 to 2007. In 1987, the greatest percentage of farms within Washington County was 50 to 179 acres in size (40 percent) and the majority of farms were 10 to 499 acres in size (nearly 89 percent). A shift in farm size occurred over time. By 2007, the greatest percentage of farms was between 10 and 49 acres (41 percent). The County and the State have experienced a shift in average farm size as a decrease in size has occurred consistently from 1987 to 2007. These trends are also illustrated as the percent change in farm size in Table T-16. From 1987 to 2007, the number of farms 50 to 179 acres in size decreased 7 percent and the number of farms sized from 180 to 499 acres decreased over 11 percent. Meanwhile, the number of farms sized from 10 to 49 acres increased by almost 14 percent, far more than farms of any other size. Furthermore, as illustrated in Table T-17, average and median farm sizes for both Washington County and Wisconsin have decreased in every five year interval from 1992 to 2007. The significance of farm size changes over these five year intervals is illustrated in Table T-18 by percent change in the average and median acreages.
NOTE: LESA (Land Evaluation and Site Assessment) is a system used by the USDA - Natural Resources Conservation Service as a way to determine the importance of a parcel for continued agricultural use. The system combines soil quality factors with non-soil factors relating to farming practices, development pressure, and factors measuring other public values (such as environmental resources). Factors included in the analysis were selected and weighted by the LESA subcommittee of the Washington County Comprehensive Planning Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Work Group.

Ag Lands and LESA analysis data source: SEWRPC
Municipal boundary current as of January 1, 2011.
Parcel boundary current as of January 1, 2008.
All information subject to errors and omissions and is not certified by Washington County.
### Table T-15
**FARM SIZE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 1987-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 acres</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 179 acres</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 499 acres</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 acres or more</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Farms</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table T-16
**PERCENT CHANGE IN FARM SIZE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 1987-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 acres</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 49 acres</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 179 acres</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>-3.6</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 to 499 acres</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>-11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 to 999 acres</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 acres or more</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table T-17
**AVERAGE AND MEDIAN FARM SIZE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 1992-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Farm Size (acres)</th>
<th>Median Farm Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Data not available before 1997.


### Table T-18
**PERCENT CHANGE IN AVERAGE AND MEDIAN FARM SIZE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 1992-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Average Farm Size (acres)</th>
<th>Median Farm Size (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1997</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-2002</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>-10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2007</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-4.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Data not available before 1997.

Conversion of Agricultural Land

Table T-19 shows land use trends in the County from 1975 to 2000. During the twenty-five year time span, land in agricultural use declined by 32,805 acres, or about 19 percent. Agricultural land use was the only nonurban land use category to decrease in acreage. All other nonurban land uses experienced an increase in acreage. Meanwhile, the amount of land in residential use more than doubled, increasing from 12,742 to 25,916 acres. This increase of 13,174 acres was the largest increase in all land use categories in the County from 1975 to 2000. Single-family residential development accounted for 12,233 acres, or about 93 percent of the total residential land increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>3,357 15.9 48 2.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>3,204 26.1 5,672 36.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Family</td>
<td>79 46.7 164 74.2</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>108 47.0 329 97.3</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
<td>7 10.6 37 50.7</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>12,742 16,140 22,362 25,916</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3,398 26.7 6,222 38.5</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11,063 11,728 13,062 15,042</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental and Institutional</td>
<td>134 12.1 133 10.7</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td>134 12.1 133 10.7</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>27,936 32,772 41,891 48,936</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonurban</td>
<td>6,210 6,446 7,088 8,339</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlands</td>
<td>3,440 3,785 4,452 5,823</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands</td>
<td>6,210 6,446 7,088 8,339</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Water</td>
<td>4,286 4,345 4,410 4,507</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>11,063 11,728 13,062 15,042</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>461 545 570 575</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>27,936 32,772 41,891 48,936</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonurban Subtotal</td>
<td>250,897 246,061 236,942 229,820</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>278,833 278,833 278,833 278,756</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
<td>12,233 99.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aAs part of the regional land use inventory for the year 2000, the delineation of existing land use was referenced to real property boundary information not available for prior inventories. This change increases the precision of the land use inventory and makes it more usable to public agencies and private interests throughout the Region. As a result of the change, however, year 2000 land use inventory data are not strictly comparable with data from the prior inventories. At the county level, the most significant effect of the change is to increase the transportation, communication, and utilities category due to the use of actual street and highway rights-of-way as part of the 2000 land use inventory, as opposed to the use of narrower estimated rights-of-way in prior inventories. This treatment of streets and highways generally diminishes the area of adjacent land uses traversed by those streets and highways in the 2000 land use inventory relative to prior inventories.

*bThe reported size of the County decreased by 77 acres between 1995 and 2000 due to the use of more precise cadastral maps.

Source: SEWRPC and Washington County.
These trends indicate a demand for additional land to accommodate urban land uses in Washington County, especially for single-family residential. There is also a decreasing supply of land for agricultural use. This trend poses several challenges to the desire of County residents to preserve productive farmland while identifying an adequate amount of land to accommodate the projected increase of about 19,000 additional households and 17,170 additional jobs expected in the County between 2000 and 2035.

**Land Price**

Equalized value trends by real estate class in the County in 2003 and 2007 are set forth in Table 105 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Residential properties experienced the greatest increase in equalized value, with an increase of 43 percent. Commercial and industrial properties also experienced increases over the same period. Commercial properties experienced an increase of 38 percent and industrial properties experienced an increase of about 12 percent. The County experienced an overall increase in equalized value of 40 percent between 2003 and 2007, which was about the same as the 39 percent increase Statewide over the same period.

Although the equalized value of agricultural land increased moderately, the sale price of agricultural land increased substantially in the County. Between 2000 and 2005, the average agricultural land sale price for parcels 35 acres or greater in the County more than doubled, from $5,054 per acre to $10,161 per acre. The average agricultural land sale price increased to a lesser degree in Southeastern Wisconsin, by 38 percent, and to a much higher extent in the State of Wisconsin, by 87 percent, over the same time period. The discrepancy in the equalized value and the sale price of agricultural land creates an opportunity for high profits in the residential development of agricultural land.

Figure T-6 shows the difference in agricultural land sale prices per acre for land remaining in agriculture versus land being converted to other uses. There are very high premiums paid for agricultural land conversion in the heavily urbanized areas of southeast and northeast Wisconsin. The premium on agricultural land conversion in other parts of the State remains relatively low or is actually negative, meaning there is a premium paid for keeping land in agriculture or, expressed another way, land is more valuable for agricultural use than for non-agricultural use.

---

8 Sixty-five percent of respondents to the comprehensive planning telephone survey conducted in 2006 placed a high priority on preserving farmland in the County.

9 Data is derived from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue through real estate transfer returns, which include information pertaining to the parties involved, size of the parcel, the predominant use of the land, and the sale price. The analysis of agricultural land prices includes only transactions between non-related parties of parcels greater than 35 acres of vacant land.
From 2004 to 2008, Washington County experienced one of the highest average premiums paid per acre than any other county in the State, second only to Milwaukee County. Premiums paid in Washington County were significantly higher than in some of the adjacent counties, including nearly nine times the premium paid in Dodge County which is immediately adjacent to the west. This indicates that there is major financial incentive for farmers to sell their land for non-agricultural development in Washington County.

**Farmland Values**

Figure T-7 shows farmland values (adjusted for inflation) broken down by three regions. Overall, farmland values have increased. In the last three decades values have been equally volatile across all regions of the State. With higher farmland values in southeast Wisconsin compounded by population and development pressures, the premium on agricultural land conversion is very high in comparison to other parts of the State.

According to Bruce Jones (Agricultural Economist, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, UW-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences), within the last five years, two trends have occurred in Wisconsin regarding farmland values. Value of land converted to residential and non-farm use has decreased (due to the decline of the housing industry). Secondly, value of land transferred from farmer to farmer has increased. This means that farmland is now holding its value.10

Since farmland loss is affected by inconsistent agricultural profitability, ensuring that farming is profitable may be the best way to protect farmland. All other factors the same, studies show that lower rates of farmland loss exist within healthy local economies (those with higher employment rates and higher incomes). For this reason alone, employment trends are important to consider in regards to farmland preservation. A municipality that is aware of employment trends can manage shifts in its economy accordingly. Furthermore, as one study puts it, "preservation does not mean that economic development stops". Instead, by ensuring the continued agricultural use of prime farmland, preservation can provide farmers and agribusinesses with security, promote agricultural investment, and help to ensure the profitability of farming.11

**Farms Enrolled in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program**

On July 1, 2009, the 2009 Wis. Act 28 repealed and recreated Wisconsin’s farmland preservation law under Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes and related tax credits under subchapter IX of Chapter 71 of the Statutes.

Farmland owners may continue to participate in one of two ways: through exclusive agricultural zoning or through Farmland Preservation Agreements. Participation through exclusive agricultural zoning may occur only when the local jurisdiction having zoning authority (city, village, town, or county) has a certified zoning ordinance. The Towns of Barton, Hartford, Kewaskum, and Trenton and the Villages of Germantown and Richfield have certified zoning ordinances. In 2010, there were approximately 84 participating landowners, with
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about 10,459 acres of farmland enrolled in the farmland preservation program, in these local governments. Lands enrolled in the program are shown on Map T-6 and the number of acres enrolled in the program in each local government is listed in Table T-20.

In jurisdictions where the County farmland preservation plan designates land as farmland but the LWCB had not certified the local zoning ordinance, a landowner could have participated in the program through a Farmland Preservation Agreement with DATCP. A landowner may continue to collect a tax credit until expiration of their existing agreement. In 2010, there were approximately 12 Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Agreements encompassing 1,148 acres of farmland in the Towns of Farmington, Jackson, Polk, and Wayne. Lands enrolled in the program are shown on Map T-6 and the number of acres enrolled in the program in each local government is listed in Table T-21.

**AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND REVENUE**

**Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold**
Analyzing the market value of agriculture products sold is essential when determining the economic impact of agriculture in a community. In 2007, sales of agricultural products totaled $107,768,000 in Washington County and $8,967,358,000 Statewide. Average sales per farm in Washington County ($129,685) exceeded the State average ($114,288) by $15,397. The market value of agricultural products sold (including direct sales) in the County and State in 2007, is listed by commodity and broken down by number of farms, total sales revenue, and sales revenue per farm in Table T-22. General commodity groups are described in the following sections.

**Crops**
In 2007, 529 of Washington County’s 831 farms (64 percent) produced crops (including nursery and greenhouse products). Crop sales generated $40,013,000 in Washington County averaging $76,000 per farm. On average, this exceeded the Statewide average per farm ($62,000) by $14,000.

**Nursery, Greenhouse, Floriculture, and Sod Products**
The average market value of nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, or sod products sold per Washington County farm was nearly double the Statewide average, exceeding it by approximately $148,000 per farm. The relative importance of the horticultural industry in the County compared to the State could likely be in response to the demand for landscaping material for urban development in the County and the Milwaukee metropolitan area.
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**Table T-20**
**EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL ZONING AGREEMENTS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Area Enrolled (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,459</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The numbers above reflect estimates of lands enrolled in the program as of December 31, 2010.
Source: Washington County.

**Table T-21**
**DATCP AGREEMENTS IN LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Number of Agreements</th>
<th>Area Enrolled (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Farmington</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Wayne</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The numbers above reflect estimates of lands enrolled in the program as of December 31, 2010.
Source: Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection and Washington County.
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**Washington County Farm Fact**
Over recent decades, Washington County has experienced a transformation in farming. The southern half of the County’s remaining farmland is primarily made up of cash grain and vegetable crops (corn for grain, sweet corn, soybeans, and wheat) while the northern half is still predominately livestock related crop production (corn, oats, and alfalfa). The largest single crop change has been in the production of soybeans which has increased from about 3,200 acres in 1984 to 21,400 acres in 2008, an increase of almost 700 percent.
This map reflects estimates of lands enrolled in the program as of December 31, 2010.
Of all grain, oilseed, dry bean, and dry pea products, corn generated the most revenue at both the County and State levels. In Washington County, corn generated $11,139,000 or 56 percent of all revenue generated from grain, oilseed, dry bean, and dry pea products. Corn generated a higher percentage of revenue (69 percent) at the State level for grains, oilseed, dry bean, and dry pea products.

Soybeans
Soybeans also proved to be a valuable crop in Washington County generating a total of $6,903,000 in 2007. This averages $32,000 per farm which exceeds the Statewide average ($28,000) by $4,000.

Livestock, Poultry, and their Products
On average in 2007, farms in Washington County that produced livestock and poultry (and their products) generated $4,000 more than such farms Statewide. Revenue from this category comprised 63 percent of total farm revenue in Washington County and 70 percent of total farm revenue Statewide.
Milk and other Dairy Products

Milk and other dairy products from cows proved to be the most significant source of agricultural revenue for both the County and State. Revenue from milk and other dairy products from cows accounted for more than half of total farm revenue in Washington County (53 percent) and the State (51 percent).

Washington County is a regional leader in the dairy industry. As shown in Table T-23, Washington County had the greatest number of dairy farms (154) and the highest dairy sales ($56,694,000) in the region in 2007. Washington County had the third highest average dairy sales per farm ($368,000) in the region and was a close second in dairy sales as a percentage of total farm sales (53 percent) trailing only Ozaukee County (56 percent).

Table T-23
MARKET VALUE OF MILK AND OTHER DAIRY PRODUCTS FROM COWS SOLD (INCLUDING DIRECT SALES) IN SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN COUNTIES: 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Number of Farms</th>
<th>Dairy Sales (in thousands)</th>
<th>Average Dairy Sales per Farm (in thousands)</th>
<th>Total Sales (in thousands)</th>
<th>Dairy Sales as Percentage of Total Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12,304</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>59,726</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>9,927</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>33,219</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>59,056</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>101,923</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52,327</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>145,520</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>56,694</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>107,767</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>11,626</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>45,243</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) signifies that information was withheld to avoid disclosing data for individual farms.


Goat Milk Farms

Goat milk production appears to be gaining ground in the region, State, and the Nation. Table T-24 shows the number of goat milk farms within the region, the State, and the nation. The number of goat milk farms tended to decline between 1992 and 1997 in the region and State overall, but rebounded from 1997 to 2007.

In the region between 1992 and 2007, the greatest increase in number of goat milk farms occurred in Walworth County (15) and the greatest increase in percentage occurred in Waukesha County (300 percent). Washington County experienced the third highest increase in number of goat milk farms in the region, increasing from zero to seven.

Table T-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change from 1992 to 2007</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenosha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaukee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walworth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukesha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>707</td>
<td>185.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,922</td>
<td>137.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Zero goat milk farms existed in 1992, therefore a change in percent was not able to be calculated.

Value of Sales
Table T-25 sets forth total value of sales\(^\text{12}\) in 2007 for farms in Washington County and Wisconsin. Overall, percentages of farms by value of sales in Washington County were very comparable to farms Statewide. Over one-third (34 percent), of all farms in Washington County had a total value in sales of less than $2,500, compared to approximately 39 percent of farms Statewide. Washington County had slightly higher percentages of farms in the $50,000 to $99,999 (9 percent) and $100,000 or more (24 percent) ranges compared to the State with 7 percent and 21 percent respectively.

Farming as Principal Occupation
Farming was the principal occupation of the primary farm operator on 552 farms (65 percent) in Washington County in 2002. In 2007, both the number and percentage of farms with farming as the principal occupation of the primary operator had declined to 437 farms, or about 53 percent of the farms in the County. This decline reveals that the number of farmers requiring additional sources of income has increased. The decline in the number of farms with farming as the principal occupation of the primary operator is mirrored Statewide. Farming was the principal occupation of the primary operator on about 59 percent of farms Statewide in 2002. Five years later, farming was the principal occupation of the farm operator on about 47 percent of farms in Wisconsin.

Cash Farm Income\(^\text{13}\)
In 2002, the average net cash income of a farm operation in Washington County ($24,654) exceeded the State average ($17,946) by 37 percent. Average net cash income from farm operations in the County in 2007 was $43,559, which was about 25 percent higher than the State average of $34,909, a decline of 12 percent in the difference between average County and State cash farm income.

CHANGE IN THE NATURE, SCOPE, LOCATION, AND FOCUS OF AGRICULTURE

Sales by Agricultural Sector
Table T-26 sets forth the changes in sales within agricultural sectors in Washington County and the State from 2002 to 2007. This table shows that the grain and dairy sectors gained strength in both the County and the State. From 2002 to 2007, grain sales increased by 89 percent in the County and by 84 percent in the State, and dairy sales increased by 71 percent in the County and 73 percent in the State. Grain sales surpassed horticulture sales as a percent of total agricultural revenue in Washington County.

Horticulture is still a more significant source of agricultural income in Washington County than the State overall. Although it experienced a decline as percent of total agricultural income in Washington County, sales increased by 10 percent in the 5-year period.

\(^{12}\) The total value of sales is equal to the gross market value before taxes and production expenses for all agricultural products sold.

\(^{13}\) Net cash farm income of the operations is derived by subtracting total farm expenses from total sales, government payments, and other farm-related income. Depreciation is not used in the calculation of net cash farm income. Net cash farm income of the operation includes the value of commodities produced under production contract by contract growers.
Vegetable sales, although generating a small percentage of total agricultural revenue in the County, nearly doubled in the 5-year period increasing by 94 percent compared to 24 percent at the State level. Sales of cattle and calves in Washington County basically mirrored trends in the State. Sales in the “other” sector declined by over 50 percent in the County, but increased by over 50 percent in the State.

Increased Efficiencies and Improved Economic Gains Related to Dairy Farming

Market Values
Through technology and improvements, farm operations can increase their efficiency and improve their economic gains. Along these lines, market values related to dairy farming appear to correspond somewhat with increased capacity. As set forth in Table T-27, this type of change is evident in Washington County as the number of farms in Washington County declined by 13 from 2002 to 2007 while the acreage of farmlands remained nearly the same over the 5-year period (as shown in Figure T-5).

Characteristics of dairy farms in Washington County were compared from 1987 to 2007 in Table T-27. While the total number of farms in Washington County declined by 14 percent over the twenty-year span, the number of dairy farms experienced a more significant decrease of 68 percent. Accordingly, the number of milk cows also decreased from nearly 24,000 in 1987 to fewer than 15,000 in 2007, a decrease of 38 percent. Meanwhile, the
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Table T-26
AGRICULTURAL SECTORS IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Washington County</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Change from 2002 to 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>$33,100</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>$56,700</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains (Crops)</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>9,400</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and Calves</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-3,000</td>
<td>-54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$72,900</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$107,800</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$34,900</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wisconsin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Change from 2002 to 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
<td>Sales (in thousands)</td>
<td>Percent of Total Agricultural Revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy</td>
<td>$2,651,000</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>$4,573,300</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>$1,922,300</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>197,400</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>244,200</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>46,800</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains (Crops)</td>
<td>893,300</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1,643,300</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and Calves</td>
<td>834,900</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>1,014,600</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>179,700</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetables</td>
<td>341,600</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>422,600</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othera</td>
<td>705,000</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>1,069,300</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>364,300</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$5,623,200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$8,967,300</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$3,344,100</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a includes tobacco, fruits, tree nuts, berries, Christmas trees, short-rotation woody crops, hay, poultry, eggs, sheep, goats, horses, aquaculture, other crops, other animals and other animal products.

market value per dairy farm remained fairly steady from 1987 to 2002 then nearly doubled from 2002 to 2007. From 1987 to 2007, market value of milk and other dairy products from cows per farm increased steadily, nearly doubling from 2002 to 2007, and increasing by 329 percent over the 20-year period.

Over recent decades in Washington County, milk cows were situated into larger populations on fewer farms resulting in an increase in average milking operation size. This trend is depicted in Figure T-8. From 1980 to 2000, the percentages of milking operations with one to 29 and 30 to 49 head of milking cows have decreased while the percentages of operations with 50 to 99 and 100 or more head of milking cows have increased.

Dairy Production
As shown in Table T-28, the number of milk cows in both the State and County have decreased in recent decades while milk production per cow has increased. These numbers, like market value numbers explained above, reflect an increase in efficiency and advanced technologies. This has allowed Washington County and the State of Wisconsin to remain strong dairy producing entities while facing challenges such as urban development and an unstable economy.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, improvements in efficiency may be accompanied by greater profits. However, the tactics necessary to improve efficiency are often associated with significant increases in farm size. As the dairy industry continues to evolve in Washington County, smaller dairy farms may be challenged to compete with more efficient, large dairy operations.
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### Table T-27
**DAIRY FARMING AND MARKET VALUE IN WASHINGTON COUNTY: 1987-2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Farms ........................................</td>
<td></td>
<td>967</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms with Milk Cows .......................</td>
<td></td>
<td>455</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Milk Cows ..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,942</td>
<td>19,202</td>
<td>14,374</td>
<td>15,179</td>
<td>14,772</td>
<td>-38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Milk Cows per Milking Farm ........</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Farms with Milk Cows .....................</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>-62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Farms Producing Milk and Other Dairy</td>
<td></td>
<td>442</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products from Cows ..................................</td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,908</td>
<td>$36,360</td>
<td>$29,647</td>
<td>$33,131</td>
<td>$56,694</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value of Milk and Other Dairy Products from Cows (in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$85,765</td>
<td>$112,570</td>
<td>$128,900</td>
<td>$187,181</td>
<td>$368,143</td>
<td>329.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AGRICULTURE

The level of existing agricultural infrastructure is a key factor to sustaining a strong agricultural business sector in Washington County well into the future. As agribusiness markets continue to evolve, it is important to identify infrastructure that exists and also what is needed to account for shifts in the ever-changing industry. Table T-29 sets forth an inventory of key agricultural infrastructure and support services located in or serving the County in 2010.

A mail-in survey of landowners with 20 acres or more in Washington County was conducted in 2010 to help gauge the needs and wishes of major landowners. Two questions on the survey specifically touched upon agricultural infrastructure. When asked if the agricultural infrastructure (co-op, veterinarians, etc.) they need were close enough to their operation, agricultural infrastructure did not appear to be a major concern. Of the 281 landowners that responded, 269 (96 percent) indicated that either everything or most of what is needed is close enough to their operation. A follow-up question then asked them to identify what type of infrastructure, if not already present, would help increase their operation’s efficiency. Respondents could select as many types of infrastructure as they wished from a provided list and could also write in responses. Of the 148 landowners that responded, the most commonly identified types of infrastructure that they would like more of to increase efficiency were agricultural suppliers, selected 34 times (23 percent), and storage facilities, selected 31 times (21 percent).

ENTERPRISES RELATED TO AGRICULTURE

Agricultural diversification is an important mechanism for economic growth. It depends, however, on there being opportunities for diversification and on farmers’ responsiveness to those opportunities. Agricultural diversification can be facilitated by technological breakthroughs, changes in consumer demand, changes in government policy and trade arrangements, and by development of irrigation, roads, and other infrastructures. Conversely, it can be impeded by risks in markets and prices and in crop-management practices, by degradation of natural resources, and by conflicting socio-economic requirements - perhaps for employment generation, or for self-sufficiency or foreign-exchange-earning capacity in particular crops, livestock, fishery or forest products.15

This section explores enterprises related to agriculture. Many of these farming enterprises have been growing in popularity in an effort to keep farming strong and profitable in Washington County and the State of Wisconsin, in resistance to urban development and in effort to be more environmentally friendly and health conscious.

---

**Table T-28**

AVERAGE ANNUAL MILK PRODUCTION IN WASHINGTON COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 1985-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Number of Milk Cows¹</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>24,800</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>19,100</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>-42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Milk Production Per Cow (Pounds)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>13,300</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>16,100</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milk Production (Pounds)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>329,840</td>
<td>324,690</td>
<td>302,100</td>
<td>288,000</td>
<td>280,280</td>
<td>-15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Number of Milk Cows (1,000 head)¹</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>1,490</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>-34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Milk Production Per Cow (Pounds)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,400</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Milk Production (Million Pounds)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>24,700</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,300</td>
<td>22,900</td>
<td>-7.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Average number of milk cows on farm during year, excluding heifers not yet fresh.


---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Municipal Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Cooperative</td>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>Feed, grain, agronomy, and energy products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Lakes Cooperative</td>
<td>Village of Random Lake (Sheboygan County)</td>
<td>Feed, grain, agronomy, and energy products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adell Cooperative</td>
<td>Village of Adell (Sheboygan County)</td>
<td>Feed, seed, and other farm supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm Veterinary Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Hills Vet Service</td>
<td>City of Hartford</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt Vet Clinic</td>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Animal Doctors</td>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewaskum Veterinary Clinic</td>
<td>Village of Kewaskum</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Veterinary Clinic</td>
<td>Town of Rubicon (Dodge County)</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayville Animal Clinic</td>
<td>Town of Williamstown (Dodge County)</td>
<td>Large animal on-farm services and small animal clinical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehring's Meat Market</td>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Meat and cheese processing and retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Moraine Hardwoods, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Sawmill and dry kiln producing hardwoods for sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fideler Farms</td>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>Processed farm grown fruits and vegetable products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schreiber Foods</td>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td>Production of cheeses and numerous dairy products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bieri's Jackson Cheese &amp; Deli</td>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>Retail cheeses and sausage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Mill &amp; Pet Supply, Inc.</td>
<td>Village of Jackson</td>
<td>Retail pet/farm animal food and supplies; landscaping supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehl Foods</td>
<td>Village of Germantown</td>
<td>Processing and packaging of dairy-based sauces, puddings and beverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewaskum Frozen Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>Village of Kewaskum</td>
<td>Custom slaughter and meat processing; cheese retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCI Cheese Company</td>
<td>Village of Richfield</td>
<td>Production, processing and retail of imported and domestic specialty cheeses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held Meat Products, Inc.</td>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td>Meat and cheese processing and retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kems Dairy, LLC</td>
<td>City of Cedarburg (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>Processor of fluid milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Spray, Inc.</td>
<td>City of Kenosha (Kenosha County)</td>
<td>Production of various beverage and food products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi Canning Co.</td>
<td>City of Lodi (Columbia County)</td>
<td>Production of canned vegetables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kraft Foods Oscar Mayer (Louis Rich Co.)</td>
<td>City of Madison (Dane County)</td>
<td>Meat processing and packaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakesides Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>City of Manitowoc (Manitowoc County)</td>
<td>Production of canned and frozen foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Ethanol</td>
<td>City of Milton (Rock County)</td>
<td>Ethanol production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer Daniels Midland Company - Ambrosia Chocolate</td>
<td>City of Plymouth (Milwaukee County)</td>
<td>Processing and marketing of food and animal feed ingredients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent Foods, Inc.</td>
<td>City of Plymouth (Sheboygan County)</td>
<td>Production, packaging and marketing of various cheese products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Monte Corp.</td>
<td>City of County of San Francisco, California</td>
<td>Manufacturer and marketer of primarily canned processed foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Renewable Fuels</td>
<td>Town of Azaltan (Jefferson County)</td>
<td>Ethanol production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Crest Ice Cream</td>
<td>Town of Cedarburg</td>
<td>Manufacturer of ice cream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didion Ethanol</td>
<td>Town of Courtland (Columbia County)</td>
<td>Ethanol production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Valley Cheese, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Fredonia (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>Manufacturer of cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Foods Co.</td>
<td>Town of Marion (Wayne County, New York)</td>
<td>Processed fruit and vegetable products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United WI Grain Producers, LLC</td>
<td>Town of Randolph (Columbia County)</td>
<td>Ethanol production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krier Foods</td>
<td>Village of Random Lake (Sheboygan County)</td>
<td>Canning and bottling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widmer's Cheese Cellars</td>
<td>Village of Theresa (Dodge County)</td>
<td>Retail cheeses and sausage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplier or Other Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gehl Company</td>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart Peterson Group</td>
<td>City of West Bend</td>
<td>Agricultural marketing and operation consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Country Ag Systems, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Implement, LLC</td>
<td>Town of Addison</td>
<td>Crop seed development and provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helena Chemical</td>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>Farm building construction and repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russ Breit Sales, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>Feed, seed, and other farm supply wholesalers; grain processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bend Elevator</td>
<td>Town of Barton</td>
<td>Farm implements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence Equipment, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Hartford</td>
<td>Agricultural fertilizer and chemical wholesales; crop management consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vogel Seed</td>
<td>Town of Jackson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairyland Seed</td>
<td>Town of Kewaskum</td>
<td>Crop seed development and provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid States Power &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>Farm and garden machinery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt a Equipment, LLC</td>
<td>Town of Polk</td>
<td>Farm equipment parts and supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner Seed &amp; Conditioning</td>
<td>Town of Trenton</td>
<td>Grain cleaning services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locken Implement</td>
<td>Village of Newburg</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strupp Implement, Inc.</td>
<td>Village of Slinger</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemke Seed Farm</td>
<td>City of Mequon (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>Seed grower and sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve Implement</td>
<td>Town of Ashford (Fond du Lac County)</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kellers Farm Supply, Inc.</td>
<td>Town of Herman (Fond du Lac County)</td>
<td>Agricultural machinery and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saukville Feeds</td>
<td>Village of Saukville (Ozaukee County)</td>
<td>Feed, seed, and other farm supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Location of corporate headquarters listed. Numerous, more localized plants serve Washington County.

NOTE: This table serves as an inventory of agricultural infrastructure and support services located in or serving Washington County as of December 31, 2010 but may not be all inclusive.

Source: UW-Extension and Washington County.
Organic Farming
Organic refers to the way agricultural products—food and fiber—are grown and processed. Organic food production is based on a system of farming that maintains and replenishes soil fertility without the use of toxic and persistent pesticides and fertilizers. Organic foods are minimally processed without artificial ingredients, preservatives, or irradiation to maintain the integrity of the food. In other words, organic agriculture is an ecological production management system that promotes and enhances biodiversity, biological cycles and soil biological activity. It is based on minimal use of off-farm inputs and on management practices that restore, maintain and enhance ecological harmony. Organic farming is a growing trend in Washington County and also at the State and national levels.

Many farmers throughout the country are embracing organic farming for a variety of reasons. While a number of benefits accompany organic farming, reasons for the adoption of organic practices include:

- Lowering input costs
- Capturing high-value markets
- Boosting farm income
- Nonrenewable resource conservation

As a follow up to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) conducted the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s first in-depth survey of organic farming in the United States. NASS collected 2008 data from operators of farms that were either USDA certified organic, were making the transition to organic production, or were exempt from certification because of sales totaling less than $5,000. As shown in Figure T-9, the 2008 Organic Production Survey counted 14,540 organic farms and ranches in the United States, comprising 4.1 million acres of land. Of those farms, 10,903 were USDA certified and 3,637 were exempt from certification. Nearly 20 percent of the nation’s certified and exempt organic farms were in California (2,714) in 2008, the most of any state in the nation, and as shown in Table T-30, Wisconsin had the second most with 1,222 organic farms.

According to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, there were 13 organic farms in Washington County covering 1,620 acres. The value of sales on these farms totaled $1,075,000. Four farms organically raised livestock and poultry products and 11 farms organically raised crops.

Within the southeastern Wisconsin region, Washington County is poised to be a leader in organic farming. As seen in Table T-31, Washington County had as many as two to four times as many organic farms than six counties in the seven-county region in 2007. Acreage in organic production in the County also greatly exceeded acreage in organic production in all other counties with the exception of Walworth County.

---

16 As defined by the Organic Trade Association.
17 As defined by the National Organic Standards Board.
18 USDA-NASS, 2008 Organic Production Survey
Also shown in Table T-31, although Walworth County had six more farms and 151 additional acres in organic production, sales of organically produced commodities in Washington County exceeded those of Walworth County and every other county in the region. Furthermore, the County's average sales per farm for organic products greatly exceeded that of every county in the region and the State.

### Organic Dairy Market

According to a survey of organic production conducted in 2008, Wisconsin farmers received an average of 25.9 cents per pound for organic milk in 2008, seven cents higher than the State average for all milk types. Additional data further demonstrates the strength and stability of the market for organic products in the typically volatile dairy industry.

Figure T-10 shows prices paid for organic milk by the Coulee Region Organic Producer Pool (CROPP)/Organic Valley in comparison to the conventional pay price for milk in Wisconsin from 1989 to 2008. CROPP is a...
local, cooperative enterprise that was formed from seven southwestern Wisconsin farms in 1988. As seen in Figure T-10, the price CROPP paid to dairy farmers for organic milk was far less volatile than the price earned by farmers producing conventional milk. The price paid to CROPP suppliers steadily escalated in a generally consistent fashion since the cooperative's inception. The few declines in organic milk prices happened in conjunction with drops in conventional milk prices. As organic milk prices were consistently higher and more stable than the prices for conventional milk, the cooperative is likely to have contributed greatly to the rapid expansion of organic dairy farms in southwestern Wisconsin. Organic-produced milk from cows accounted for over 64 percent of the State's total organic sales in 2008.

Although the 2007 Census of Agriculture does not contain specific county data for organic milk sales or production, the number of farms in production and sales of organic livestock and poultry products, which includes organic milk, indicates that in 2007 Washington County had the most farms selling organic livestock and poultry products in the Region and was the only county to report its organic livestock and poultry products sales. As Washington County has been a regional leader in the dairy industry with the greatest number of dairy farms and highest dairy sales, the continued increasing efficiency of dairy farms may further contribute to the County's role as a regional leader in organic dairy farming.

Wisconsin’s organic sales totaled $132.8 million, including $30.1 million in crops sales and $102.6 million in sales of livestock, poultry and their products. The top five organic sales categories by sector for the State in 2008 are presented in Table T-32. Organic livestock, poultry, and their products account for more than three-quarters of Wisconsin's total organic sales, the bulk of which is from organic milk from cows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Livestock and Livestock Products</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Field Crops</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Fruits, Berries, and Vegetables</th>
<th>Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Milk from Cows</td>
<td>$85,143,556</td>
<td>Corn for Grain</td>
<td>$7,372,031</td>
<td>Vegetables, other</td>
<td>$3,249,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Chicken Eggs</td>
<td>7,503,408</td>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>3,473,933</td>
<td>Cranberries</td>
<td>2,365,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cattle and Calves*</td>
<td>4,974,345</td>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>2,974,380</td>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>1,620,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Milk Cows</td>
<td>3,182,616</td>
<td>Haylage</td>
<td>1,620,293</td>
<td>Tomatoes</td>
<td>405,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beef Cows</td>
<td>475,618</td>
<td>Winter Wheat</td>
<td>775,441</td>
<td>Squash, all types</td>
<td>293,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes organic bulls, beef calves, replacement milk heifers, etc.

Source: USDA-NASS, 2008 Organic Production Survey

22 Megatrends
24 The total organic livestock and poultry products sales for both Ozaukee and Walworth were withheld to avoid disclosing data for individual farms as each county had very few farms selling organic livestock and poultry.
**Specialty Foods and Crops**

Specialty foods are a new and rapidly growing trend in Wisconsin. Specialty foods have unique quality and features, and are targeted towards consumers who are willing to pay a higher price for the product. Specialty cheeses, gourmet foods, novelty products, organics, and health foods are all examples of specialty foods that can be produced in Wisconsin.

Artisan dairies are one of the sectors the State has declared worth pursuing. According to the National Agricultural Statistics Service, specialty cheeses rose by seven percent in 2005 to 355 million pounds produced. That means specialty cheeses now comprise 15 percent of the State’s total cheese volume.

According to Brian Gould (Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, UW-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences), Wisconsin set a record in 2009 for cheese output producing 2.65 billion pounds equaling 26 percent of the nation’s total cheese production. This makes Wisconsin the number one cheese producing state in the nation as California’s production has decreased by 10 percent since 2007 and Wisconsin’s has increased by seven percent. Of the 2.65 billion pounds produced, 480 million pounds (approximately 18 percent) were specialty cheese, a nine percent increase from the previous year.25

Organic foods are also considered a specialty food and are being promoted and well supported in Wisconsin. This growing market is becoming more popular every year at the national level. According to the Organic Trade Association’s 2010 Organic Industry Survey, U.S. sales of organic food and beverages have grown from $1 billion in 1990 to $24.8 billion in 2009. Sales in 2009 represented 5.1 percent growth over 2008 sales. Experiencing the highest growth in sales during 2009 were organic fruits and vegetables, up 11.4 percent over 2008 sales.

**Horticulture/Floriculture**

The urban agriculture/horticulture industry has produced more than $2.6 billion from sales and services annually. In 1998, Wisconsin had more than 1,100 production nurseries utilizing more than 12,000 acres, 1,250 dealers in nursery stock and herbaceous perennials, 13 million square feet of bedding plants, cut flowers and floriculture crops grown under glass and on 723 open acres. Retail greenhouses and nurseries exceeded $157 million in sales in 1997. Maintenance of 1.2 million acres of turf is estimated at $1.5 billion annually. Sixty-two sod growers raise just under 7,000 acres of sod annually at an estimated value of $14 million. It is estimated there are 1,500 fresh market growers in the State.

Washington County Farm Fact

**Meadow Creek Elk Farms, LLC**

(Town of Farmington)

One form of specialty food production that can be found in Washington County is on Meadow Creek Elk Farms, LLC (MCEF) located in the Town of Farmington. At MCEF elk are raised for their velvet antler (a mainstay in traditional Chinese medicine) and for meat.

“The barn and outbuildings on our 130 year old homestead, in rural West Bend, WI, sat vacant for many years. Long gone are the days of dairy cows in the barn, crops in the fields and corn in the silo. Today a new era in agriculture and health awareness has made this old farm useful once again. The pastures are enclosed with eight foot fence. The dairy cows have been replaced with elk that forage on high quality grasses and legumes for their native diet. Supplemented with hay, to maintain their body condition, our elk live low-stress lives, allowing for the development of high quality antlers and safe, healthy, natural and nutritious meat. The heritage of farming will continue to grow as this exploding new industry unfolds.”

– MCEF website

http://www.elkantlers.com/Meadow_Creek.htm

As shown on Table T-26, while horticulture provided 14 percent of agricultural revenue for Washington County in 2007, horticulture sales provided less than 3 percent of agricultural revenue for the State. The relative importance of the horticultural industry in the County compared to the State could likely be in response to the demand for landscaping material for urban development in the County and the Milwaukee metropolitan area. According to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, Washington County was ranked third of all Wisconsin counties in the value of sales of commodities that fall under the nursery, greenhouse, floriculture, and sod group.

Rapid urbanization, coupled with horticultural activity on that land increases the potential for a negative impact on natural resources. Research shows that homeowners use up to six times more fertilizers and chemicals per acre than those in agricultural production.

Consumers are increasingly aware of and concerned about issues such as food safety, lawn care, pesticide use and environmental quality. For example, increasing concern of parents and school officials over children’s exposure to pesticides in the State’s 3,000 K-12 schools has increased the demand for school Integrated Pest Management Programs. Consumer demand for information and educational training through the Master Gardener Program, operated through the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension, continues to increase across the State. More than 1,200 Master Gardeners have been trained in southeastern Wisconsin alone.26

**Agri-tourism**

Agri-tourism is an alternative farming enterprise that is defined as a business conducted by a farm operator for the enjoyment and education of the public, to promote the products for the farm, and thereby generate additional farm income. Agri-tourism is a subset of farm-based tourism which includes recreation, camping, hunting and fishing, as well as retail, lodging, and entertainment.27

Examples of agri-tourism include:

- Farm tours for families and school children
- Day camps
- Crop art or barn art
- Rural weddings
- Hay or sleigh rides
- Overnight stays in a bed and breakfast
- Farm and cannery tours
- Petting farms
- “Pick-your-own” farm sales
- Farmers’ markets
- Overnight stays in a bed and breakfast

---

Value Added Agriculture

According to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), in its simplest form, value-added agriculture is a process of increasing the economic value and consumer appeal of an agricultural product. It allows farmers to benefit by being part of a “specialized” supply chain and affords them the chance to receive a larger share of the consumers' dollar. Usually producer-driven, there is room for both small- and large-scale development within value-added agriculture.

DATCP has an ambitious vision for value-added agriculture in Wisconsin. The Department is working to enhance the State's specialty foods reputation with development rooted in specialty meats, livestock and dairy; promote strong market development efforts to create branded products with a "From Wisconsin" identity; develop high-value industrial crops for nutraceutical (nutritional supplements) and pharmaceutical uses, along with ethanol and fiber crop production; and establish industry-led entrepreneurial agriculture with a State partnership and a proven development framework.

The Department's focus is to cultivate improvement in the economic well-being of farmers and rural communities. Diversification into alternative crops or livestock can create additional income streams for Wisconsin farms. The development of alternative crops and livestock or new agricultural enterprises creates jobs and increases the investment in rural communities.28

Value added farmers use several methods to market their products to local consumers. Community supported agriculture (CSA), agri-tourism, the internet, home delivery, specialty stores, you pick stands, on farm stands, and farmer's markets all provide the farmer with great visibility to local consumers.

It is estimated that in 2004, there were 6,700 farms in Wisconsin that were classified as ‘value added’. This number is slightly less than one half as many farms as found in the dairy sector (at that time there were approximately 16,000 dairy farms in the State).

DATCP, working with State, Federal and private partners, developed the Value Added Dairy Initiative (VADI) to help restore and reinvigorate its transitioning dairy sector. The initiative is federally-funded, and matched by in-kind contributions of agencies and organizations within Wisconsin's dairy sector.

---

According to the 2009 VADI Report:

- Milk production is on the rise. Wisconsin’s 2008 milk production increased by 2.5 percent, cresting to 24.7 billion pounds.
- Specialty cheese production set a new record in 2008 as production increased by 4 percent to a total of 419 million pounds. Wisconsin’s specialty cheese industry continues to rapidly grow and innovate. Since the inception of the Value Added Dairy Initiative in 2004, specialty cheese production has increased to almost 20 percent of the State’s cheese production. In addition, 99 of the State’s 136 cheese plants now craft at least one type of specialty cheese, both numbers of plants and specialty cheese crafters were up from the previous year.
- Reinvestments into all aspects of Wisconsin’s dairy industry are occurring as processors and producers across the State have each reinvested nearly $1 billion to modernize their respective processing operations or dairy farms during the past 5 years. Projections over the next 5 years anticipate an additional $1 billion by each group in planned reinvestments using a variety of VADI tools.
- In total, 43 new processing plants have opened and more than 70 have expanded in Wisconsin since the VADI began in 2004.29

There is a growing trend of consumers demanding healthier and locally grown products. Value added agriculture not only meets consumer demand, but is a growing market in Wisconsin. Value added agriculture can often offer the consumer an agricultural experience or relationship with the producer that normally cannot be obtained elsewhere. Although value added farms seem to be smaller in size than traditional farms, value added farms are more manageable and fill a niche by utilizing smaller vacated farmsteads.

As residential development has occurred in Washington County in recent decades, many farms have sold their land to be subdivided and many smaller farmsteads have struggled to survive. Value added agriculture, in its broadest sense, and niche farming should be considered as a means to keep agriculture economically sustainable on smaller farmsteads in Washington County.

**Equestrian (Horse) Industry**

In 2007, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls conducted a survey to estimate the number of households in the State that own at least one horse. The survey, designed to assess the economic impact horse owners have on the State’s economy, revealed some very significant findings.30

The SRC estimates that there are between 299,341 and 351,208 horses in the State and that their total value is between $998 million and $1.2 billion. Other key findings from the survey include:

- The equine industry directly generates $30 million to $35 million in annual revenues and $735 million to $862 million in expenses. The equine industry is, in short, a significant economic sector in the State.
- The total impact of the equine industry in Wisconsin, including indirect and induced impacts, is estimated to be:
  - $1.3 billion and $1.5 billion in sales or total economic impact per year
  - 33,259 to 37,416 jobs that generate between $269 million and $303 million in labor income
  - $351 million and $395 million in total income in Wisconsin
  - $106-$120 million in taxes (local + state + federal) are generated because of the equine industry

---


Horses in Wisconsin are primarily used for pleasure/trail riding or showing/competing and most owners ride about once a week.

The issues facing Wisconsin’s horse owners focus primarily on land use concerns. Housing developments that limit where horses can be ridden (61 percent) and lack of local trails (50 percent) were the most commonly cited issues facing the State’s equestrians. Relatively few horse owners said that they faced a lack of local services (e.g. veterinarians, information, farriers) needed for their horses.

According to Liv Sandberg (Equine Specialist, Department of Animal Science, UW-Madison College of Agricultural and Life Sciences), a leveling off in numbers of horses has occurred in recent years, but they still remain important parts of many peoples’ lives. The future of the horse industry looks promising as 5,900 children participate in the State’s 4-H horse project, and this number does not include children participating in horse programs through pony clubs, saddle clubs, the Future Farmers of America (FFA), or other organizations. In 2010, there were 108 youth enrolled in horse or horseless 4-H projects in Washington County.

Sustainable/Biodynamic Agriculture

Sustainable Agriculture
The Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 defined sustainable agriculture as an integrated system of plant and animal production practices having a site-specific application that will, over the long term:

- satisfy human food and fiber needs
- enhance environmental quality and the natural resource base upon which the agricultural economy depends
- make the most efficient use of nonrenewable resources and on-farm resources and integrate, where appropriate, natural biological cycles and controls
- sustain the economic viability of farm operations
- enhance the quality of life for farmers and society as a whole.

Farm operators can engage in varying degrees of sustainable agriculture. For example, farmers could do any or all of the following to work toward sustainability: increasing biodiversity wherever possible through crop rotation, reducing chemical inputs, and adopting other practices that promote environmental stewardship.

Rides and Reins Therapeutic Equestrian Center, Inc. is a non-profit organization located on 45 acres in the Town of Polk with the goal of providing physically, mentally and emotionally challenged individuals an opportunity for emotional and physical growth through horsemanship by making therapy fun instead of painful when provided on horseback. Children who participate in therapeutic horseback riding experience physical, emotional, and mental rewards. Because horseback riding gently and rhythmically moves the riders body in a manner similar to the way a person walks, riders with physical disabilities often show improvements in flexibility, balance, and strength. Not only does therapeutic riding offer physical benefits to students, but also psychological benefits. The riders feel a sense of achievement that often enhances motivation towards recovery. Individuals having mental or emotional disabilities often form a unique relationship with a horse that can lead to self-confidence, patience, and increased self-esteem. Medical professionals, as well as the American Physical Therapy Association, recognize the positive qualities of therapeutic horseback riding.

-Rides and Reins Therapeutic Equestrian Center website (http://ridesnreins.com/index.html)

32 Kandi O’Neil, Washington County UW-Extension 4-H Youth Development Educator, November 2010.
33 From the 1990 “Farm Bill,” Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (FACTA), Public Law 101-624, Title XVI, Subtitle A, Section 1603.
intercropping, use of cover crops, farmscaping, and integrated pest management; applying animal manures or compost; diversifying enterprises and planning for profit; minimizing tillage, commercial fertilizer, and pesticides; buying supplies locally; employing local people; and including quality of life into his or her goals.34

**Biodynamic Agriculture**

Biodynamic agriculture is an advanced organic farming system that is gaining increased attention for its emphasis on food quality and soil health and was the first ecological farming system to develop as a grassroots alternative to chemical agriculture. A basic ecological principle of biodynamics is to conceive of the farm as an organism, a self-contained entity. Emphasis is placed on the integration of crops and livestock, recycling of nutrients, maintenance of soil, and the health and well being of crops and animals; the farmer too is part of the whole. Biodynamic agriculture includes a series of holistic management practices that address the environmental, social, and financial aspects of the farm. Biodynamic practices include striving to be self-sufficient in the farm’s use of energy, fertilizers, plants, and animals.

**INNOVATIONS IN AGRICULTURE**

**Anaerobic Digestion**

According to the Midwest Rural Energy Council, anaerobic digesters convert the energy stored in organic materials present in manure into biogas. Biogas can be fed directly into a gas-fired combustion turbine. The type of turbine most often used for small-scale electricity production is the microturbine. Combustion of biogas converts the energy stored in the bonds of the molecules of the methane contained in the biogas into mechanical energy as it spins a turbine. The mechanical energy produced by biogas combustion in an engine or microturbine spins a turbine that produces a stream of electrons, or, electricity. In addition, waste heat from these engines can provide heating or hot water for use on farm.

As a fuel, biogas composed of 65 percent methane yields about 650 BTU per cubic foot. Often used when designing systems for the anaerobic digestion of manure, these energy estimates can predict the amount of power production per animal. General estimates predict one kilowatt of electricity production requires five to eight dairy cows.

Environmental benefits of anaerobic digestion include:

- Odors are significantly reduced or eliminated.
- Flies are substantially reduced.
- A relatively clean liquid for flushing and irrigation can be produced.
- Pathogens are substantially reduced in the liquid and solid products.
- Greenhouse gas emissions are reduced.

Nonpoint source pollution is substantially reduced.

Economic benefits of anaerobic digestion include:

- The time devoted to moving, handling, and processing manure is minimized.
- Biogas is produced for heat or electrical power.
- Waste heat can be used to meet the heating and cooling requirements of the dairy facility.
- Concentrating nutrients to a relatively small volume for export from the site can reduce the land required for liquid waste application.
- A rich fertilizer can be produced for sale to the public, nurseries, or other crop producers.
- Income can be obtained from the processing of imported wastes (tipping fees), the sale of organic nutrients, greenhouse gas credits, and the sale of power.
- Power tax credits may be available for each kWh of power produced.
- Greenhouse tax credits may become available for each ton of carbon recycled.
- Power generated is “distributed power” which minimizes the need to modify the power grid. The impact of new power on the power grid is minimized.\(^35\)

**Bio-fuels and Bio-technology\(^36\)**

Biodiesel is a clean burning alternative to petroleum diesel that is produced by domestic renewable resources, such as vegetable oils and animal fats. Biodiesel can be used as a pure fuel (B100) or blended with petroleum and can be used in any diesel engine with little or no engine modifications. The State of Wisconsin continues to promote the production and use of biodiesel as an alternative transportation fuel. Wisconsin continues to position itself to be a leader in biodiesel technology innovation, production and consumption.

In 2004, Wisconsin’s first biodiesel refining facility began production at 2 million gallons per year. There are currently six operating, two idle, and five proposed biodiesel facilities with a total production capacity of over 44.3 million gallons annually. There are also 25 smaller scale production facilities producing less than 1 million gallons annually. Wisconsin’s actual biodiesel production in 2008 remained level at an estimated 7.46 million gallons as compared to 7.40 million gallons in 2007.

Historically, production capacity growth has been positive; even so, the total amount of fuel produced per year is considerably less than capacity. Despite many challenges facing the biodiesel industry last year, the Wisconsin Office of Energy Independence determined that Wisconsin’s actual biodiesel production increased 1.7 percent from an estimated 7.46 million gallons in 2008 to 7.59 million gallons in 2009.

**Wisconsin Ethanol Production**

According to the Office of Energy Independence, as of March 2009, Wisconsin ranked ninth in the country for ethanol production at 527 million gallons of annual capacity. Ethanol production in Wisconsin increased 3 percent from 447.3 million gallons in 2008 to 462 million gallons in 2009. Of the 462 million gallons that were produced in the State, 229.4 million gallons, nearly 50 percent, stayed in the State. The amount of Wisconsin-made ethanol blended in gasoline increased from 217 million gallons in 2008 to 229.4 million gallons in 2009, a 5.4 percent increase. Ethanol blended fuel offered in Wisconsin includes E10,


E20, E25 and E85, the number indicates the percentage of ethanol blended with conventional gasoline.

According to the Renewable Fuels Association and as shown in Table T-33, in 2010 there were ten fuel ethanol facilities in Wisconsin. The closest biorefinery facilities to Washington County are Didion Ethanol in Cambria, United WI Grain Producers, LLC in Friesland, Valero Renewable Fuels in Jefferson Junction, and United Ethanol in Milton. Although the exact amount of corn grown in Washington County that is converted to ethanol is not documented, a significant amount is known to be transported to ethanol plants on an annual basis.

Table T-33
FUEL ETHANOL FACILITIES AND CAPACITIES
BY PLANT IN WISCONSIN: 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Nameplate/Operating Capacity (mg/y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACE Ethanol, LLC</td>
<td>Stanley</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badger State Ethanol, LLC</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Rock Renewable Fuels, LLC</td>
<td>Necedah</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didion Ethanol</td>
<td>Cambria</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubay Biofuels Greenwood</td>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>– b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Ethanol</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United WI Grain Producers, LLC</td>
<td>Friesland</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica Energy, LLC</td>
<td>Oshkosh</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Renewable Fuels</td>
<td>Jefferson Junction</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Wisconsin Renewable Energy, LLC</td>
<td>Boyceville</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aMillions of gallons per year.

bNot applicable (under construction).

Source: Renewable Fuels Association and Washington County.
TRENDS, NEEDS, OR PLANS
THAT MAY AFFECT FARMLAND PRESERVATION

INTRODUCTION

Section 91.10 (1) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that a farmland preservation plan identifies, describes, and documents non-farm development trends, plans, or needs related to housing, transportation, utilities, energy, communications, business development, community facilities and services, waste management, municipal expansion, and environmental preservation that may affect farmland preservation and agricultural development in the County. Understanding the trends, plans, or needs associated with these elements is important to farmland preservation planning because of the effects they have on the demand for land. A plan that accounts for future demand can incorporate strategies that provide the necessary amount of land for all of the County's needs while preserving agriculture. This chapter analyzes and summarizes trends, needs, and plans for each of the aforementioned elements.

HOUSING (AND RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes housing (and residential development) trends and needs as documented in Chapter II of Washington County’s comprehensive plan as well as other chapters in this plan.

- In 2009, there were 51,473 households with an average household size of 2.53 persons per household in Washington County. The number of households in the County has increased over the last few decades while the average number of persons per household has decreased. This trend has continued through 2009 and is typical throughout Wisconsin reflecting the fact that family sizes (average number of children per family) have decreased and unmarried persons have increasingly tended to establish their own households rather than live with family.

- The median household income in the County was $60,549 in 2009, which was $3,136 more than the Region’s median household income of $57,413, $10,556 more than the State’s median household income of $49,993, and $10,328 more than the Nation’s median household income of $50,221.

- Population and household projections for the year 2035 were prepared by the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) in 2004-2005.\(^1\) Under the Regional

---

\(^1\) See Chapter II of Washington County’s comprehensive plan for details on how population and household projections were determined.
Land Use Plan, the projected population for Washington County in 2035 is 157,265 persons (see Table 19 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan). This is a projected increase of 39,769 persons, or about 34 percent, over the 2000 population level of 117,496. Changes in the number and size of households will accompany changes in the size of the resident population. Taking the assumptions from the regional land use plan into consideration with the projected average household size of 2.45 persons per household, the projected number of households for Washington County in 2035 is 62,849. This is a projected increase of 19,006 households, or about 43 percent, over the 43,843 households in 2000.

- Local governments in Washington County developed population and household projections for 2035 to use in local comprehensive plans that refine the systems level projections developed by SEWRPC for the Region and County. These projections form the basis used to plan for land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and other community facilities for each local comprehensive plan through the planning design year of 2035. The resultant population projection was 184,512 persons for Washington County\(^2\) in 2035. This is a projected increase of 67,016 persons, or about 57 percent, over the 2000 population level of 117,496. Using the projected average household size (as determined by local governments) of 2.54 persons per household, the population projection selected by local governments would result in 74,587 households in Washington County in 2035. This is a projected increase of 30,744 households, or about 70 percent, over the 43,843 households in 2000. The final population and household projections chosen by each local government for use in preparing local comprehensive plans is set forth in Table 25 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**
  Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding housing in Washington County include: lack of affordable housing, rising housing costs, lack of senior housing, and the location of residential developments.

**Plans**

The following summarizes how existing plans address housing (and residential development) as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Regional Land Use Plan**
  The regional land use plan recommends a centralized regional settlement pattern within defined urban service areas. New urban development is encouraged to occur largely as infill in existing urban centers and in urban growth areas emanating outward from existing urban centers. The regional plan also recommends that existing developed areas be conserved and enhanced; that new urban development occur at densities which can efficiently and effectively be supported by public sanitary sewerage, water supply, and other services; and that urban development occur only in those areas that are covered by soils suitable for such development and which are not subject to special hazards such as flooding or erosion.

The regional land use plan recommends that prime agricultural land be preserved for long-term agricultural use and not be converted to either urban development or to other forms of rural development. An exception is prime agricultural land located adjacent to existing urban centers and within planned urban growth/sewer service areas, which is proposed to be converted to urban use to provide for orderly growth of those urban centers.

In addition to preserving prime agricultural lands and environmental corridors, the regional land use plan seeks to maintain the rural character of other lands located outside planned urban service areas. The plan

---

\(^2\) Includes the portions of the City of Hartford and Village of Newburg that extend outside of Washington County.
encourages continued agricultural and other open space uses in such areas. The plan seeks to limit
development in such areas primarily to rural-density residential development, with an overall density of
no more than one dwelling unit per five acres. Where rural residential development is accommodated, the
regional plan encourages the use of conservation design, with homes grouped together on relatively small
lots surrounded by permanently preserved agricultural, recreational, or natural resource areas such as
woodlands, wetlands, or prairies sufficient to maintain the maximum recommended density of no more
than one home per five acres.

- **Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan**

  The land use plan for Washington County for the year 2035 is presented on Map 84 of Washington
  County’s comprehensive plan. Table 108 in the comprehensive plan sets forth the number of acres and
  percent of the County in each land use category on the Land Use Plan Map. The plan map indicates where
certain types of urban development should be encouraged while preserving agricultural and
environmentally significant land and resources. The Washington County land use plan map is a
compilation of the land use plan maps prepared by each of the cities, towns, and villages in the County.
The Town of Barton Land Use Plan for the year 2035, however, uses a “phased plan” approach to land
use planning. The County’s year 2035 land use plan presented on Map 84, as that map pertains to the
Town of Barton, includes the Town of Barton’s Phase 3 land use plan for the years 2025 to 2035. The
plan addresses housing related land use categories such as “Agricultural and Rural Residential”
development and “Residential Development” as follows:

  **Agricultural and Rural Residential**

  Agricultural and rural residential uses occupy 80,529 acres, or about 29 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan
  map. The agricultural and rural residential category would allow all agricultural uses, as well as rural-density residential
  development with an average density of one home for each five to 34.9 acres. The plan encourages the continuation of
  agricultural activity in these areas, whether it is conventional farming or hobby farming (for example, the keeping of horses
  on residential lots, where permitted by local zoning ordinances). Where rural-density residential development is
  accommodated, local governments are encouraged to require the use of conservation subdivision design or lot-averaging
  techniques to help preserve rural character and provide a buffer between adjacent farmland and residential uses. In
  some cases, the common open space in conservation subdivisions may be used for agriculture.

  **Residential Development**

  Residential uses occupy 47,434 acres, or about 17 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map.
  This compares to 37,996 acres of residential lands in the County in 2006, or an increase of 9,438 acres or
  about 25 percent between 2006 and 2035. Residential categories include a suburban density residential
category, which would include predominantly single-family homes at densities equating to lot sizes of
between one and five acres; a medium-density urban residential category, which would include single-
family and potentially two-family homes at densities equating to lot sizes of 10,000 square feet to one
acre; and a high-density urban residential category, which would include single-, two-, and multi-family
homes at a density of less than 10,000 square feet per dwelling unit. Of the residential land uses, 31,155
acres, or about 66 percent, are in the suburban residential category; 13,737 acres, or about 29 percent, are

---

3 Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is being updated to include land use plan maps adopted by local governments after the County plan was adopted in April 2008.
in the medium-density residential category, and 2,542 acres, or about 5 percent, are in the high-density residential category.

Ordinances
Local governments have substantial influence over agricultural resources in the County, especially with regard to providing protection for agricultural lands and providing areas for development through local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances. A zoning ordinance divides a community into districts for the purpose of regulating the use of land and structures; the height, size, shape, and placement of structures; and the density of housing.

Housing structure type, housing unit size, and lot size are controlled by local government zoning regulations. The zoning authority of cities, villages, and towns in Washington County represents an important influence on housing development patterns. Zoning regulations can substantially determine the location, size, and type of housing. A 2006 inventory was conducted as part of the comprehensive planning process of existing residential zoning districts in each local government to help provide a basis for determining the effect of zoning regulations on various types of housing. The results of the inventory are presented in Table 149 of the comprehensive plan. Map 75 in Chapter VI of the comprehensive plan shows generalized zoning in effect in 2000.

Residential zoning districts include minimum lot size requirements, which specify the smallest land area a residential structure can be constructed upon. Lot size requirements are important because larger minimum lot size requirements can add to the total price of developing a residence by increasing land and land improvement costs; however, larger minimum lot sizes may be appropriate in areas without urban services, or in environmentally sensitive areas.

Minimum lot size requirements are typically smaller in local governments, or portions of local governments, that are served by public sewer and water. Public sewer and water services are available in the Cities of Hartford and West Bend, and all of the villages in the County, although not all of the areas within the Village of Germantown or Village of Slinger are provided with sewer and water services. Several towns provide sanitary sewer service to portions of the Town through utility or sanitary districts. See the “Utilities and Energy” section of this chapter for more information.

All of the local zoning ordinances enacted by Washington County communities include minimum floor area requirements for homes and multi-family units. These requirements are important because the cost of housing units typically increases for larger homes. Minimum floor area requirements generally correlate to minimum lot size requirements; the larger the minimum lot size requirement, the larger the minimum floor area requirement. Many local governments also relate the minimum floor area required to the number of bedrooms in the home or apartment.

TRANSPORTATION

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes transportation trends and needs as documented in Chapter IV of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- Between 1975 and 2000, the amount of land used for urban uses, including residential, commercial, industrial, and transportation uses, increased by about 21,000 acres, from about 28,000 acres to about 49,000 acres, or about 75 percent. The amount of land used for agriculture decreased by about 33,000 acres, or by about 19 percent.
Urban land uses consist of residential; commercial; industrial; governmental and institutional; and transportation, communication, and utility uses. Urban land uses encompassed about 48,936 acres, or about 18 percent of the County, in 2000. Land used for transportation, utilities, and communications facilities encompassed about 15,616 acres, or about 32 percent of all urban land and about 6 percent of the total County.

The street and highway system serves several important functions, including providing for the movement of through vehicular traffic; providing for access of vehicular traffic to abutting land uses; providing for the movement of pedestrian and bicycle traffic; and serving as the location for utilities and stormwater drainage facilities. The arterial street and highway system is intended to provide a high degree of travel mobility, serving the through movement of traffic between and through urban areas. Arterial streets and highways accounted for 425 miles in 2005. The primary function of land access streets is to provide access to abutting property. Collector streets are intended to serve primarily as connections between the arterial street system and the land access streets. WisDOT maintains a detailed database of county and local street information in the “Wisconsin Information System for Local Roads” (WISLR).

**Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**

Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding transportation in Washington County include: lack of public transportation, lack of major east/west corridor, scattered low density development increasing travel time, need to expand park and rides, and lack of funding.

**Plans**

The following summarizes how existing plans address transportation as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

**Regional Transportation System Plan**

The regional transportation system plan is intended to provide a vision for, and guide to, transportation system development in the Region for 20 or more years into the future. It is a multimodal plan of recommended transportation actions designed to address existing and anticipated future transportation problems and needs. The plan consists of four principal elements: public transit, systems management, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and arterial streets and highways. Future needs for transit, street and highway, and other transportation improvements considered in the regional transportation planning process are derived from the future growth proposed in the regional land use plan. The 2035 regional transportation system plan and modifications to that plan recommended by the Washington County jurisdictional highway system plan advisory committee are described in the Transportation Element (Chapter XI) of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

---

Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan

Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses transportation related land uses through the following land use categories:

Street and Highway Rights-of-Way

All existing street and highway rights-of-way (as of January 1, 2007) are shown on Map 84 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan as a separate category. Chapter XI in the comprehensive plan provides additional information regarding planned transportation facilities in Washington County. There are 15,661 acres, or about 6 percent of the County, within existing street and highway rights-of-way.

Other Transportation and Utilities (Except Streets and Highways)

This category includes transportation facilities other than street rights-of-way, such as airports, park-ride lots, and railroad rights-of-way. It also includes private and public utilities that provide residents and businesses with electric power, natural gas, communications, water, and sewage and solid waste management facilities and services. This category occupies 1,464 acres, or about 1 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map.

Jurisdictional Highway System Plan

In 1975 the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopted an initial jurisdictional highway system plan. That plan, with a design year of 1990, was intended to help provide the County, over time, with an integrated highway transportation system that would effectively serve and promote a desirable land use pattern in the County, abate traffic congestion, reduce travel time and costs, and reduce accident exposure. The initial plan has been amended periodically to cope with growing traffic demands; maintain an integrated County highway system; adjust the existing jurisdictional highway system to better serve the major changes in traffic patterns taking place within the County; and achieve an equitable distribution of arterial street and highway development and maintenance costs and revenues among the various levels and units of government. The County jurisdictional highway plan was updated in 2007 and 2008 to reflect the recommendations of the new regional plan, and is described in Chapter XI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

A Public Transit Plan for Washington County

The current public transit plan for Washington County sets forth the findings and recommendations from a study of transit service needs in Washington County and the means by which those needs might best be met. The primary focus of the plan was to provide transit service for Milwaukee County residents to jobs in Washington County through the establishment of the Washington County Commuter Express Service (described in Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan). The service has evolved over time to primarily provide traditional work commute trips from Washington County to downtown Milwaukee and Wauwatosa. The transit plan also recommended the establishment of shared-ride taxicab services. Shared taxicab services are currently provided by Washington County and the Cities of Hartford and West Bend. Additional information regarding public transit in Washington County is provided in Chapters IV and XI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

---

5 Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
UTILITIES AND ENERGY

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes utility and energy trends and needs as documented in Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- Sewer service areas within the County include the Cities of Hartford and West Bend and surrounding areas; the Villages of Jackson, Kewaskum, Newburg, and Slinger and surrounding areas; portions of the Village of Germantown; and the unincorporated hamlet of Allenton in the Town of Addison. About 50,128 acres, or 18 percent of the County, were within existing planned sanitary sewer service areas in 2006. About 15,084 acres, or about 5 percent of the County, and 71,500 residents, or 61 percent of the population, were served by public sanitary sewers in 2000.

- Sanitary districts in Washington County include the Allenton Sanitary District in the Town of Addison, the Hilldale Sanitary District in the Town of Hartford, the Scenic Drive Sanitary District in the Town of Trenton, the Silver Lake Sanitary District in the Town of West Bend, and the Wallace Lake Sanitary District in the Towns of Barton and Trenton. There are also two utility districts in the County; the Bark Lake Utility District in Richfield and the Pike Lake Utility District in the Town of Hartford. The Bark Lake Utility District provides street lighting service. The Pike Lake utility district includes land within the boundaries of the Pike Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District, but extends outside lake district boundaries. Sanitary sewer service is provided by the Pike Lake utility district, which discharges to the City of Hartford sewage treatment plant. 7

- The Big Cedar Lake Management District and the Little Cedar Lake Protection and Rehabilitation Districts, both located partially in the Town of West Bend and partially in the Town of Polk, have adopted sanitary district powers in addition to their lake district powers, but neither district provides sanitary sewerage services. The Big Cedar Lake District provides trash collection services for properties in the district.

- Washington County regulates private onsite wastewater treatment systems (POWTS) for any development that is not served by sanitary sewer. Development in this case applies to residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Chapter 25 of the Washington County Code of Ordinances sets forth the regulations for POWTS in both incorporated (city and village) and unincorporated (town) areas of the County. Between 1980 and 2006, permits were issued for 10,913 POWTS in Washington County.

- Groundwater is the source of water for residential, commercial, and industrial uses in Washington County. Portions of Washington County served by public water utilities encompassed about 13,800 acres, or about 5 percent of the County, in 2000. An estimated 66,800 County residents, or about 57 percent of the County population, were served by public water utilities in 2000. Private water supply systems in the County served about 260 acres in 2000. Other users get their water from private wells.

- The Cities of Hartford and West Bend and the Villages of Jackson, Kewaskum, Newburg, and Slinger have extensive, although not all-inclusive, curb and gutter storm sewer systems. Portions of the Village of Germantown and hamlet of Allenton also have curb and gutter storm sewer systems. All other communities, which include the Towns of Barton, Erin, Farmington, Germantown, Hartford, Jackson,  

7 Information updated since comprehensive plan was adopted and published.
Kewaskum, Polk, Trenton, Wayne, West Bend, the Village of Richfield, and rural portions of the Town of Addison outside Allenton may have limited curb and gutter systems but rely heavily on roadside swales and culverts to collect stormwater and runoff. Many local governments require the use of wet detention basins to help control stormwater runoff and meet the water quality goals specified in Chapter NR 151 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, regardless of whether they use curb and gutter or roadside swales to convey stormwater.

- Solid waste collection in Washington County was provided by a combination of public and private services in 2006. Solid waste is deposited at general-use landfills accepting municipal waste in adjacent counties. There are no landfills in Washington County that accept municipal or residential waste. Each local government in the County operates a recycling program.

- In a telephone survey of more than 1,200 Washington County residents conducted in 2006, 82 percent of respondents indicated support for expanding wind power. As displayed in Table T-34, Dodge and Fond du Lac Counties, located adjacent west and north of Washington County respectively, are home to a total of 253 commercial wind turbines that generate nearly 400 megawatts of power which can power more than 99,000 households. Portions of Washington County do contain the topography desired for wind farm development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Owner/Project Name</th>
<th>Year of Start Date</th>
<th>Number of Turbines</th>
<th>Megawatts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dodge</td>
<td>Babcock &amp; Brown &quot;Butler Ridge&quot;</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
<td>WI Power &amp; Light &quot;Cedar Ridge&quot;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
<td>We Energies &quot;Blue Sky Green Field&quot;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodge/Fond du Lac</td>
<td>Invenergy &quot;Forward&quot;</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fond du Lac</td>
<td>We Energies &quot;Byron&quot;</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>253</strong></td>
<td><strong>397.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: RENEW Wisconsin and Washington County.*

- **Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**

Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding utilities and energy in Washington County include: lack of space for garbage (landfills), lack of encouragement for renewable energy sources, high utility costs, and problems with sanitary sewage.

**Plans**

The following summarizes how existing plans and/or ordinances address utilities as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Water Quality Management Plan**

In 1979, the Regional Planning Commission adopted an areawide water quality management plan for Southeastern Wisconsin as a guide to achieving clean and healthy surface waters within the seven-county Region. The plan has five elements: a land use element; a point source pollution abatement element; a

---

non-point source pollution abatement element; a sludge management element; and a water quality monitoring element.

The point source pollution abatement element of the regional water quality management plan is of particular importance to land use planning. That plan element recommends major sewage conveyance and treatment facilities and identifies planned sewer service areas for each of the sewerage systems in Southeastern Wisconsin. Under Wisconsin law, major sewerage system improvements and all sewer service extensions must conform with the water quality management plan.

Sanitary sewer service areas in Washington County are shown on Map 49 in Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. A list of adopted sewer service area plans in Washington County is set forth in Table 95 of the comprehensive plan. Additional information regarding areas provided with sewer service and sewerage facilities is provided in Chapter V of the comprehensive plan.

**Water Quality Management Plan Update**

The Commission worked with the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) to update the regional water quality management plan\(^9\) for the area within the Kinnickinnic River, Menomonee River, Milwaukee River, Root River, and Oak Creek watersheds; the Milwaukee Harbor estuary; and the adjacent nearshore areas draining to Lake Michigan. The planning area included that portion of Washington County located east of the subcontinental divide, or about 59 percent of the County (see Map 20 in Chapter III of Washington County’s comprehensive plan). The interagency effort used the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s recommended watershed approach to update the water quality management plan and to develop the MMSD’s 2020 Facilities Plan for the study area, called the Greater Milwaukee Watersheds. The plan recommends standards to control point and nonpoint pollution sources, and provides the basis for decisions on community, industrial, and private waste disposal systems.

**Regional Water Supply Plan**

The Commission adopted a regional water supply plan for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region in 2010.\(^10\) The regional water supply plan together with the abovementioned groundwater inventories and a ground water simulation model form the SEWRPC regional water supply management program. The preparation of these three elements included interagency partnerships with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and many of the area’s water supply utilities.

The regional water supply plan includes the following major components:

- Water supply service areas and forecast demand for water use.
- Recommendations for water conservation efforts to reduce water demand.
- Evaluation of alternative sources of supply, recommended sources of supply, and recommendations for development of the basic infrastructure and institutional structures required to deliver that supply.
- Identification of groundwater recharge areas to be protected from incompatible development.


• Specification of new institutional structures necessary to carry out plan recommendations.
• Identification of constraints to development levels in subareas of the Region due to water supply sustainability concerns.

**Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan**

Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses utility related land uses through the following land use category:

*Other Transportation and Utilities (Except Streets and Highways)*

This category includes transportation facilities other than street rights-of-way, such as airports, park-ride lots, and railroad rights-of-way. It also includes private and public utilities that provide residents and businesses with electric power, natural gas, communications, water, and sewage and solid waste management facilities and services. This category occupies 1,464 acres, or about 1 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map.

**Chapter 25 (Sanitary Code) of the Washington County Code of Ordinances**

As noted in Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan, Washington County regulates private on-site wastewater treatment systems (POWTS) for any development in the County that is not served by a public sanitary sewer system. The number and type of POWTS located in the County as of 2006 are set forth in Table 78 in Chapter V of the comprehensive plan. The authority to regulate POWTS comes from Chapters Comm 5, Comm 16, Comm 82, Comm 84 through 87, and Comm 91 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code. Chapter 25, the Sanitary Code, of the Washington County Code of Ordinances sets forth the regulations for POWTS in the County. Chapter 25 of the County Ordinance should be updated periodically to allow for advancements in POWTS technology over the comprehensive plan design period in accordance with changes to the Wisconsin Administrative Code.

**NR 151 and NR 216 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code**

Chapter NR 216 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, which is intended to reduce the discharge of pollutants carried by stormwater, requires county and local governments in urbanized areas, which are identified based on population and density, to obtain a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) Stormwater Discharge Permit. The code requires that the designated county or local government meet State standards to control pollution that enters a municipal storm sewer system and develop a storm sewer system map, a public information and education program, a stormwater and erosion control ordinance, an illicit discharge detection program, and a plan to reduce suspended solids.

Chapter NR 151 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code requires that municipalities with a WPDES permit reduce the amount of total suspended solids in stormwater runoff by 20 percent by 2008 and by 40 percent by 2013, with respect to stormwater runoff from areas of existing development with no controls as of October 2004. The Village of Germantown is part of the Milwaukee urbanized area and must obtain a permit from the DNR under Phase I stormwater regulations. The Village of Germantown has applied for a permit as part of a group of other communities in the Menomonee River watershed. Phase II of NR 216 requires municipalities outside urbanized areas with a population greater than 10,000 and a density over 1,000 persons per square mile to obtain a WPDES Stormwater Discharge Permit. As a result of Phase II requirements, the Cities of Hartford and West Bend, Washington County, and the Village of Richfield will be required to obtain permits. Washington County is required to obtain a permit only for coverage of

---

11 Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
its facilities in the City of West Bend, City of Hartford, and the urbanized portions of the Villages of Germantown and Richfield.

In addition, regardless of whether a municipality is required to have a stormwater discharge permit under Chapter NR 216, Chapter NR 151 requires that all construction sites that have one acre or more of land disturbance must achieve an 80 percent reduction in the amount of sediment that runs off the site. With certain limited exceptions, those sites required to have construction erosion control permits must also have post-development stormwater management practices to reduce the total suspended solids (sediment) that would otherwise run off the site by 80 percent for new development, 40 percent for redevelopment, and 40 percent for infill development occurring prior to October 1, 2012. After October 1, 2012, infill development will be required to achieve an 80 percent reduction. If it can be demonstrated that the solids reduction standard cannot be met for a specific site, total suspended solids must be controlled to the maximum extent practicable.

Under the requirements of Chapter NR 151, as of March 10, 2008, incorporated municipalities with average population densities of 1,000 people or more per square mile that are not required to obtain municipal stormwater discharge permits must implement public information and education programs relative to specific aspects of nonpoint source pollution control; municipal programs for management of leaf and grass clippings; and site specific programs for application of lawn and garden fertilizers on municipally-owned properties with over five acres of pervious surface. This requirement applies to virtually all cities and villages.

COMMUNICATION

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes communication trends and needs as documented in Chapters V and VII of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Telecommunications Service and Facilities**
  Telecommunication facilities in Washington County are documented in Table 82 and Map 54 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Although there are many telecommunication service providers, there are only a few basic types of communication services. These are:

  1) Voice Transmission Services; including: “Plain Old Telephone Service” (POTS); cellular wireless; satellite wireless; packet-based telephone networks; and Internet voice services;
  2) Data Transmission Services, including: the Internet; ATM-Frame Relay, and third generation (3G) cellular wireless networks;
  3) Multimedia Services, including: video, imaging, streaming video, data, and voice; and
  4) Broadcast Services, including AM/FM terrestrial radio, satellite radio and television, terrestrial television, and cable television.

Antennas providing wireless cell phone service were inventoried in 2005 as part of the regional telecommunications plan. The location of wireless telecommunications towers and antennas in Washington County are shown on Map 54 and listed in Table 82 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Providers with facilities in the County include Ameritech, AT&T, Charter Communications, Cingular, Motorola, NConnect, Netwurx, Nextel, Prime Co, Sprint, TeleCorp, T-Mobile, SBC, U.S. Cellular, Verizon, Verizon North, Voice Stream Wireless, and Time-Warner Cable.

- In a telephone survey of more than 1,200 Washington County residents conducted in 2006, 72 percent of respondents indicated support for expanding high speed internet service.
Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses

Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. A weakness identified regarding communication in Washington County was a lack of broad-band service in parts of the County.

Plans

The following summarizes how existing plans and/or ordinances address communication as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

• Regional Telecommunications Plan

Telecommunications have become increasingly important in the local, national, and global economies. SEWRPC has undertaken a regional telecommunications planning effort to create a better understanding of telecommunications networks and the provision of services such as wireless and wireline telecommunications and high speed, broadband telecommunications throughout the Region. An inventory of wireless telecommunications providers and antennas providing cell phone service in Washington County is included in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 51, A Wireless Antenna Siting and Related Infrastructure Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin, published in September 2006. In addition to presenting inventories of both infrastructure and performance for the existing cellular/PCS mobile wireless networks operating in the Region, the plan describes a recommended wireless telecommunications plan for the Region.

The wireless communications plan recommended in Planning Report No. 51 consists of two levels of wireless networks – a wireless backhaul network\(^{12}\) plan and a community-level wireless access network plan. The plan sets forth an approach to implement both the regional wireless backhaul network and community level wireless network plans. The proposed plan implementation process is intended to influence, rather than replace, existing competitive private sector, market-driven planning in order to promote the public interest within the Region. The Towns of Addison and Wayne worked with SEWRPC to develop a community level wireless access network plan. The Town of Wayne is currently working with HeirComm Networks to implement its plan.

A regional broadband access plan, which built upon the wireless telecommunications plan, was completed in 2007.\(^{13}\) Upon implementation, this plan will support a mix of wireline and wireless networks that will provide fourth generation (4G) video, voice, and data communications services to the entire Region. A central feature of the recommended plan is the potential for cooperative efforts between the public and private sectors in which infrastructure costs are shared between the public safety and commercial networks. Implementation of the recommended plan will require county or multi-county action, although partial implementation can be achieved at the community or multi-community level.

• Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan\(^{14}\)

Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses communication related land uses through the “Other Transportation and Utilities” category described on page 102 of this document.
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\(^{12}\) A backhaul network is designed to convey wireless communications data from multiple users in a relatively small service area to a centralized access point. Multiple access points in a larger service area in turn transmit wireless data to a cable Internet connection (gateway) maintained by a local exchange company. Information is also disseminated from the Internet to the access network, then to local users through the backhaul network.


\(^{14}\) Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes business development trends and needs as documented in Chapter II of this plan as well as Chapter XIII of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- As stated in Chapter II of this plan, farm proprietor employment and farm employment in general have experienced a decline in recent years.

- While the agricultural sector constitutes a small and declining share of the regional economy, it still constitutes a viable economic sector. Wisconsin agriculture is expected to hold a comparative advantage in the dairy and vegetable segments. However, due to continued technological advances in genetics and mechanization, cost pressures from national and global competition, and modern management practices, the employment levels in agriculture may be expected to continue to decline. The continued conversion of farmland to urban uses may also be expected to reduce agricultural employment in the Region.

- While the overall number of jobs in Washington County is projected to increase between 2000 and 2035, jobs in agricultural, agricultural services, forestry, mining, and unclassified jobs are projected to experience a decline of 156 jobs or by about 7 percent.

- The status of agriculture has evolved over recent years. As a whole, farm operators are getting older and are less likely to participate in farming as a full-time occupation. Between 1982 and 2007, the average age of principal farm operators in Washington County increased from 50 to 56. Nearly 30 percent of principal operators in Washington County are age 65 or older – a typical retirement age among other professions. More than half are age 55 or older.

- In Washington County, the number of principal farm operators reporting farming as their primary occupation declined from 552 in 2002 to 437 in 2007 or by 21 percent over the last five years. This is likely due to a combination of factors, including difficulty covering operational expenses on small and mid-sized farms, a desire for more stable wages and health insurance, and an increase in residential-lifestyle farms.

- An emerging trend since 2000 is the presence of immigrant labor on dairy farms. Roughly 40 percent of hired workers on Wisconsin dairy farms are recent immigrants, primarily of Hispanic descent.

- In Washington County, 16 percent of principal farm operators are women, an increase of 6 percent from 2002 to 2007. Women comprised 31 percent of all farm operators in 2007, a decrease of 4 percent since 2002.

- A list of desirable businesses was developed by the HUED workgroup during the comprehensive planning process based in part on the information presented in Chapter XIII of Washington County’s comprehensive plan and consideration of the recommendations in the Washington County Economic Development Strategic Plan and the Milwaukee 7 Strategic Framework. Desired agricultural business and industries for Washington County included:

15 The HUED workgroup focused primarily on developing the Housing, Utilities and Community Facilities, and Economic Development elements of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
Niche agriculture, including organic farming; food production for local restaurants, micro-breweries, and other niches; and crop production for the bio-fuel industry

- Continuation of dairy farming and other existing types of agriculture
- Food processing

During a brainstorming exercise conducted with the HUED workgroup during the comprehensive planning process, the County’s perceived strengths and weaknesses regarding attracting and retaining desirable businesses and industries that may be related to agriculture include:

**Strengths**

- Strong regional cooperation and promotion through the Milwaukee 7 economic development initiative
- Strong educational system including high schools, UW-Washington County (UWWC), and Moraine Park Technical College (MPTC); and proximity to Milwaukee area universities and colleges, including Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC)
- High quality of life, including good healthcare; recreational and open space amenities; rural character; high quality public services; low crime rate; cultural opportunities; and location in the Milwaukee Metropolitan Area
- Highway system, USH 41/USH 45, and good access to Milwaukee and Chicago
- Access to transportation and/or shipping through rail, local airports, General Mitchell International Airport, and the Port of Milwaukee
- Educated and skilled workforce
- County and local governments that are receptive to business needs
- Consistent population growth
- Fair Park (meeting, convention, and exhibition facilities that operate year-round to showcase area businesses)

**Weaknesses**

- Lack of jobs with pay levels high enough to afford housing in the County
- Lack of affordable workforce housing
- Too many educated young people leaving the County
- Aging of the County’s workforce population
- High land costs
- Lack of availability of business services
- County residents can be reluctant to change and fearful of new business ideas
- “NIMBY” (Not In My Back Yard) attitude in some cases

- Many goals, objectives, policies, and programs that are identified in Washington County’s comprehensive plan that directly address agriculture are listed in Chapter III of this farmland preservation plan.

---

16 Communities within the Germantown School District are within the MATC service area.
Plans
The following summarizes how Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses business development as documented in Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan**\(^\text{17}\)
  Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses business development related land uses through the following land use categories:

  **Mixed-Use**
  The mixed-use category occupies 3,453 acres, or about 1 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map, and would include a mix of residential, commercial, and institutional uses. Parcels designated for mixed use should be developed in accordance with a site plan approved by the local government concerned, and typically would be subject to planned unit development or traditional neighborhood development regulations in the local zoning ordinance. Mixed use areas are generally located along arterial highways. The concept is that commercial and institutional uses would be located adjacent to the arterial highway and would help to buffer residential uses from highway noise. Each local government would determine the uses allowed within this category by specifying the uses and allowable densities in their community comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance.

  **General Commercial**
  General commercial uses occupy 4,064 acres, or about 2 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map. This category includes retail stores; services, including drycleaners, barber shops, banks, and restaurants; and business and professional offices. This category also includes downtown business districts and community and neighborhood shopping centers.

  **Office/Professional Services**
  The office/professional services category occupies 568 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map. This category is more limited in the types of uses permitted than the general commercial category; primarily because it would include only limited retail uses. The office/professional services category includes a variety of business uses such as the offices and professional services of doctors, dentists, architects, engineers, attorneys, computer programmers, graphic artists, insurance agents, travel agents, financial planners, and other similar recognized professions and consultation services. This category may also include corporate headquarters, financial institutions, and medical facilities.

  **Business/Industrial**
  The business/industrial category occupies 2,261 acres, or about 1 percent of the County, on the 2035 land use plan map. This category would allow a mix of industrial, office, retail, and service uses, and reflects the modern business park where a mix of office and industrial uses are typically accommodated. It is
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\(^{17}\) *Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.*
anticipated that these areas would be developed in a park-like setting with landscaping, consistent signage, and similar building materials and designs to present an integrated image to customers.

Industrial
The plan envisions that the areas devoted to industrial land uses would occupy 3,971 acres, or about 1 percent of the County. This category would accommodate manufacturing and other industrial uses, such as outdoor storage of commercial vehicles and building materials.

Organizations and Programs
Although Washington County does not have a specific plan to guide business development in the County other than from the perspective of land use, a number of economic development organizations and programs have been created to assist in the establishment, retention, and expansion of area businesses, some of which could possibly be utilized to assist agribusiness development. Such organizations and programs are described in Part 2 of Chapter XIII in Washington County’s comprehensive plan (beginning on page 539).

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes community facility and service trends and needs as documented in Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- The Cities of Hartford and West Bend and the Villages of Germantown, Jackson, Kewaskum, and Slinger each have a municipal police department that provides service 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The Village of Newburg and the Town of Trenton also have police departments. These two departments do not operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and the Washington County Sheriff’s Department provides service to these areas when the municipal police departments are not operating. All unincorporated areas in the County and the Villages of Newburg and Richfield are served by the Washington County Sheriff’s Department.

- There were 14 fire departments serving the County in 2006, which include the Allenton Volunteer, Ashippun Volunteer (Dodge County), Boltonville Volunteer, Fillmore Volunteer, Germantown, Hartford, Jackson, Kewaskum, Kohlsville Volunteer, Newburg Volunteer, Richfield, Slinger Volunteer, St. Lawrence Volunteer, and West Bend fire departments. There were also 32 emergency medical service (EMS) zones in the County served by 15 EMS departments in 2006.

- There were four public safety answering points (dispatch centers) in Washington County taking emergency calls 24 hours a day.

- There were two hospitals in the County offering a full range of medical services in 2006, Saint Joseph’s Hospital located in the Town of Polk and Aurora Medical Center of Washington County located in Hartford. Saint Joseph’s Hospital had 138 beds and Aurora Medical Center of Washington County had 71 beds in 2006.

- There were 36 public schools in five high school districts and 26 private schools in the County in 2006 serving elementary and secondary grades. There is also one college and one technical college.
Plans
The following summarizes how Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses community facilities and services as documented in Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan**
  Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan addresses community facility and service related land uses through the following land use category:

  *Governmental and Institutional*
  The governmental and institutional land use category includes governmental and institutional buildings and grounds for which the primary function involves administration, safety, assembly, or educational purposes. This includes public and private schools, government offices, police and fire stations, libraries, cemeteries, religious institutions, hospitals, nursing homes, and similar facilities. The plan envisions that the areas devoted to such uses would occupy 2,876 acres, or about 1 percent of the County.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes waste management trends and needs as documented in Washington County’s Land and Water Resource Management Plan and Chapter V of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

**Human Waste**
- Waste materials, including pharmaceuticals, hazardous substances, tires, and electronic goods are potential sources of pollutants to the land and water resources of Washington County. Improper disposal of these wastes into landfills, roadside ditches and waterbodies is a concern of our generation as well as future generations.

- Working with partners, the County organizes and hosts countywide “Clean Sweep” waste collections. The program facilitates safe and convenient disposal of acceptable waste products through licensed, State-approved organizations.

- Solid waste collection in Washington County was provided by a combination of public and private services in 2006. Solid waste is deposited at general-use landfills accepting municipal waste in adjacent counties. There are no landfills in Washington County that accept municipal or residential waste. Each local government in the County operates a recycling program.

- Washington County regulates private onsite wastewater treatment systems (POWTS) for any development that is not served by sanitary sewer. Development in this case applies to residential, commercial, and industrial uses. Chapter 25 of the Washington County Code of Ordinances sets forth the regulations for POWTS in both incorporated (city and village) and unincorporated (town) areas of the County. Between 1980 and 2006, permits were issued for 10,913 POWTS in Washington County.

- **Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**
  Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding waste management in
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18 Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
Washington County include: lack of space for garbage (landfills) and no solution for waste materials management.

Animal Waste

- According to the 2008 Census of Agriculture, Washington County was home to 35,500 cattle and calves and 1,500 hogs and pigs. These animals produce as much waste as a city of approximately 650,000 people. This manure can be a valuable and economical source of fertilizer, however, if improperly managed, it can adversely impact water quality and aquatic life.

- Significantly lowered oxygen levels occur as a direct result of the decomposition of animal wastes in streams and lakes. Furthermore, animal waste contains high concentrations of phosphorus and nitrogen. When added to the ecosystem, they create conditions favorable for the occurrence of eutrophication, thereby inducing similar problems caused by commercial fertilizer runoff. Bacteria (e.g. fecal coliform) and ammonia (a toxic form of nitrogen) are also associated with raw waste. Both are harmful, and in extreme cases, fatal, to both animals and humans.

- The major sources of manure runoff in the County are from Animal Feeding Operations (AFOs), improper storage and field spreading practices, and stream pasturing. The Wisconsin Priority Watershed Program has been highly successful in certain areas of the County, but manure management practices must be implemented by all livestock farms in the County.

Plans

The following summarizes how the Land and Water Resources Management Plan addresses waste management.

- **Land and Water Resources Management Plan**
  An updated Land and Water Resources Management Plan was adopted by the County Board in October 2010. The following goals, objectives, and planned actions and outcomes were identified within the plan for animal and hazardous human waste management:

  - **Goal:** Reduce the human and environmental risks posed by animal waste.
    - **Objective:** Continue application of the County’s Manure Storage Ordinance (Chapter 16).

    **Planned Actions and Outcomes**
    - Continue to provide high quality technical review and planning assistance.
    - Continue updates to Chapter 16 of the County Code to include new State and Federal standards.
    - Continue to develop an inspection procedure and inspection schedule for manure storage facilities.
    - Inspect 10% of facilities annually based on procedure; take follow-up action as needed.
    - Educate producers, town officials, agricultural lenders and contractors regarding ordinance requirements through a minimum of 1 method annually (e.g., event displays, presentations, website, brochures, newsletters, etc.).

  - **Objective:** Ensure that all livestock operations have no: overflowing manure storage facilities, unconfined manure stacks within Water

A manure storage facility. Reducing the human and environmental risks posed by animal waste is a goal outlined in Washington County’s Land and Water Resources Management Plan.

Overflow of manure from storage facilities can be harmful to human health and water quality.
Quality Management Areas, direct runoff from feedlots or stored manure to water resource, and/or animals in streams where degradation of the streambank has or will likely occur.

Planned Actions and Outcomes

- Continue to map existing livestock operations.
- Continue to conduct on-site inventory of existing operations to determine compliance.
- Continue to develop and revise producer farm resource conservation plans which address these objectives.
- Educate producers, town officials, agricultural lenders and contractors regarding these objectives through a minimum of 1 method annually (e.g., event displays, presentations, website, brochures, newsletters, etc.).
- Assist a minimum of 5 producers annually to implement corrective measures.
- Develop a monitoring and inspection procedure that encompasses State Performance Standards.
- Promote waste-spreading BMPs that prevent runoff to water resources through a minimum of 1 method annually (e.g., event displays, presentations, website, brochures, newsletters, etc.).
- Inspect 10% of operations annually and take follow-up action as needed.

Objective: Assist with the planning and development of livestock expansions.

Planned Actions and Outcomes

- Continue to provide technical assistance for expansion projects.

Goal: Reduce the human and environmental risks posed by hazardous waste.

Objective: Provide convenient and cost effective methods for County residents to dispose of unused hazardous waste, thereby protecting County natural resources.

Planned Actions and Outcomes

- Establish permanent annual funding for the full-service Clean Sweep program.
- Continue to promote partnerships with local governments, health care facilities and the business community involving program initiatives.
- Continue to promote and conduct annual Countywide full-service Clean Sweep Collections incorporating pharmaceutical, electronic goods, tires, hazardous waste, etc. through a minimum of 4 methods annually
- (e.g., event displays, presentations, website, brochures, newsletters, press releases, etc.).

Objective: Increase awareness on the hazards of dioxins and other toxins/carcinogens emitted by open burning.

Planned Actions and Outcomes

- Provide educational materials to residents through a minimum of 1 method annually (e.g., event displays, presentations, website, brochures, newsletters, etc.). Provide information to producers as part of farm assessments.
MUNICIPAL EXPANSION

Trends and Needs
The following summarizes municipal expansion trends and needs as documented in Chapter IV of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Urban Growth Ring Analysis and Historical Urban Growth**
  SEWRPC utilizes an urban growth ring analysis and a land use inventory to inventory and monitor urban growth and development in the Region as shown on Map 36 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. The Commission land use inventory is a more detailed inventory that places all land and water areas in the Region into one of 66 land use categories, providing a basis for analyzing specific urban and nonurban land uses. The inventory results, as they apply to the County, are summarized in Part 1 of Chapter IV in Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**
  Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding municipal expansion in Washington County include: annexation of farmland for development, pressures to sell agricultural land, lack of consistent zoning and planning, rapid development, annexing and/or subdividing without sewer services, blurring between rural and urban areas, high cost of land values because of aggressive growth, land use patterns do not allow for efficient delivery of government services and result in higher costs, and loss of property owner’s rights.

Plans
The following summarizes how existing plans address municipal expansion as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Regional Land Use Plan**
  As previously stated in this chapter, the regional land use plan sets forth the fundamental concepts that are recommended to guide the development of the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region. See the housing section of this chapter in which the Regional Land Use Plan is further described.

- **Municipal Boundary Agreements**
  Boundary agreements currently exist between the following local governments:
  - Village and Town of Jackson
  - City and Town of West Bend
  - City of Hartford, Village of Richfield, and Towns of Erin and Hartford

  More information regarding municipal boundary agreements can be found in Chapter VI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Intergovernmental Agreements**
  Intergovernmental agreements currently exist between the following local governments:
  - City of Hartford and Town of Erin
  - City of Hartford and Village of Slinger

  More information regarding municipal boundary agreements can be found in Chapter VI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
Ordinances

A zoning ordinance is a public law that regulates and restricts the use of property in the public interest. The primary function of zoning should be to implement an adopted master or comprehensive plan. Indeed, Section 66.1001(3) of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that zoning, land divisions, and official mapping decisions made by local and county governments be consistent with local and county comprehensive plans as of January 1, 2010.

A zoning ordinance divides a community into districts for the purpose of regulating the use of land and structures; the height, size, shape, and placement of structures; and the density of housing. A zoning ordinance typically consists of two parts: a text setting forth regulations that apply to each of the various zoning districts, together with related procedural and administrative requirements; and a map delineating the boundaries of zoning districts.

The following summarizes how existing ordinances may impact farmland preservation as documented in Chapters VI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Zoning Ordinances**
  Each city, town, and village in Washington County has adopted and enforces its own zoning ordinance. Local governments have substantial influence over agricultural resources in the County, especially with regard to providing protection for agricultural lands and providing areas for development through local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances. In towns, town zoning applies in all areas of the town except the shoreland area. The County enforces shoreland and floodplain zoning regulations in shoreland areas in the towns.

- **Extraterritorial Zoning Regulations**
  The Wisconsin Statutes authorize cities and villages to adopt extraterritorial zoning regulations for adjacent unincorporated areas, in cooperation with the adjacent town, within three miles of a city of the first, second, or third class, and within 1.5 miles of a city of the fourth class or villages.

  No permanent extraterritorial zoning regulations were in effect in Washington County in 2010. More information regarding extraterritorial zoning regulations in Washington County can be found in Chapter VI of the County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Land Division Regulations**
  A land division ordinance is a public law that regulates the division of land into smaller parcels. Land division ordinances provide for appropriate public oversight of the creation of new parcels and help ensure that new development is appropriately located; lot size minimums specified in zoning ordinances are observed; street rights-of-way are appropriately dedicated or reserved; access to arterial streets and highways is limited in order to preserve the traffic-carrying capacity and safety of such facilities; adequate land for stormwater management, parks, drainageways, and other open spaces is appropriately located and preserved; street, block, and lot layouts are appropriate; and adequate public improvements are provided. Land division ordinances can be enacted by cities, villages, towns, and counties, with the latter’s approval authority applying only in unincorporated (town) areas and limited objecting authority applying within cities and villages. Thus, within towns, it is possible for both counties and towns to have concurrent jurisdiction over land divisions. Cities and villages also have “extraterritorial” plat approval jurisdiction over subdivisions proposed in town areas near their corporate boundaries.

The Washington County land division ordinance regulates land divisions in towns that initially or by subsequent divisions create five or more lots of five acres each or less in area within a five-year period. In addition, the Washington County shoreland and floodplain zoning ordinance includes land division regulations for areas located in the shoreland district. As required by Chapter NR 115 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, the ordinance regulates land divisions creating three or more lots of five acres or
less within a five-year period. Washington County also has authority under Section 236.10 of the Statutes to review and approve all subdivisions located in unincorporated portions of the County.

All cities and villages in the County have adopted a land division ordinance, and all of the towns except the Town of Germantown have adopted a land division ordinance. Under Chapter 236, local governments are required to review and take action on plats for subdivisions. Table 100 in Chapter VI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan provides a summary of the scope of land division ordinances adopted by local governments in Washington County.

- **Extraterritorial Platting Authority**
  Under Section 236.10 of the Statutes, a city or village may review, and approve or reject, subdivision plats located within its extraterritorial area if it has adopted a subdivision ordinance or an official map. Section 236.02 of the Statutes defines the extraterritorial plat review jurisdiction as the unincorporated area within three miles of the corporate limits of a city of the first, second, or third class, or within 1.5 miles of the corporate limits of a city of the fourth class or a village. The Cities of West Bend and Hartford, and the Villages of Germantown, Jackson, Kewaskum, Newburg, Richfield, and Slinger have extraterritorial plat authority over adjacent land in unincorporated areas.

- **Official Mapping Ordinances**
  Section 62.23(6) of the Wisconsin Statutes allows the Common Council of any City to establish an official map for the precise identification of right-of-way lines and boundaries of streets, highways, waterways, and parkways and the location and extent of railroad rights-of-way, public transit facilities, parks, and playgrounds. An official map is intended to be used as a precise planning tool for implementing master and comprehensive plans and for insuring the availability of land for the above features.

  All of the towns in Washington County have adopted village powers and created a town plan commission. The clerk of any city, village, or town in the County that adopts an official map by ordinance or resolution must record a certificate showing that the city, village, or town has established an official map with the Washington County register of deeds.

  One of the basic purposes of the official map is to discourage the construction of structures and their associated improvements on land that has been designated for future public use. Local government subdivision ordinances can also require land shown on the official map to be dedicated for street, park, or other public use at the time land is subdivided. The official map is a plan implementation device that operates on a communitywide basis in advance of land development and can thereby effectively assure the integrated development of the street and highway system, and unlike subdivision control, which operates on a plat-by-plat basis, the official map can operate over the entire community in advance of development proposals. The official map is a useful device to achieve public acceptance of long-range plans in that it serves legal notice of the government’s intention well in advance of any actual improvements. The Cities of Hartford and West Bend and the Villages of Jackson and Kewaskum have adopted official maps. The maps were last updated in 1997, 2001, 2007, and 2001, respectively.

**ENVIRONMENTAL PRESERVATION**

**Trends and Needs**

The following summarizes environmental preservation trends and needs as documented in Chapter III of Washington County’s comprehensive plan and Chapters II and III of the County’s draft park and open space plan.

---

20 Waterways may be placed on the map only if included within a comprehensive surface water drainage plan.
• **Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program**
  The Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) is a Federal-State-Local partnership between the USDA Farm Services Agency (FSA), the NRCS, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR), DATCP, and participating County Land Conservation Departments (LCD) throughout Wisconsin. The goal of CREP in Washington County is to establish riparian buffers and/or restore wetlands along navigable streams in order to reduce upland sediment (erosion) and pollution from entering surface waters. Agricultural lands that are currently being farmed are eligible for this program through 15-year contracts or through permanent conservation easements.

• **Soil and Water Resource Management Program**
  In 2004 the County elected to no longer participate in the CREP program, however, through annual grants from the DATCP Soil and Water Resource Management (SWRM) Program, the County has continued to promote the installation of riparian buffers. Landowners agreeing to the same restrictions required by CREP receive the same financial incentives that were offered through the CREP as CREP Equivalent Payments. Similar to CREP, agricultural lands that are currently being farmed are eligible for this program through 15-year contracts or through permanent conservation easements.

• **Conservation Reserve Program**
  The USDA administers the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) to help provide water quality protection, erosion control, and wildlife habitat in agricultural areas. Under the CRP, the landowner enters into an agreement to restore or protect lands for a 10-year or longer period in return for cash payments or assistance in making conservation improvements.

• **Wetland Reserve Program**
  The Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) is a program aimed at protecting wetlands on private property. This is typically done by providing a financial incentive to landowners to restore wetlands that have been drained for agricultural use. Landowners who choose to participate in the program may sell a conservation easement to the USDA or enter into a cost-share restoration agreement with the USDA to restore wetlands. The landowner retains private ownership of the wetland area but limits future uses.

• **Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas**
  Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas are described in Chapter III of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. In 2000, about 60,300 acres, comprising about 22 percent of the County, were encompassed within primary environmental corridors. About 9,800 acres, comprising about 3 percent of the County, were encompassed within secondary environmental corridors. Isolated natural resource areas encompassed about 6,450 acres, or about 2 percent of the County.

• **Natural Areas, Critical Species Habitat, and Aquatic Sites**
  Natural areas, critical species habitat, and aquatic sites are described in Chapter III of Washington County’s draft park and open space plan. As of 2009, a total of 94 natural areas, encompassing about
16,852 acres, or about 6 percent of the County, have been identified. Of the 94 identified sites, eight are classified as NA-1 sites (statewide or greater significance) and encompass about 3,267 acres, 29 are classified as NA-2 sites (countywide or regional significance) and encompass about 5,715 acres, and 57 are classified as NA-3 sites (local significance) and encompass about 7,870 acres.

Twenty-one critical species habitat sites have been identified in Washington County. These sites encompass an area of 615 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County. There are also 60 aquatic habitat sites supporting threatened or rare fish, herptile, or mussel species in the County, including 188 miles of rivers and streams and 2,749 acres of lake waters.

- **Park and Open Space Sites** As of 2009, there were 26,652 acres of park and open space land encompassing about 10 percent of Washington County in fee simple ownership. An additional 2,734 acres were under conservation or other easements intended to protect the natural resources of a site.

  - **Owned by Washington County**
    In 2009, Washington County owned 16 park and open space sites, including seven major parks encompassing 1,229 acres; seven other park and outdoor recreation sites encompassing 154 acres; and two special outdoor recreation sites, not considered part of the County park system, encompassing 141 acres. In all, these 16 sites encompass 1,524 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County.

  - **Owned by the State of Wisconsin**
    In 2009, there were 31 State owned park and open space sites encompassing 12,551 acres, or about 5 percent of the County. Of these 31 sites, 23 sites encompassing 12,155 acres were owned by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; five sites, encompassing 305 acres were owned by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation; and three sites, encompassing 91 acres, were owned by the University of Wisconsin.

  - **Owned by Local Governments and Public Schools**
    In addition to County and State owned park and open space sites, there were 158 park and open space sites owned by local governments and public schools in Washington County in 2009. Those sites encompassed about 3,602 acres, or about 1 percent of the County. Local governments owned 124 of the park and open space sites and public schools owned 34 of the sites.

  - **Commercial and Organizational Park and Open Space Sites**
    In 2009 there were 108 of these sites encompassing about 6,547 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. These sites include privately-owned golf courses, schools, subdivision parks, hunting clubs, campgrounds, boat access sites, horse stables, and soccer parks.

  - **Private and Public-Interest Resource Oriented Park and Open Space Sites**
    There are a number of conservation organizations active in Washington County, including the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, the Cedar Lakes Conservation Foundation, The Nature Conservancy, and other non-profit conservation organizations. These organizations acquire lands for resource protection purposes. Such
organizations owned 32 sites encompassing 2,427 acres in 2009. A religious organization, the Carmelite Fathers, also own a 446-acre site (Holy Hill), and the Big Cedar Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District owns three sites encompassing 149 acres for resource protection purposes.

- **Weaknesses and Threats Identified Through S.W.O.T. Analyses**
  Multiple strength, weakness, opportunity, and threat (S.W.O.T.) analyses were conducted during the comprehensive planning process. Weaknesses and threats identified regarding environmental preservation in Washington County include: lack of protection for natural resources (including funding and community involvement), impervious surfaces preventing groundwater recharge, abuse/overuse of groundwater supply, and loss of wetlands and environmental corridors.

**Plans**
The following summarizes how existing plans address environmental preservation as documented in Chapters VI and IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Regional Land Use Plan**
The regional land use plan recommends that primary environmental corridors be preserved, with limited exceptions. The regional plan includes guidelines for essential facilities and other limited development that can be accommodated within environmental corridors while maintaining the basic integrity of the corridors, as shown on Table 94 of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Limited development on the fringes of upland environmental corridors may also be accommodated under specified conditions. Primary environmental corridors are shown on Map 67 of the comprehensive plan. The regional plan further recommends the preservation, to the extent practicable, of the remaining secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, as determined through county and local planning efforts.

- **Regional Natural Areas Plan**
The regional natural areas plan as it pertains to Washington County is depicted on Maps 25 and 26 in Chapter III of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. The natural areas plan identifies the most significant remaining natural areas, critical species habitats, geological sites, and archaeological sites in the Region, and recommends means for their protection and management. The plan identifies potential sites to be placed in public or private protective ownership, and other sites to be protected, insofar as it is possible, through zoning or other regulatory means without protective ownership. It also recommends that a detailed management plan be prepared and implemented for each site placed under protective ownership. An amendment to the natural area plan was adopted by the Commission in December 2010. The recommendations of the amended regional natural areas plan will be incorporated into the update to the Washington County Park and Open Space Plan.

- **Washington County 2035 Land Use Plan Map**
Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Map addresses environmental preservation related land uses through the following land use categories:

---

22 Documented in Amendment to the Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region, December 2010.
23 Washington County’s 2035 Land Use Plan is further described earlier in this chapter and Chapter IX of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.
Environmentally Significant Areas
To effectively guide urban development and redevelopment in the County into a pattern that is efficient, stable, safe, healthful, and attractive, it is necessary to carefully consider the location of planned land uses in relation to natural resources. Locating new urban development outside of primary environmental corridors and other environmentally sensitive areas will serve to maintain a high level of environmental quality in the County, and will also avoid costly development problems such as flood damage, wet basements, failing pavements, and infiltration of clear water into sanitary sewerage systems. Properly relating new development to such environmentally significant areas will also help preserve the scenic beauty of the County, which depends on its natural resources.

The comprehensive plan recommends substantial preservation of remaining primary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other environmentally sensitive areas. Development within these areas should be limited to required transportation and utility facilities, compatible outdoor recreation facilities, and very low density residential development carefully designed so as to minimize the impact on natural resources.

Primary Environmental Corridors
Environmental corridors, more fully described in Chapter III of the comprehensive plan, are linear areas in the landscape that contain concentrations of high-value elements of the natural resource base. Primary environmental corridors contain almost all of the best remaining woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat areas, as well as floodplains and steeply sloped areas where intensive urban development would be ill-advised. The protection of the primary environmental corridors from additional intrusion by urban development is one of the principal objectives of this plan. Primary environmental corridors occupy 55,232 acres, or about 20 percent of the County on the 2035 land use map.

Secondary Environmental Corridors
Secondary environmental corridors contain concentrations of high-value elements of the natural resource base, but are smaller in area than primary environmental corridors. Secondary corridors serve to link primary corridors, or encompass areas containing concentrations of natural resources between 100 and 400 acres in size. Secondary environmental corridors occupy 9,424 acres, or about 3 percent of the County on the 2035 land use map. Secondary environmental corridors facilitate surface water drainage and provide corridors for the movement of wildlife and for the dispersal of seeds for a variety of plant species.

Isolated Natural Resource Areas
Isolated natural resource areas consist of areas with important natural resource values which are separated geographically from environmental corridors. Most of the isolated natural resource areas in the County are wetlands or tracts of woodlands that are at least 200 feet wide and between five and 100 acres in area. Isolated natural resource areas, under the plan, occupy 6,265 acres, or about 2 percent of the County in 2035. The plan recommends that these areas be preserved in essentially natural, open space uses whenever possible, since these areas sometimes serve as the only available wildlife habitat in an area and provide natural diversity to the landscape. Isolated natural resource areas also lend themselves for certain uses such as parks, drainageways, or stormwater detention or retention areas.

Wetlands
Most wetlands five acres or larger are located within primary or secondary environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas. Those that are outside these areas are designated in a separate category on the land use plan map, and encompass 1,192 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County in 2035. Wetlands are regulated under State and Federal laws and County ordinances. Development of wetlands (usually requiring them to be filled) is limited. Permits to allow development in wetlands generally
require “mitigation,” which requires new wetlands to be created or existing degraded wetlands to be restored. Mitigation may be required on the same development site or in a different location.

Other Conservancy Lands to be Preserved
The plan also recommends the preservation of 3,319 acres of conservancy lands in addition to primary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and wetlands in 2035. This land use category includes the common open areas of residential developments, including conservation subdivisions, and small natural areas containing important natural resource values, such as woodlands less than five acres in size, if such resources are included on a local government’s land use plan map.

Development on Parcels Containing Environmentally Significant Areas
Where possible, the comprehensive plan recommends that urban development be located entirely outside of primary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other environmentally significant areas. While calling for preservation of primary environmental corridors, the plan recognizes that in some cases it may be necessary to allow very low density residential development on the upland portion of such lands. In addition to limited residential development, land uses such as transportation and utility facilities and certain recreational uses may also be accommodated within these environmentally significant areas without jeopardizing their overall integrity. Guidelines for the types of development that may be accommodated within various component natural resource features of primary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas are set forth in Table 101 in Chapter VIII of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Even though these guidelines are not exhaustive, with good judgment they may be extended to, and be used for the evaluation of, proposals for similar types of development not specifically listed.

Surface Water
The surface water land use category includes lakes, ponds, rivers, creeks, and streams. Surface waters encompass 4,512 acres, or about 2 percent of the County on the 2035 land use map.

- Washington County Park and Open Space Plan
A County park and open space plan was adopted by the Washington County Board in March 2004.24 That plan consists of both an open space preservation element and an outdoor recreation element, intended to, respectively, protect areas containing important natural resources and to provide major parks, areawide trails, and resource-oriented recreational facilities. Major parks are defined as publicly-owned parks at least 100 acres in size providing opportunities for such resource-oriented activities as camping, golfing, picnicking, and swimming. Responsibility for providing community parks, neighborhood parks, and local trails is assigned to cities, villages, and towns. Map 68 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan shows the outdoor recreation element of the park and open space plan. The outdoor recreation element recommends three new major park sites and two smaller County parks on Tilly and Big Cedar Lakes; new facilities and improvements at existing major parks; the development of areawide trails; and boat access facilities to major lakes.

---

The open space preservation element of the plan recommends that 77,334 acres of land be protected for park and open space preservation purposes through a combination of public or non-profit conservation organization ownership or through the application of protective zoning. The plan recommends that Washington County acquire about 2,900 acres for resource protection purposes and about 1,700 acres for new or expanded County parks. Map 69 in the comprehensive plan shows the open space preservation element of the park and open space plan.

- **Quaas Creek Watershed Protection Plan**
  A Quaas Creek Watershed Protection Plan was adopted by the County Board in February 2004. The plan was created to address issues impacting the water quality and recreational use of Quaas Creek, located in the City of West Bend and Towns of Polk, Trenton, Jackson, and West Bend. These issues focus on future land development, especially the changing of rural land use to urban land use, and the detrimental effects these land use changes may have on the hydrology, water quality, habitat quality, bank stability, and fisheries within Quaas Creek.

- **Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Master Plans**
  Each DNR property is required to have a "master plan" that establishes the goals and objectives for the property and identifies how the area will be managed and developed. These plans are designed to clearly communicate to the public how the property will “look” and what benefits the area will provide. The DNR has adopted master plans for the Allenton Wildlife Area, the Kettle Moraine State Forest – Northern Unit, the Kettle Moraine State Forest – Loew Lake Unit, and the Theresa Wildlife Area. The DNR has recently completed a master plan for the Kettle Moraine State Forest – Pike Lake Unit, which lies within the Town of Hartford. The Jackson Marsh Wildlife Area does not have an adopted master plan, but does have a management plan. Summaries of adopted master plans and the management plan for the Jackson Marsh Wildlife Area are provided in Chapter VI of Washington County’s comprehensive plan.

- **Washington County Shoreland, Wetland, and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance**
  Under Section 59.692 of the Wisconsin Statutes and Chapter NR 115 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code, counties are responsible for regulating shoreland areas within unincorporated (town) areas. Shorelands are defined as all land lying within 1,000 feet of the ordinary high-water mark of navigable lakes, ponds, and flowages; or within 300 feet of the ordinary high-water mark of navigable rivers and streams or to the landward side of the floodplain, whichever distance is greater. The Washington County shoreland, wetland, and floodplain zoning ordinance is set forth in Chapter 23 of the Washington County Code of Ordinances and applies to shorelands, shoreland-wetlands, and floodplains in all towns within the County. Map 72 in Washington County’s comprehensive plan shows those areas in the County regulated under Chapter 23. The County ordinance generally protects these areas from intensive development.

- **Erosion Control and Stormwater Management**
  The Washington County Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Ordinance is set forth in Chapter 17 of the Washington County Code of Ordinances. The ordinance includes requirements for land development and land disturbing activities designed to minimize sedimentation, water pollution, flooding, and related property and environmental damage caused by soil erosion and uncontrolled stormwater runoff during and after construction. The ordinance applies to all unincorporated lands in Washington County unless a Town Board has adopted an ordinance at least as restrictive as the County ordinance. County ordinance
requirements continue in effect in any area annexed by a city or village, unless the city or village enforces a city or village ordinance which complies with the minimum standards established by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and is at least as restrictive as Washington County’s ordinance.
INTRODUCTION

The Working Lands Initiative (WLI), outlined in Wisconsin State Statute 91, identifies multiple farmland preservation tools and techniques that farmland owners may utilize to protect their lands and to make themselves eligible to claim tax credits. Specifically, the WLI is based upon three preservation techniques; farmland preservation zoning, establishment of agricultural enterprise areas, and the purchasing of agricultural conservation easements. This chapter describes these farmland preservation tools in detail, explores other preservation techniques not specifically outlined by the WLI, and explains local programs and marketing techniques that support local farmland preservation efforts.

PART I: PRESERVATION TOOLS OF THE WORKING LANDS INITIATIVE

There are three WLI’s programs – farmland preservation zoning, agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs), and the purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) that were established to achieve preservation of areas significant for current and future agricultural uses. These programs are intended to preserve farmland but should not be considered tools for preventing annexation.

Farmland Preservation Zoning

Farmland preservation zoning is a preservation tool that may be implemented by the local zoning authority (town, village, city or county) if it voluntarily chooses to adopt a farmland preservation zoning ordinance. A farmland

---

1 The only zoning authorities in Washington County able to adopt and enforce a farmland preservation zoning ordinance through the Working Lands Initiative for tax credit purposes are the towns and villages participating in the farmland preservation planning process that have designated farmland preservation areas within their municipal boundaries. The County does not have zoning authority outside of shoreland, wetland, and floodplain zoning.
preservation zoning ordinance and its corresponding zoning map should identify any districts zoned for farmland preservation and describe the uses permitted within such districts.

Local zoning ordinances must be consistent with a county’s certified farmland preservation plan. Therefore, only land within a farmland preservation area, as designated within a certified county farmland preservation plan, is eligible for farmland preservation zoning. Farmers covered by the ordinance may claim State farmland preservation tax credits if the ordinance is certified for compliance with State farmland preservation standards. Landowners of farmland within a certified farmland preservation area and zoned for farmland preservation are eligible to collect $7.50 per acre as a tax credit.

Farmland preservation zoning serves to maintain agricultural activity and is designed to protect large contiguous blocks of land. Such large areas can provide landowners with assurance regarding the continued agricultural and agriculturally-related use of land. Benefits from this security include contributing predictability to farm management decisions, limiting land use conflicts with neighbors, and encouraging agricultural investment, all of which are diminished when land is removed from agricultural use.

Six local governments within Washington County, including the Towns of Barton, Hartford, Kewaskum, and Trenton and the Villages of Germantown and Richfield had exclusive agriculture zoning ordinances encompassing a total of 10,459 acres in 2010. These ordinances, which were created under the former farmland preservation program, expire December 31, 2012. Any zoning authority that wishes to continue or pursue farmland preservation zoning must adopt a new farmland preservation zoning ordinance that has been certified to meet WLI standards.

**Rezoning**

Section 91.48 of the *Statutes* outlines the conditions to rezone land out of a certified farmland preservation zoning district. Though rezoning may be done without penalty, special procedures apply for removing individual parcels from a certified farmland preservation district.

State law requires a zoning authority to do all of the following before rezoning land out of a certified farmland preservation district at the request of any person:

- Hold a public hearing on the requested rezoning.
- Make all of the following “findings” after public hearing:
  - The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.
  - The rezoning is consistent with any applicable comprehensive plan.
  - The rezoning is substantially consistent with the county’s certified farmland preservation plan.
  - The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels of land that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use.
By March 1 of each year, a political subdivision must provide a report to DATCP of the number of acres that the political subdivision has rezoned out of a farmland preservation zoning district with a map that clearly shows the location of those areas. A copy of the report must also be submitted to the County.

**An Alternative to Rezoning**

A zoning authority concerned over landowner resistance to rezoning procedures has another option for farmland preservation. Upon the recognition that most rezoning requests seek to rezone agricultural parcels for residential construction, the new farmland preservation law allows residential construction within a farmland preservation district, without the need for rezoning, pursuant to a conditional use permit. Conditional use permit standards ensure that approved residences are compatible with the farmland preservation district.²

A zoning authority could take advantage of this option by adopting a simple zoning ordinance text amendment that allows residential construction that meets the State standards under *State Statute* 91.46 to occur within a farmland preservation district under a conditional use permit. Such an amendment would not take away any existing landowner rights in farmland preservation districts. An amendment would allow farmers in the affected district to continue claiming tax credits and permit compatible residential construction within the farmland preservation district without the need to rezone. The text amendment alternative can protect farmland and does not require any official zoning map changes.

**Nonfarm Residences and Residential Clusters**

By State law, utilization of conditional use permits for the creation of nonfarm residences within farmland preservation zoning districts is an option only if all of the following apply:

- The ratio of nonfarm residential acreage to farm acreage on the base farm tract on which the residence is or will be located will not be greater than 1 to 20 after the residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.
- There will not be more than four dwelling units in nonfarm residences, nor, for a new nonfarm residence, more than five dwelling units in residences of any kind, on the base farm tract after the residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.
- The location and size of the proposed nonfarm residential parcel, and, for a new nonfarm residence, the location of the nonfarm residence on that nonfarm residential parcel, will not do any of the following:
  - Convert prime farmland from agricultural use or convert land previously used as cropland, other than a woodlot, from agricultural use if on the farm there is a reasonable alternative location or size for a nonfarm residential parcel or nonfarm residence.
  - Significantly impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

A zoning authority may issue one conditional use permit that covers more than one nonfarm residence in a qualifying nonfarm residential cluster. A nonfarm residential cluster qualifies if all of the following apply:

- The parcels on which the nonfarm residences would be located are contiguous.
- The zoning authority imposes legal restrictions on the construction of the nonfarm residences so that if all of the nonfarm residences were constructed, each would satisfy the requirements listed above for nonfarm residences.

² See *State Statute* 91.46 for more information regarding conditional uses.
**Farmland Preservation Zoning Ordinance Certification**

DATCP may certify a farmland preservation zoning ordinance for a period that does not exceed 10 years. Upon the time of certification expiration, the zoning authority may make necessary amendments and submit its farmland preservation zoning ordinance for recertification. If land is rezoned to a nonagricultural use, the landowner is no longer eligible to claim tax credits through the Working Lands Initiative for the acres rezoned.

**Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs)**

Whether or not a local zoning authority adopts a farmland preservation zoning ordinance, owners of land within a farmland preservation area may petition for the establishment of Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs). An AEA is a contiguous land area which is devoted primarily to agricultural use and locally targeted for the preservation and development of agriculture. DATCP is authorized by administrative rule to designate up to 1,000,000 acres as AEAs statewide. Only land within a certified farmland preservation area, as designated in the county's certified farmland preservation plan, is eligible for DATCP's consideration for AEA designation. AEAs offer an option for farmland owners to claim tax credits if their local zoning authority chose not to implement a farmland preservation zoning ordinance through the Working Lands Initiative.

To have an area designated as an AEA, a petition must be submitted to DATCP for consideration. Petitions must be jointly filed by owners of at least five eligible farms in the area and any political subdivision (town, village, city, or county) in which any part of the proposed AEA is located. By working together, local farm owners and local governments can better ensure adequate interest in establishing and maintaining an AEA if selected for designation. Petitions are expected to address participating landowners' and local governments’ goals regarding the preservation of agricultural land use and agricultural development for the proposed AEA. Petitioners must also identify the activities and the existing or future land use controls that will aid in achieving those goals.

The boundary of a proposed AEA must enclose a contiguous land area, containing land owned by each of the farm owners petitioning. However, the land owned by the petitioning farm owners need not be contiguous. As a result, the boundary may include land owned by others who are not petitioners. While AEAs are oriented towards agricultural preservation and agricultural development, they may include other compatible land uses such as environmental preservation, or compatible infrastructure that supports agriculture.

It is important to recognize that the designation of an AEA does not restrict or control land use within the designated area, though local regulations and restrictions within the designated area are still applicable. Designation of an AEA does not specifically protect areas from encroaching development or land use conflicts. Instead, designation of an AEA identifies the area as valuable for current and future agricultural use, with the potential to promote investment in agriculture and agricultural-related businesses. It is up to local governments to establish or enforce land use practices to preserve, protect and promote agricultural enterprises as appropriate.

**Farmland Preservation Agreements**

If an AEA is designated, landowners are not automatically eligible to claim tax credits. Eligible farm owners within the area must voluntarily sign a farmland preservation agreement with the State to collect tax credits. A

---

3 “Contiguous” means parcels that meet at more than one point and are only separated by a lake, stream, or transportation or utility right-of-way.
farmland preservation agreement requires the land to be in agricultural use for a minimum of 15 years. The designation of an AEA remains in effect unless the designation is terminated by the State through administrative rule, an action which requires a public hearing. Tax credits available to farmers in an AEA are:

- $5 per acre for land that is covered by a farmland preservation agreement, or
- $10 per acre for land that is covered by a farmland preservation agreement and located in a certified farmland preservation zoning district.

**Agreement Conversion Fees**

A landowner under a farmland preservation agreement may terminate the agreement on any or all acres of land outlined in the agreement prior to the expiration date (minimum 15-year term) by paying a “conversion fee”. Conversion fees involved with the termination of farmland preservation agreements are equal to three times the Grade 1 Agricultural Land Assessment Value. That product is then multiplied by the number of acres being released from the agreement. In 2010, the Grade 1 Value averaged approximately $286 for rural Washington County communities and termination fees averaged $858 per acre. Table T-35 shows termination fees calculated for rural Washington County communities for the year 2011. Figure T-11 shows how the conversion fee would be calculated for the Town of Addison. Land located within a designated AEA can only be removed from the AEA through the State administrative rule process. Even if the land is sold, it remains a part of the designated AEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Grade 1 Value (in dollars per acre)</th>
<th>Conversion Fee (Grade 1 Value x 3 in dollars per acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addison</td>
<td>$282</td>
<td>$846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kewaskum</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bend</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richfield</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated using 2011 Grade 1 Agricultural Land Assessment Values. Source: Wisconsin Department of Revenue and Washington County.

**Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) Program**

The PACE program provides State funding for the purchase of agricultural conservation easements. An agricultural conservation easement prohibits development that would make the land unavailable or unsuitable for agricultural use. Easements are voluntary and allow a landowner to be compensated for limiting development on his or her farmland. Easements are permanent and are carried over to subsequent landowners if the property is sold. With an agricultural conservation easement, a landowner continues to pay property tax on the land at the current required rate.

Through the PACE program, DATCP will provide funding to cooperating local entities (local governments or non-profit organizations) for the purchase of easements from willing landowners. Local entities purchase the

---

*This is based on the Wisconsin Department of Revenue Use Value Guidelines for Agricultural Land Assessment, available online at: [http://www.revenue.wi.gov/report/a.html](http://www.revenue.wi.gov/report/a.html).*
easements and may be reimbursed for up to 50 percent of the easement cost by the PACE program. The State and local entities will then be co-holders of the easement.

During the finalization of the State budget plan in 2011, the future of the PACE program was put into question. The 2011 WI Act 32, 2011-2013 State Biennial Budget Bill required DATCP to evaluate the PACE program, including but not limited to the local administration of the program, source of funding, State participation and requirements for local match. DATCP was required to include options to replace PACE with a less costly and more efficient program for preserving farmland and report its findings to the State Joint Financing Committee and the standing agricultural committees in each house of the Legislature by June 30, 2012. The statutory references to PACE remain, but the provision requiring DATCP to annually solicit applications was deleted. Please visit DATCP’s website (http://datcp.wi.gov/) or contact DATCP for information on the status of the PACE program.

To be eligible for PACE funds, the land must be within a farmland preservation area, as designated within a certified county farmland preservation plan. PACE funded easements are intended to strengthen areas that have been planned and designated as local farmland preservation areas in a certified county farmland preservation plan. Landowners must be willing to relinquish the easement or development rights. Proposed easements must protect or enhance waters of the State or other public assets and the location of the easement should be consistent with county and local farmland preservation plans. Agricultural conservation easements may also provide additional protection to areas that have been designated as agricultural enterprise areas.

Land with an agricultural conservation easement cannot be developed for any purpose that would prevent the land from being used for agriculture. Land with an agricultural conservation easement will remain on property tax rolls. With an agricultural conservation easement on the property, a landowner will continue to:

- Privately own and manage the land
- Keep farming the land
- Keep the title to the property
- Be eligible for the farmland preservation income tax credit (if standards are met for tax credit eligibility through farmland preservation zoning or in designated AEAs)
- Control public access

**Applying for Easements**

After DATCP makes its annual request for proposals, the cooperating local entity can submit easement proposals to DATCP. Landowners should contact their cooperating local entities if they are interested in an agricultural conservation easement for their land.

In order to be eligible for consideration for a grant under the PACE program, an application must meet all of the following:

- The entire property must be located in a farmland preservation area designated in the county’s certified farmland preservation plan.
- The entire property must be located in an area consistent with a local comprehensive plan.
- A qualified farm conservation plan must be in effect for the property.
- At least 50 percent of the property must be cropland, pasture, or grassland.

---

5 PACE application materials are available on-line at: http://www.datcp.state.wi.us/workinglands/pace.jsp.
6 A qualified farm conservation plan means a plan prepared by local, state or federal conservation agency staff for the purposes of compliance with state or federal Soil and Water Conservation Standards including ATCP 50.
The landowner must sign a statement indicating that they produced at least $6,000 in Gross Farm Revenue\(^7\) during the relevant tax year or $18,000 during the last three years, including the relevant tax year.

The application must be submitted by a qualified cooperating entity (a political subdivision or a qualified non-profit conservation organization).

All landowners must sign an agreement indicating that they are willing to convey the proposed agricultural conservation easement.

Easements considered for PACE funding will be also judged based on the ability to:

- Preserve agricultural capacity and conserve important or unique agricultural resources
- Be consistent with local farmland preservation zoning
- Enhance an agricultural enterprise area, as designated by the State
- Be practical and consistent with other methods of land preservation
- Be close to other protected lands or enhance other protected lands
- Be cost effective
- Be in danger of conversion from agricultural use

**Easement Approval Process**

An interested landowner applies to the local cooperating entity for easement consideration. A local government or non-profit organization submits a proposal for an easement.

**Tax Credit Eligibility Requirements**

There is $27 million available statewide annually to provide farmland preservation tax credits to landowners beginning in the 2010 tax year. There is no cap on the amount of credit that an individual can claim or on the amount of acreage eligible for a credit. However, if the total amount of claims exceeds $27 million in a given year, the State is obligated to prorate the value of the credits available to individuals. Though a property's location within a certified farmland preservation area is the principal criterion, the WLI requires landowners to meet multiple criteria in order to be considered eligible to claim farmland preservation tax credits. These criteria include the following:

- Acres claimed must be located in a farmland preservation area identified in a certified county farmland preservation plan. Eligible land includes agricultural land or permanent undeveloped natural resource areas or open space land that is:
  - in an area certified for farmland preservation zoning, and/or
  - located in a designated agricultural enterprise area and under a farmland preservation agreement

- The land is operated as part of a farm that produced at least $6,000 in gross farm revenue during the preceding tax year or $18,000 in the past three years. Income from rental receipts of farm acres does not count toward gross farm revenue. However, gross farm revenue produced by the renter on the landowner’s farmland can be used to meet this eligibility requirement.

\(^7\) “Gross Farm Revenues” means gross receipts, excluding rent, from the land’s agricultural use, less the cost or other basis of livestock or other items purchased for resale that are sold or otherwise disposed of during the taxable year. If a landowner rents out farmland, “Gross Farm Revenues” may include farm revenues received by the renter but produced from the owner’s farmland.
Landowners may be eligible to collect tax credits for participating in farmland preservation programs.

**Soil and Water Conservation Compliance**

Under the Working Lands Program, farmers who claim a farmland preservation tax credit must comply with State soil and water conservation standards. Starting with tax year 2010, farmers cannot claim the farmland preservation tax credit under the new program, unless they certify on their tax returns that they are in compliance with State conservation standards. In order for a claimant to certify compliance on a tax return, the claimant’s farm:

- Must comply with the NR 151 State agricultural performance standards and prohibitions incorporated into ATCP 50, or
- Have a schedule of compliance designed to meet State conservation standards by a specific deadline set by the county (which cannot extend beyond December 31, 2015).

For those farmers who do not know their compliance status, they can remain eligible for tax credits only if they contact a conservation professional to assess their farm’s compliance status and take further actions to come into compliance if needed.

Counties have new responsibilities to monitor compliance with the standards including farm inspections at least once every four years. If a claimant is found out of compliance with the standards, the County will take appropriate actions to address this concern, and in certain cases may issue a notice of noncompliance to the Department of Revenue. Once the claimant is back into compliance, the County will notify the Department of Revenue that the claimant is again eligible to receive the tax credit.

**PART II: ADDITIONAL PRESERVATION TECHNIQUES**

The preservation tools listed in this section represent existing and potential strategies for the protection of farmland and open space within Washington County. These preservation tools offer other farmland preservation options for communities. Details of how each tool works, including the benefits and limitations of each, can

---

8 See State Statutes 91.80 and 91.82 for more information regarding soil and water conservation compliance. Additional information is also available on-line at: http://www.datcp.state.wi.us/workinglands/soil-water_compliance.jsp.

9 NR 151 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code establishes and prescribes runoff pollution performance standards and prohibitions for agricultural facilities, operations and practices.

10 ATCP 50 of the Wisconsin Administrative Code implements Wisconsin’s soil and water resource management program found under Chapter 92, Wisconsin Statutes.
be found in a document published by the Washington County Planning and Parks Department in 2005 titled *Farmland and Open Space Preservation Tools* (FOSP) report.

Preservation tools included in the FOSP report are grouped into two categories; regulatory and incentive-based. Regulatory based tools control or define the activities or modifications that a landowner may conduct on his or her land, through the regulation of ordinances. Incentive based tools support or encourage a specific activity or modification that a landowner may conduct on his or her land and although some of these tools may be incorporated into an ordinance, they are voluntary. The FOSP report can be obtained at the office of the Planning and Parks Department and is also available on-line at [www.co.washington.wi.us/pln](http://www.co.washington.wi.us/pln).

The following preservation tools are discussed in the FOSP report:

### Regulatory Based Tools
- Agricultural Protection Zoning (Exclusive Agriculture Zoning)
- Conservation Development
- Lot Averaging
- Incentive Zoning (Density Bonus Incentives)
- Mitigation Ordinances and Policies
- Sliding-Scale Zoning
- Transfer of Development Rights
- Right-to-Farm Laws

### Incentive Based Tools
- Fee-simple Purchase
- Donations
- Bargain Sale
- Conservation Easements
- “Options Review” for Developers
- USDA Programs

### Recommendations to Increase Housing Density
Increasing housing density can help preserve farmland by reducing the amount of land needed for nonfarm development, which will in turn, reduce the pressure for agricultural land conversion for residential, commercial, and industrial development.\(^{11}\) *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035* serves as a long-range guide for officials, staff and citizens to address future development and protect agricultural and natural resources through the year 2035. The following represents a sample of the adopted goals, objectives, policies, programs, and suggested actions for local governments from *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035* that identify ways local governments can accommodate growth while preserving existing farmland.

*From Pages 303-305 of Chapter VIII (Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element)*

- **Policy:** Encourage more compact development within sewer service areas to minimize the development of farmland for urban uses.
- **Program:** Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation to protect farmland. Strategies include boundary agreements and more regular and compact city and village boundaries.
- **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.

---

 Where rural-density residential development is accommodated, local governments are encouraged to require the use of conservation subdivision design or lot-averaging techniques to help preserve rural character and provide a buffer between adjacent farmland and residential uses. In some cases, the common open space in conservation subdivisions may be used for agriculture.

- **Objective:** Encourage land uses and densities that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low costs to all levels of government and private utilities.

- **Suggestion for Local Governments:** It is also suggested that local communities that wish to accommodate additional urban development locate urban density residential uses within neighborhoods or hamlets. The neighborhoods or hamlets should contain necessary supporting local services, such as park, retail and service, and elementary school facilities. Local governments are encouraged to renew and redevelop older, underutilized urban areas that are in need of revitalization, and encourage infilling of undeveloped land within existing urban service areas, to accommodate additional urban growth before developing land on the outskirts of urban service areas.

- **Policy:** In communities with sewer service areas and other urban services, encourage local comprehensive plans and ordinances that support the provision of a full range of housing types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings, at appropriate densities.

- **Suggestion for Local Governments:** It is also suggested that new urban density residential land uses and major commercial and industrial land uses be located within planned urban service areas, where such uses can be served more efficiently by utilities and community facilities.

---

**From Pages 443 and 452 of Chapter X (Housing Element)**

- **Suggestion for Local Governments:** Communities with sewer service areas and other urban services should provide for a full range of housing structure types and sizes including single-family, two-family, and multi-family at densities that can be economically served by sanitary sewers.

- **Suggestion for Local Governments:** Local ordinances should be revised as necessary to be consistent with the local comprehensive plan. Areas with higher residential densities should be located in sewer service areas. If towns desire higher density developments, cooperative methods should be studied with neighboring cities and villages, which may be able to extend urban services to portions of the town.

---

**PART III: SUPPORTING FARMLAND PRESERVATION**

In recent years, many local governments, schools, and various business and non-profit organizations throughout the State have been developing or promoting an increasing variety of programs that support local agriculture. Such programs include the implementation of various marketing strategies geared to promote locally produced agricultural products through marketing and tourism opportunities. The success of these programs depends on the acceptance of local consumers. Consumers may adopt lifestyles that embrace locally produced agricultural products which may, in turn, help the consumers understand the importance and community value of locally protected farmland.

This section describes programs that promote local agriculture acknowledging the need to preserve local farmland. Although these programs will not directly preserve the land itself, they may help generate awareness of local farmland preservation needs and create a sustainable environment for existing agriculture.

**Promoting Locally Grown Foods**

The concept of promoting locally grown foods is somewhat subjective due to the varying interpretations as to how “local” is defined. Congress addressed the issue in the 2008 Farm Bill which developed a definition to use in the
regulation of food production which the USDA acknowledged in 2010.\textsuperscript{12} As a result, foods can be marketed as local if the final product is raised, produced, and distributed within 400 miles of its origin or within the State in which it was produced.\textsuperscript{13,14} Businesses with specific retail and production focuses may still have varying definitions of local, accounting for the distance travelled by a product, the size or character of the locality in which it was produced, or even by an ecoregion, which may be determined by ecological units referencing anything from topography, soil, or climate to a local watershed.\textsuperscript{15}

Buying locally grown foods has become increasingly popular for a number of years now, and many predict the trend will continue. Supporting the growth of local food positively impacts farmers, communities, and Wisconsin's economy.\textsuperscript{16} Buying locally-produced goods results in more money remaining within the community and efforts to promote local purchasing have been increasing in popularity over recent years. Due to the varied positive impacts of supporting local economies, the trend extends to industries outside of agriculture as well.

Buying locally produced goods can also increase the efficiency of money by directing the maximum amount of money to the purchased product instead of to costs incurred through transportation, distribution, and various marketing services that often include packaging, fuel, electricity/energy, corporate profits, general labor costs, and many others.

The efficiency of America's consumer dollar in the purchasing of food is calculated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service (ERS). According to the ERS, as of 2006, nearly 19 cents of every consumer dollar spent on food went towards the value of the initial farm products. The remaining 81 cents of every dollar spent on food in the U.S. was directed to the marketing share. In such, the farm share of the consumer dollar was at its lowest point in the history of conducting the ERS marketing bill analysis. The decline in farm value share from 1965 to 2006 can be attributed to a large agricultural supply which has the effect of holding down farm prices. Meanwhile increased expenditures for food marketing services have caused the cost of retail food to rise.

Despite its overall decline, the farm share remained fairly steady, fluctuating only one cent between 1998 and 2006. At the same time, the proportion of consumer spending on food intended for consumption away from home has increased to account for over 70 percent of total consumer spending on food. The proportion of consumer spending which was directed towards energy costs, corporate profits, and miscellaneous costs has also increased.\textsuperscript{17} Efforts to buy locally are among the measures that can be useful in preventing the decline of farm value share as marketing costs rise in the future.

Embracing the State concept of local production promoted by the USDA, support for local agriculture is available throughout the nation. DATCP offers a variety of educational, funding, and marketing initiatives, including The Buy Local, Buy Wisconsin (BLBW) initiative, which strives to stimulate the State's agricultural economy through consumers' increased purchase of locally grown or produced food.\textsuperscript{18} In addition to a grant program, BLBW has a travelling workshop program to assist small and medium size farmers statewide in developing the tools they need


\textsuperscript{17} Labor, transportation, and packaging costs, on the other hand, fell between 1998 and 2006.

\textsuperscript{18} Web. 8 December. 2010. (http://www.datcp.state.wi.us/mktg/business/marketing/val-add/directmktg/blbw/blbw_grants.jsp).
to capitalize on local and regional markets. The BLBW initiative also publishes the Wisconsin Local Food Marketing Guide, providing agricultural producers with information for use in capitalizing on local markets through direct sales, including farmer's markets, consumer promoted agriculture, or other venues.¹⁹

**Community Supported Agriculture**²⁰

Community supported agriculture (CSA) is the partnership of agricultural producers and consumers, who contribute membership dues to cover the upcoming season's anticipated labor and supply costs. In return, a farm participating in CSA distributes shares of harvested food to members each week of the season.²¹ Instead of independently shouldering the risks associated with farming, including detrimental weather, pests, and the changing prices of the marketplace, farmers who operate CSA farms share whatever bounty or scarcity comes of their crops with their members. While relieving some of the burdens and uncertainties of conventional marketing, this arrangement can provide farmers with a more equitable return for their investments and labor. CSA farms may even request that members volunteer to assist with planting and harvesting crops, distributing shares, or with marketing efforts to allow farmers to focus on food production and farm maintenance. The viability of many CSA farms has, in fact, been attributed to such member involvement.

Farms taking part in community supported agriculture are highly diversified and differ in their goals. CSA farms are often devoted to ecologically sound farming, using organic, biodynamic, or sustainable practices. Much of the demand for such responsibly-produced food stems from urban areas. Across the nation, CSA has converted urban lots into productive lands to address social problems, providing fresh vegetables and community service opportunities to meet local needs. Though primarily family-operated, the second national CSA Farm Survey completed in 2001 found that the 63 percent of CSA farms operating under an individual operator or sole proprietor is low compared to the percent of total farms operating under an individual or sole proprietor nationwide (86 percent). CSA farms have been organized as partnerships, corporations, non-profits, or cooperative businesses more often than farms nationwide.²²

This effort of community supported agriculture is recognized for promoting rural-urban connections. Urban members establish relationships with local farmers and rural land through farms participating in CSA. Known to host field days, festivals, and potlucks, or to produce newsletters, provide recipes, and hold workshops, CSA educates the community about farming practices and food. By participating in community supported agriculture, members can direct their food dollars towards agriculture that ensures their food is grown, processed, and distributed in a favorable manner. This inherent community involvement is part of a growing social movement calling for urban and rural citizens to share responsibility for the land. Community supported agriculture was initiated in the 1960s by European citizens and farmers to fund the full costs of ecologically sound, socially equitable agriculture that would address public concerns regarding food safety and the conversion of agricultural land for urban uses.

Though classified with and subject to similar financial challenges as small farms, farms participating in community supported agriculture can provide farmers with a variety of benefits. CSA farmers have typically had

---


²⁰ Unless otherwise cited, this section was adapted from information provided by the Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems at UW-Madison: Web. 13 December. 2010. (http://www.cias.wisc.edu/farm-to-fork/community-supported-agriculture-growing-foodand-community/).

²¹ Wisconsin farms employing greenhouses and root cellars or conducting successive plantings to extend the growing season can provide their members with fresh shares of food up to eight months of the year.

greater gross income from production compared to the value of such sales for farms nationwide in general. In addition, with the proportion of incomes in agricultural households across the country increasingly coming from non-farm sources, farmers nationwide tend to depend on non-farm income, while CSA farmers are less dependent on non-farm income. Of those surveyed, more than 55 percent of CSA farmers had non-farm income of less than $10,000. Comparably, less than 10 percent of farms nationwide had non-farm income of less than $10,000 and nearly 80 percent had non-farm income between $10,000 and $99,999.23 CSA farmers also indicate tendencies towards satisfaction with their financial abilities, workload, stress levels, quality of life, and community involvement.24

Farm to School Programs
Farm to School is broadly defined as a program that connects schools (K-12) and local farms with the objectives of serving healthy meals in school cafeterias, improving student nutrition, providing agriculture, health and nutrition education opportunities, and supporting local and regional farmers. Since each Farm to School program is shaped by its unique community and region, the National Farm to School Network does not prescribe or impose a list of practices or products for the Farm to School approach.

In summary, Farm to School brings healthy food from local farms to school children nationwide. Farm to School is a comprehensive program that extends beyond farm fresh salad bars and local foods in the cafeteria to include waste management programs like composting, and experiential education opportunities such as planting school gardens, cooking demonstrations and farm tours. The program teaches students about the path from farm to fork, and instills healthy eating habits that can last a lifetime. At the same time, use of local produce in school meals and educational activities provides a new direct market for farmers in the area and mitigates environmental impacts of transporting food long distances. The Farm to School approach helps children understand where their food comes from and how their food choices impact their bodies, the environment and their communities at large.25

Community Gardens
Community gardens have a broad definition. It can be urban, suburban, or rural. It can grow flowers, vegetables, herbs, and fruits. It can be one community plot, or can be many individual plots. It can be at a school, hospital, or in a neighborhood. It can also be a series of plots dedicated to "urban agriculture" where the produce is grown for a market.

There are many benefits to community gardens, a few of which include:

- Improving the quality of life for people in the garden by creating opportunities for recreation, exercise, therapy, and education
- Providing a catalyst for neighborhood and community development
- Beautifying neighborhoods
- Producing nutritious food
- Reducing family food budgets
- Preserving green space

23 2001 survey findings in comparison to 1997 Census of Agriculture findings.
The concept of community gardening is not new in Washington County. As of 2010, there were three community gardens established in Washington County. One garden is operated by the Ozaukee Master Gardeners and is located in the City of West Bend. Another garden is operated by the Master Gardeners of Washington County and is located in the Village of Kewaskum. A third garden was established on the property of St. Aidan’s Episcopal Church in the City of Hartford.

Farmers’ Markets
Farmers’ markets provide competitively priced, high-quality fresh produce and inspire millions of people to consciously choose fresh, high-quality, and farm-friendly food. While surveys indicate that the pricing and quality of food are primary reasons for patronizing farmers’ markets, consumers agreed that direct contact with farmers was among the main draws to attend farmers’ markets. Farmers’ markets allow farmers to create relationships with individuals in the community that results in the development of consumer loyalty.

Consumers are also attracted to farmers’ markets because they value the community aspect and festive atmosphere of markets. Markets allow consumers to be in contact with farmers and knowledgeable vendors who generally provide visitors with exceptional customer service. Knowing local farmers can provide the community with an understanding about farming practices and about the produce offered. In gathering answers to their cooking questions and insight on the agricultural industry, consumers can become proponents for their farming neighbors, having value in the opportunity to know what they are purchasing and who they are purchasing it from.

Farmer’s markets are an important source of revenue as they offer the unique opportunity to obtain better profit margins by selling directly to the consumer, a critical element for small and medium-size farmers. On average, farmers only receive about 20 cents on the dollar for products sold wholesale, which is often less than the cost of production on small and medium-size farms. Farmers' markets can capture about 90 percent of retail value, a proportion of consumer spending otherwise unavailable to farmers.

Becoming a vendor at a farmer's market typically does not subject a grower to high start-up costs, allowing farmers' markets to serve as business incubators, helping prospective and existing farmers to develop crucial business skills and a viable business strategy. Farmers have an opportunity to test new products and ideas without a lot of risk as they discover consumers' needs and interests through one-on-one interaction with market visitors. The relatively small size of the average farm providing produce to the local market allows a farmer to quickly adjust production to meet consumer needs and capitalize on new market niches.

Consumer trends show an ever-increasing demand for fresh, healthy, locally grown food from farmers' markets. While the number of farmers' markets across the Country has experienced an average annual increase of 8 percent from 1994 to 2010, growth in the value of products purchased through direct sales has been increasing at an accelerated pace, as shown in Figure T-12. In addition to the various value-added products available at farmers' markets, some markets incorporate educational components or special events.

**Culinary Incubators**

Culinary incubators are establishments designed to allow individuals to develop a business in the food industry by making use of shared kitchen facilities, supplies, and equipment. Along with food preparation and storage space, culinary incubators may provide users with space to accommodate cooking demonstrations as well as meeting or gathering space, which enable the incubator to be used for food service, whether for catering parties, serving users' products, or for community events. Culinary incubators may make facilities available to individuals or groups through contracts or hourly rates.

In order for food produced within an incubator to be lawfully sold to the public, culinary incubators must be commercially licensed, meeting State and local health and safety ordinances. Because of the significant expense of licensing, the availability of a licensed facility for flexible and independent use can ease one of the primary challenges faced by prospective culinary entrepreneurs.

In turn, incubators may place a variety of requirements on users including knowledge of and certification in safe food handling, appropriate State or local licensing, liability insurance, or a security deposit.

Often established to encourage economic development, incubators may be operated by local non-profit organizations or designed to fill a gap in the local market. Either way, the services provided by culinary incubators offer members of the community the opportunity to expand upon and capitalize from the skills which they may otherwise lack the mechanisms to further develop. In such, incubators may incorporate education or training programs that can provide users with business planning, marketing, and networking skills. Programs may be developed or offered through a partnering organization with the goal of helping users to confidently produce and market their products. Incubators may expect that facility and programs users should achieve independence from within a certain time frame.

Additional amenities that incubators can provide can fulfill a range of purposes. In order to support the convenient transition of an individual into a business owner, incubators may incorporate computer labs or day-care facilities. The provision of on-site distribution sites through retail establishments, cafés, or restaurants within or affiliated with the incubator can be a great benefit to incubator users. Such facilities can offer a variety of opportunities including the chance to source one's ingredients and supplies, gain experience marketing products to the public, and the ability to collect revenue.

As of late 2010, at least three culinary incubators are offering opportunities to prospective entrepreneurs in Wisconsin. One of these, The Farm Market Kitchen in Algoma, Wisconsin, a regional food processing business incubator run by a non-profit organization, has a number of altruistic goals associated with its facilities. The Farm Market Kitchen seeks to promote unique cultural heritage of the area and to enhance tourism. Noting the value of

---


the rural landscape, The Farm Market Kitchen also seeks to promote the economic and agricultural riches of the region while upholding the sustainable balance of its environmental treasures.

Culinary incubators are prime locations for the development of business partnerships and collaborations. For example, local youth may be able to gain paid on-the-job experience providing service and hospitality work through an incubator. Local community gardens may provide incubator users with the opportunity to support an individual or neighborhood group growing produce that provides the incubator with needed ingredients.30

These collaborators receive additional support from the community as their culinary creations are also available within local stores. Collaborations such as these have the potential to strengthen the local agricultural industry as well as contributing significantly to the overall economic well-being of the community.

Marketing Farming and Products31
As noted by the Department of Trade, Agriculture, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) in its promotion of Wisconsin's local foods market, there are a wide variety of means through which producers can market their goods. Direct and intermediate marketing opportunities enable farmers to have an active role in determining the sale price of their products. Farmers must be able to evaluate their interests, preferences, and capabilities when determining which market to pursue for his or her agricultural products. Some such considerations include whether the farmer is willing and interested in complying with State inspections, having direct customer contact, participating in food preparation, and taking on varying degrees of risk.

Direct Marketing
Two means through which farmers can make their products locally available include direct and intermediate marketing. Direct marketing allows farmers to sell their products directly to consumers for their personal use. Products sold through such sales, referred to as direct sales, are not intended for resale. Farmers’ markets, community supported agricultural (CSA) farms, agri-tourism, Pick Your Own opportunities, and on-farm stores account for the most commonly recognized direct sales, due to their increased visibility.

Direct sales customers are willing to pay a higher purchase price directly to farmers because they expect that farmers are capable of providing food that is fresher and more nutritious than food available through other venues. Thus, farmers can achieve success in direct marketing through consumer loyalty. Farmers can expect consistency in customers' direct purchasing by providing a high-quality product at a value that meets or exceeds their expectations. According to DATCP, direct marketing can have positive economic and social impacts on urban and rural communities. By encouraging entrepreneurship and innovation, attracting agricultural tourists, and promoting alternative forms of agriculture, direct marketing can promote desirable rural development while enhancing the regional quality of life.32

Intermediate Marketing
Intermediate marketing enables a farmer to sell his or her products to agricultural buyers for resale. Wholesalers and distributors are among a variety of establishments and institutions that can be considered potential customers for intermediate sales. Grocery stores, super-markets, and other food retailers are becoming increasingly interested in offering locally-produced foods. Similar trends are prevalent in restaurants, hospitals, and schools who find value among the variety of advantages in using local agricultural products in the foods they make available to their customers, patients, students, and staff. Trends rely upon consumers' perceptions of and

---

30 See footnote 29.
preferences for locally-produced foods, whether attributed to their freshness, increased nutritional value or their decreased environmental impact.

Selling one's products through such establishments enables farmers to receive exposure to multiple markets in various locations with the potential to increase a farmer's consumer base. Intermediate sales have increased potential to ensure that farmers have consistent orders from buyers that may amount to larger quantities of products that a farmer can sell. The predictability of orders and higher sales volume can result in more highly efficient farm operation.

As previously noted, State efforts to promote local agriculture include a variety of tools and programs available to producers to capitalize on local and regional markets, many of which are available through DATCP and the UW-Extension. Along with the Wisconsin Apple Growers Association (WAGA), these groups worked together to establish Savor Wisconsin, an initiative to make Wisconsin's unique and specialty agricultural products available both locally and globally. The initiative emphasizes the purchasing of locally grown, produced, and manufactured products by connecting its website users to registered producers, businesses, and farmers' markets in the State.

Savor Wisconsin offers users the opportunity to identify only products which have at least 50 percent of its ingredients, production, or processing activities from or done within the State. This specification, Something Special from Wisconsin, was devised by DATCP's Division of Agricultural Development in 1983 to guarantee that consumer dollars could be measurably directed towards the livelihood of local farmers, food processors, entrepreneurs, and communities. Other marketing strategies offered by DATCP include the Buy Local, Buy Wisconsin Program, a Value-Added Agriculture Initiative, and development of the Wisconsin Local Food Marketing Guide, the primary source for the information above on direct and intermediate marketing.

Agriculture in Washington County can benefit from diversification to provide the large metropolitan population base of the region with specialty farm products and services. Examples provided by the regional planning commission include the ready market for fresh, high value produce in suburban supermarkets and restaurants, demand for organically produced dairy products, meat, fruit, and vegetables, the greater viability of “U-Pick” farms, and an increased demand for nursery stock and horse stabling services. Local agri-businesses can find assistance with planning and marketing, management, finances and budgeting, and research and development through the UW-Extension Washington County Agriculture program.

---

33 More information is available at: www.savorwisconsin.com.

34 "Farmland and Open Space Preservation Tools" Washington County Department of Planning & Parks, 2005; available online through the County's website (http://www.co.washington.wi.us/departments.iml?mdl=departments.mdl&ID=PLN).

35 Web. 15 December. 2010. (http://washington.uwex.edu/agriculture/farm-management/).
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:²

• 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 1 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](http://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

An FPA may not include any area that is planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date the plan is adopted.
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. 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. 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.

---

1 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.
2 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 T-36
ZONING DISTRICTS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS INCLUDED IN FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

<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 shoreland-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.\(^5\) 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

\(^5\) 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.
Map T-7
DRAFT 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.
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. 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

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.
Map T-11

CHANGES REQUESTED TO THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS BY THE TOWN OF BARTON - WEST 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.
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.
Map T-17

DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF JACKSON

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.
Map-19
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-20
DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE VILLAGE OF RICHFIELD

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-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-23

FINAL DRAFT FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF TRENTON

Village of Newburg
City of West Bend

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-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) 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
REFERENCE TO WHERE FARMLAND PRESERVATION ISSUES AND GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS ARE ADDRESSED WITHIN WASHINGTON COUNTY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<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>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>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-2nd 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-7th policy on page 303; and New-4th 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

*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 local farmland protection programs, 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)*

Promoting agricultural tourism is a goal in Washington County.
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.
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.\(^8\)

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 Increment Financing (TIF) districts to redevelopment and infill areas within developed portions of the city or village, rather than using TIFs to stimulate new development that converts prior to converting land on the outskirts of communities from agricultural to urban uses.

- **Page 305, 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](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**

REFERENCE TO WHERE GOALS, OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS RELATED TO INCREASING HOUSING DENSITY IN AREAS OUTSIDE OF FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS ARE ADDRESSED WITHIN WASHINGTON COUNTY’S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

<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 agricultural 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 town to develop local farmland protection tools, 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.
IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

Section 91.10(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that if a county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 was adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors on April 15, 2008. This farmland preservation plan was adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors in the form of Amendment No. 2 to the comprehensive plan as Appendix T on December 10, 2013.

Section 91.10(3) of the Statutes requires a county to follow the plan adoption and amendment procedures outlined in Section 66.1001(4), the comprehensive planning law, when adopting or amending a farmland preservation plan. These adoption and amendment procedures are summarized in Chapter XV (Implementation Element) of Washington County’s comprehensive plan. Section 91.10(5) of the Statutes requires a county to notify the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) prior to holding a public hearing and provide DATCP copies of the plan or amendment providing an opportunity to review and comment. During the development and adoption of this farmland preservation plan, the County followed steps outlined in a Public Participation Plan for Developing and Amending the Farmland Preservation Plan which was adopted by the Washington County Board of Supervisors on March 16, 2010.

PART I: PLAN REVIEW AND ADOPTION

For any planning process, it is good practice to hold public informational meetings and hearings on recommended plans before their adoption. Such actions provide opportunity to acquaint residents and landowners with the recommended plan and solicit public feedback about the plan. The plan may then be modified to reflect any pertinent new information and incorporate sound and desirable new ideas presented at these meetings. Accordingly, a public hearing was held before the Washington County Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee (PCPC) on October 24, 2011 with a public informational meeting preceding the hearing. A copy of the public hearing notice can be found in the end of this plan appendix. The County provided public notice of the hearing in accordance with the requirements of State Statute 66.1001 and distributed the draft plan report to all of the parties specified in the law. The PCPC recommended approval of the plan to the County Board on October 26, 2011 by approving a resolution and ordinance by majority vote of the entire committee. Pursuant to sections 91.16, 91.18, and 91.20 of the Statutes, outlining the plan certification process and requirements, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) certified the FPP on May 17, 2013 for a period expiring on December 31, 2023. Changes based on DATCP’s recommendations were presented to the PCPC on September 30, 2013. The PCPC recommended adoption of the FPP to the Washington County Board of

---

2 DATCP’s certification order is included as Attachment B at the end of this plan appendix.
Supervisors by approving a resolution and ordinance. Upon adoption, the plan became a guide to be used by County officials and staff in making agricultural and land use decisions. The Washington County Board adopted this farmland preservation plan by ordinance on December 10, 2013.

PART II: PLAN AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Since this farmland preservation plan has been adopted as an appendix within the comprehensive plan, procedures for amending this farmland preservation plan must comply with the amendment procedures for comprehensive plans as outlined by Section 66.1001(4) of the Statutes. In addition to the procedures outlined in Section 66.1001(4), any amendment to this farmland preservation plan (Appendix T of Washington County’s comprehensive plan) requires review and recertification of the farmland preservation plan by DATCP which involves a timeframe not to exceed 90 days. The certification of an amendment to the approved farmland preservation plan expires on the date that the certification of the farmland preservation plan expires. However, a comprehensive revision to a farmland preservation plan may be treated as a new plan and DATCP may specify a new expiration date for a period that does not exceed ten years.

When applying for certification of a farmland preservation plan amendment, the following must be submitted in writing to DATCP in addition to any other relevant information that the County chooses to provide (in accordance to Section 91.20 of the Statutes):

- The proposed farmland preservation plan or amendment.
- A concise summary of the farmland preservation plan or amendment, including key changes from any previously certified farmland preservation plan.
- A concise summary of the process by which the farmland preservation plan or amendment was developed, including public hearings, notice to and involvement of other governmental units within the county, approval by the county, and identification of any key unresolved issues between the county and other governmental units within the county related to the farmland preservation plan or amendment.
- The relationship of the farmland preservation plan or amendment to any county comprehensive plan.
- A statement, signed by the county corporation counsel and the county planning director or chief elected official, certifying that the farmland preservation plan or amendment complies with all of the requirements in Section 91.18.
- Other relevant information that the department requires by rule.

PART III: RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS

The comprehensive planning law, specifically Section 66.1001(2)(i) of the Statutes, requires the Implementation Element of the comprehensive plan to include a compilation of the recommended programs for each of the other elements of the comprehensive plan. A compilation of the programs can be found on pages 613 through 637 in Chapter XV of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035. A relative priority ranking for these programs was developed for their implementation. Additionally, an agency or entity responsible for implementing each program was identified.

A number of programs related to farmland preservation previously identified in the comprehensive plan have been updated or amended as part of this farmland preservation plan and new programs have also been identified. The process of how farmland preservation issues and recommended actions were identified is described in Chapter VII (Issue Identification, Farmland Preservation Areas and Recommendations) of this plan.

---

3 2013 Resolution 40 and 2013 Ordinance 18 are included as Attachments G and H at the end of this plan appendix.
4 The procedure for amending the comprehensive plan is summarized on pages 611-612 in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035.
Programs that have been newly identified as part of the farmland preservation planning process (as listed in Chapter VII of this plan) are presented in Table T-39. The table identifies the agency or entity responsible for implementing each program. Prioritization of the programs listed in Table T-39 will take place when the County comprehensive plan is updated prior to 2018. The programs are organized under the “issues” that they are listed under in Chapter VII of this plan.

### Table T-39

**NEW FARMLAND PRESERVATION RECOMMENDED PROGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Responsible Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and the Preservation and Protection of Farmland Issue</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: Encourage local governments to participate in the update to the County Farmland Preservation Plan at least every ten years.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Cooperation Issue</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: Encourage local governments to utilize methods of supporting farmland preservation as identified in Part 3 of Chapter VI in this plan.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: Encourage local governments to review permitting processes and consider ways to expedite the processes.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LG, PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Public Perception Toward Agriculture Issue</td>
<td>PPD, UWEX, FB, 4H, DI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program: Continue to encourage efforts to publicize the “Living in the Country” guide to owning property and living in rural Washington County.</td>
<td>PPD, UWEX, FB, 4H, DI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following agencies and entities are identified as having responsibility for implementing element programs:
LG – Local Governments
PPD – Planning and Parks Department
UWEX – UW Extension
FB – Farm Bureau
4H – 4-H Clubs
41 – Dairy Industry

Source: Washington County.

### PART IV: CONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN

For good planning purposes, and as mandated by Section 91.10(2) of the 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 new farmland preservation program, the Working Lands Initiative, requires that a County’s comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan are carefully examined for inconsistencies which must be resolved prior to certification of the farmland preservation plan.

Farmland preservation plan text and map amendments must be adopted as part of the County comprehensive plan and must be consistent with the elements of the comprehensive plan. Requiring the farmland preservation plan to be adopted as an amendment of the comprehensive plan will ensure consistency between the comprehensive plan elements and farmland preservation plan.

Washington County Planning and Parks Department staff undertook substantial efforts to ensure consistency between recommendations adopted within the comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan. Staff compared new recommendations to adopted recommendations with great care given to ensure internal consistency among all comprehensive plan elements and Appendix T (Farmland Preservation Plan). All recommendations were reviewed by the Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee (FPPAC) and the PCPC. There are no known inconsistencies among the recommendations.
PART V: CONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FARMLAND PRESERVATION ZONING ORDINANCES

Six local governments enacted exclusive agricultural zoning ordinances under the former farmland preservation program. As part of the new program (the Working Lands Initiative) and as outlined in Section 91.34 of the Statutes, exclusive agricultural zoning ordinances will expire on December 31, 2012 and local governments must adopt farmland preservation zoning ordinances to allow landowners to remain eligible to claim farmland preservation zoning tax credits.5

Farmland preservation zoning ordinances must be in compliance with Subchapter III of Chapter 91 of the Statutes (Sections 91.30 – 91.50). This may require local governments to amend existing zoning ordinances to achieve compliance. Farmland preservation zoning ordinances must also be substantially consistent with the County’s certified farmland preservation plan. Farmland preservation zoning ordinances need to be certified by DATCP for a period not to exceed 10 years and would include a farmland preservation zoning map identifying farmland preservation districts. Landowners of farmland within a certified farmland preservation area and zoned for farmland preservation are eligible to collect $7.50 per acre as a tax credit.

Authorized land uses in a farmland preservation zoning district are restricted to agricultural and agricultural-related uses but may included some nonfarm residential development. Sections 91.44 and 91.46 of the Statutes outline permitted and conditional uses respectively. Any land uses allowed that are not in compliance with Sections 91.44 and 91.46 would prevent a farmland preservation zoning ordinance from qualifying for certification. Permitted and conditional uses are described in Part I of Chapter VI in this plan.

Prior to the Working Lands Initiative, DATCP generally required an exclusive agricultural zoning map to be at least 80 percent consistent with the farmland preservation areas identified in a County’s farmland preservation plan. As farmland preservation plans are certified under the new program, DATCP will apply higher standards and require 100 percent consistency between local government farmland preservation zoning maps and the County farmland preservation plan.

As of July, 2011, no rural local governments in Washington County have adopted a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or updated their current exclusive agriculture zoning ordinance to meet the requirements of Chapter 91. Of the six local governments that approved the FPAs and adopted the resolution of intent, they have until December 31, 2012 to adopt a farmland preservation zoning ordinance meeting the requirements of Chapter 91 to allow landowners to be eligible to claim tax credits through farmland preservation zoning.

PART VI: PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE PLAN

As described in Chapter XV of the County comprehensive plan,6 the Washington County Planning and Parks Department will prepare a report every five years for the PCPC and County Board documenting plan implementation progress and activities during the previous five years. The report will summarize how the comprehensive plan was used to direct policy decisions by County officials and staff and whether circumstances have changed that have necessitated amendments to the plan. Since this farmland preservation plan has been incorporated into the comprehensive plan (as Appendix T), the report will also consist of any implementation activities of this plan.

Section 91.16(2) of the Statutes outlines the certification period for a farmland preservation plan. DATCP may certify a farmland preservation plan for a period that does not exceed ten years, therefore this farmland

---


6 See page 638 in Chapter XV (Implementation Element) of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 from more information.
preservation plan must be updated at least every ten years to remain in compliance with the law. This farmland preservation plan (Appendix T of the comprehensive plan) may be updated prior to the 10 year maximum certification period in concurrence with an update of *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035*. 
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WASHINGTON COUNTY
FARMLAND PRESERVATION
PLAN CERTIFICATION

DARM DOCKET NO. 11-48-66-000-P
ORDER EXTENDING CERTIFICATION
THROUGH DECEMBER 31, 2012

INTRODUCTION
Washington County has asked the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection ("DATCP") to extend the county's current farmland preservation plan certification for 1 year, pursuant to s. 91.14(4), Wis. Stats., so that the county may concurrently update its farmland preservation and comprehensive plans. DATCP has considered this matter and adopts the following decision:

FINDINGS OF FACT

(1) DATCP is an agency of the State of Wisconsin, and is responsible for administering ch. 91, Wis. Stats. ("farmland preservation law"). Under the farmland preservation law, as repealed and recreated by 2009 Wis. Act 28, DATCP is responsible for certifying county farmland preservation plans. Certification enables farmers in the affected county to claim farmland preservation tax credits under ch. 71, subch. IX, Wis. Stats.

(2) Washington County is a county of the State of Wisconsin. Washington County has adopted a farmland preservation plan which is currently certified under ch. 91, Wis. Stats. According to s. 91.14, Wis. Stats., the current plan certification is scheduled to expire on December 31, 2011.

(3) Under s. 91.14(4), Wis. Stats., DATCP may extend the scheduled expiration date of a county plan certification for up to 2 years, based on a written request from the county that demonstrates to the satisfaction of the DATCP Secretary that the extension will allow the county to concurrently develop its farmland preservation and comprehensive plans (or plan updates).

(4) In a letter dated December 15, 2011 (copy attached), Washington County asked DATCP to extend the scheduled expiration date of the county’s plan certification for one year, pursuant to s. 91.14(4), Wis. Stats. to permit concurrent development of farmland preservation and comprehensive plan updates.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

(1) Washington County’s written request demonstrates to the satisfaction of the DATCP Secretary that a 1-year extension of the county’s current farmland preservation plan certification would allow the county to concurrently develop its farmland preservation plan and comprehensive plan (or plan updates).

(2) The DATCP Secretary is authorized, under s. 91.14(4), Wis. Stats., to grant the requested extension.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED, pursuant to s. 91.14(4), Stats., that the current certification of the Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan is extended for 1 year, through December 31, 2012.

Dated this 22nd day of December, 2011.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

By

Ben Brancel, Secretary

Parties for Purposes of Review Under s. 227.53, Wis. Stats.: Washington County

Copies to:

Debora M. Sielski
Washington County Planning and Parks Department
Public Agency Center – Suite 2300
333 East Washington St
West Bend, WI 53095-2003

DATCP Agricultural Resource Management Division
STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

WASHINGTON COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN (TOWNS OF BARTON, HARTFORD, AND GERMANTOWN)  
DATCP DOCKET NO. 13-F-06-06-96
DARM DOCKET NO. 131-00000-P-13 F-0513

INTRODUCTION

Washington County has asked the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection ("DATCP") to certify a proposed comprehensively revised county farmland preservation plan pursuant to s. 91.16, Wis. Stats. DATCP has considered the request and adopts the following decision:

FINDINGS OF FACT

(1) DATCP is an agency of the State of Wisconsin, and is responsible for administering Wisconsin’s farmland preservation law under ch. 91, Wis. Stats., as repealed and recreated by 2009 Wis. Act 28.

(2) Washington County is a county of the State of Wisconsin.

(3) In order for a county and its residents to participate in the farmland preservation program, a county must have a state-certified farmland preservation plan. Among other things, the certified plan must clearly designate farmland preservation areas that the county plans to preserve for agricultural use.

(4) Washington County has a state-certified farmland preservation plan that expired on December 31, 2012.

(5) Under s. 91.16(8), Wis. Stats., the certification of a farmland preservation plan does not cover any subsequent plan revision (adopted after July 1, 2009) unless DATCP certifies that plan revision.

(6) On November 3, 2011, DATCP received from Washington County a request to certify a comprehensively revised county farmland preservation plan under s. 91.16, Wis. Stats. The county submitted the application in the form required under s. 91.20, Wis. Stats. The application included the certifications required under s. 91.20(3), Wis. Stats.

(7) Under s. 91.16(3)(a), Wis. Stats., DATCP may certify a county plan based on the county’s certification under s. 91.20(3), Wis. Stats., that the plan meets applicable certification standards under s. 91.18, Wis. Stats.

(8) DATCP may certify a farmland preservation plan if the plan meets applicable statutory standards under s. 91.18, Wis. Stats. DATCP may certify based on the representations contained in the county’s
application, but may conduct its own review and verification as it deems appropriate.

(9) Under s. 91.10(2), Wis. Stats., the farmland preservation plan must be consistent with the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035, and the County must include the farmland preservation plan in the County Comprehensive Plan.

(10) Under s. 91.16(2)(a), Wis. Stats., DATCP may certify a county farmland preservation plan for a specified period of up to 10 years. Under s. 91.16(6), Wis. Stats., DATCP may make its certification contingent upon the county adoption of the certified plan text and maps, in the form certified.

(11) Under s. 91.16(9), Wis. Stats., DATCP may withdraw its certification at any time if DATCP finds that the certified plan materially fails to meet applicable certification standards under s. 91.18, Wis. Stats.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

(1) Based on Washington County’s certification that the attached county farmland preservation plan meets applicable certification requirements under s. 91.18, Wis. Stats., DATCP may certify that plan for up to 10 years.

(2) DATCP may make its certification contingent upon the county adoption of the certified plan text and maps, in the form certified, and contingent upon its adoption as part of the County comprehensive plan.

(3) Certification does not apply to plan amendments made after the certification date, unless DATCP certifies those amendments.

(4) DATCP may withdraw its certification at any time if DATCP finds that the certified plan text and maps materially fail to meet applicable certification standards under s. 91.18, Wis. Stats.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The attached Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan text (dated February 28, 2013) and maps for the Towns of Barton (dated July 26, 2011), Hartford (dated December 2012), and Germantown (dated March 2013) are hereby certified under s. 91.16, Wis. Stats., and contingent upon the following, which must occur before December 31, 2013:

(a) County adoption of the plan, included as part of the County comprehensive plan, in the form submitted, and

(b) County adoption of amended Map 84 in the County comprehensive plan so that it is consistent with the Washington County Farmland Preservation Plan.

(2) The certified farmland preservation plan area for Washington County is titled “Farmland Preservation Areas.”

(3) This order takes effect on the date on which the county adoption of the plan text and maps, in the form submitted, takes effect.
(4) This certification expires at the end of the day on December 31, 2023.

Dated this 17th day of May, 2013.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

By Ben Brancel, Secretary

Parties for Purposes of Review Under s. 227.53, Wis. Stats.:

Debora M. Sielski, Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator
Washington County Planning and Parks Department
333 E. Washington Street
Suite 2300
PO Box 2003
West Bend, WI 53095-2003
RESOLUTION NO. 11003
TOWN OF BARTON

A RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO INCORPORATE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS INTO A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE TOWN OF BARTON: 2035

WHEREAS, the Town of Barton, pursuant to Sections 60.10(2)(c), 62.23, 61.35, 60.22 (3), and 66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Barton: 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Washington County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Sections 59.69 and 66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 land use plan map in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 incorporates the adopted land use plan maps identified in the adopted comprehensive (master) plans for areas within the corporate limits of all Cities, Villages and Towns in Washington County; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative includes three programs (Farmland Preservation Program, Agricultural Enterprise Area Program, and the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement Program) as part of the 2009 - 2011 State budget signed into law on June 29, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Washington County, in cooperation with a multi-jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, including representatives from 15 local governments, is developing a Farmland Preservation Plan that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes that must be adopted by December 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the multi-jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, has developed a Farmland Preservation Area Map that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10 (1)(d), (e) and (f) of the Wisconsin Statutes and has prepared a Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Barton that identifies areas to preserve for agricultural use and agriculture-related uses; and

WHEREAS, incorporating the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Barton into A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Barton: 2035 allows landowners within those Farmland Preservation Areas to voluntarily participate in the Agricultural Enterprise Area Program and the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement Program of the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 91.16(5) and (6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) shall grant or deny an
application for plan certification within 90 days of submittal and may certify the plan subject to conditions specified by DATCP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after DATCP has certified the Farmland Preservation Plan and the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopts the Farmland Preservation Plan, that the Town of Barton will review any changes or conditions specified by DATCP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Town of Barton that if in agreement with any changes or conditions specified by DATCP that the Town of Barton will take the necessary steps to amend their comprehensive (master) plan embodied in *A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Barton: 2035* accordingly to include the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Barton with references to their 2035 land use plan map.

Adopted this _6_ day of _6-21_, 2011.

Ayes 5  Noes 0  Absent 0

Chairperson
Town of Barton

Attest:
Clery
Town of Barton
RESOLUTION NO. 06-13-11-2
TOWN OF GERMANTOWN

A RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO INCORPORATE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS FOR THE TOWN OF GERMANTOWN INTO A MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR WASHINGTON COUNTY: 2035

WHEREAS, the Town of Germantown, pursuant to Sections 60.10(2)(c), 62.23, 61.35, 60.22 (3), and 66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035; and

WHEREAS, the Washington County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Sections 59.69 and 66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 land use plan map in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 incorporates the adopted land use plan maps identified in the adopted comprehensive (master) plans for areas within the corporate limits of all Cities, Villages and Towns in Washington County; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative includes three programs (Farmland Preservation Program, Agricultural Enterprise Area Program, and the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement Program) as part of the 2009 – 2011 State budget signed into law on June 29, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Washington County, in cooperation with a multi-jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, including representatives from 15 local governments, is developing a Farmland Preservation Plan that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes that must be adopted by December 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the multi-jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, has developed a Farmland Preservation Area Map that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10 (1)(d), (e) and (f) of the Wisconsin Statutes and has prepared a Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Germantown that identifies areas to preserve for agricultural use and agriculture-related uses; and

WHEREAS, incorporating the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Germantown into A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 allows landowners within those Farmland Preservation Areas to voluntarily participate in the Agricultural Enterprise Area Program and the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement Program of the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 91.16(5) and (6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) shall grant or deny an
RESOLUTION NO. 06-13-11-2
TOWN OF GERMANTOWN

application for plan certification within 90 days of submittal and may certify the plan subject to conditions specified by DATCP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after DATCP has certified the Farmland Preservation Plan and the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopts the Farmland Preservation Plan, that the Town of Germantown will review any changes or conditions specified by DATCP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Town of Germantown that if in agreement with any changes or conditions specified by DATCP that the Town of Germantown will take the necessary steps to amend their comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 accordingly to include the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Germantown with references to their 2035 land use plan map.

Adopted this 13 day of June, 2011.

Ayes 3 Noes 0 Absent 0

Chairperson
Town of Germantown

Attest:
Clerk
Town of Germantown
RESOLUTION NO. __________
TOWN OF HARTFORD

A RESOLUTION OF INTENT TO INCORPORATE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS
INTO A COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE TOWN OF HARTFORD: 2035

WHEREAS, the Town of Hartford, pursuant to Sections 60.10(2)(c), 62.23, 61.35, 60.22 (3), and
66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in
A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Hartford: 2033; and

WHEREAS, the Washington County Board of Supervisors, pursuant to Sections 59.69 and
66.1001 (4) (b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, adopted the comprehensive (master) plan embodied in
A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035; and

WHEREAS, the 2035 land use plan map in A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for
Washington County: 2035 incorporates the adopted land use plan maps identified in the adopted
comprehensive (master) plans for areas within the corporate limits of all Cities, Villages and
Towns in Washington County; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative includes three programs (Farmland
Preservation Program, Agricultural Enterprise Area Program, and the Purchase of Agricultural
Conservation Easement Program) as part of the 2009 – 2011 State budget signed into law on
June 29, 2009; and

WHEREAS, Washington County, in cooperation with a multi-jurisdictional Farmland
Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, including representatives from 15 local governments, is
developing a Farmland Preservation Plan that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10
of the Wisconsin Statutes that must be adopted by December 31, 2011; and

WHEREAS, the multi-jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, has
developed a Farmland Preservation Area Map that meets the requirements set forth in Section
91.10 (1)(d), (e) and (f) of the Wisconsin Statutes and has prepared a Farmland Preservation
Area Map for the Town of Hartford that identifies areas to preserve for agricultural use and
agriculture-related uses; and

WHEREAS, incorporating the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Hartford into A
Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Hartford: 2033 allows landowners within those Farmland
Preservation Areas to voluntarily participate in the Agricultural Enterprise Area Program and the
Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement Program of the Wisconsin Working Lands
Initiative.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 91.16(5) and (6) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Wisconsin
Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) shall grant or deny an
application for plan certification within 90 days of submittal and may certify the plan subject to conditions specified by DATCP.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that after DATCP has certified the Farmland Preservation Plan and the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopts the Farmland Preservation Plan, that the Town of Hartford will review any changes or conditions specified by DATCP.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Town of Hartford that if in agreement with any changes or conditions specified by DATCP that the Town of Hartford will take the necessary steps to amend their comprehensive (master) plan embodied in A Comprehensive Plan for the Town of Hartford: 2015 accordingly to include the Farmland Preservation Area Map for the Town of Hartford with references to their 2035 land use plan map.

Adopted this 15 day of June, 2011.

Ayes Noes Absent

[Signature]
Chairperson
Town of Hartford

[Signature]
Clerk
Town of Hartford
NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that a Public Hearing will be held at a meeting of the Washington County Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee on Monday, October 24, 2011 at 7:15 p.m. at the Washington County Fair Park, 3000 County Highway PV, West Bend, WI at which time there will be heard and considered:

The Public Hearing for public comment on the Final Draft of Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County as Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and the proposed ordinance and resolution will be discussed. A brief overview of the Plan will be presented at 7:05 p.m.

Washington County has been working in cooperation with partnering local governments in preparing the Plan which identifies the farmland preservation areas in Washington County, in accordance with the requirements of Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

Copies of the Final Draft of Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County as Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and the proposed resolution and ordinance are available for review at the Washington County Planning and Parks Department, 333 E. Washington Street, Suite 2300, West Bend, WI, during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday – Friday, all local libraries and on-line at www.co.washington.wi.us/pln. Written comments will be accepted until October 24, 2011 at 3:00 p.m. Any questions, written comments, or requests for copies of the Plan should be directed to Debora Sielski, Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator, Washington County Planning and Parks Department at 333 E. Washington Street, Suite 2300, West Bend, WI 53095, 262-335-4445 or via email at deb.sielski@co.washington.wi.us. Written comments will be read at the public hearing and will be given the same weight as oral testimony. The Washington County Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee will meet on October 26, 2011 at the Public Agency Center, Room 3005, at 1:00 p.m. to review and consider the Plan for approval and recommendation to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection for certification and the Washington County Board of Supervisors for adoption.

Dated the 20th day of September, 2011.

[Signature]
Debora Sielski, Deputy Planning and Parks Administrator
Washington County Planning and Parks Department
Adoption of Amendment No. 2 - Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County of A Multi-Jurisdictional Plan for Washington County: 2035

WHEREAS, the Washington County Board of Supervisors adopted the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 as the County comprehensive plan on April 15, 2008, following extensive public participation; and

WHEREAS, the Planning, Conservation, and Parks Committee finds that the comprehensive plan, with Amendment No. 2, contains all of the required elements specified in Section 66.1001(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes and that the comprehensive plan, with the proposed amendment, is internally consistent; and

WHEREAS, Wisconsin’s Farmland Preservation law, set forth in Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes, requires County governments to prepare and adopt a farmland preservation plan; and

WHEREAS, Washington County received a grant from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to defray a portion of the cost of developing this farmland preservation plan; and

WHEREAS, Washington County, in cooperation with the Multi-Jurisdictional Farmland Preservation Plan Advisory Committee, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, UW-Extension, and participating local governments, has developed a farmland preservation plan that meets the requirements set forth in Section 91.10 of the Wisconsin Statutes; and

WHEREAS, copies of the plan report were available for public review in the County Clerk’s office and the Washington County Planning and Parks Department office, at public libraries, and on the County website; and

WHEREAS, throughout the development of the plan Washington County has solicited public input consistent with the Public Participation Plan adopted in March 2010 to ensure the public had ample opportunity for involvement in the development of the farmland preservation plan; and

WHEREAS, the County has duly noticed a public hearing on Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan as Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and the Planning, Conservation, and Parks Committee held the public hearing on October 24, 2011 in accordance with Section 66.1001(4)(d) of the Statutes and the public participation procedures for comprehensive plan amendments adopted by the County Board on January 12, 2010; and
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WHEREAS, after a well publicized public informational meeting and public hearing, on September 30, 2013, the Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee recommended approval of Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan as Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035 and adoption by Ordinance by the County Board of Supervisors;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Washington County Board of Supervisors that pursuant to Sections 91.10, 59.69 and 66.1001(4)(b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, that the farmland preservation plan embodied in Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan as Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035, is hereby adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Chapter 21 of the Washington County Code shall be revised to specifically amend the Washington County Comprehensive Plan as referred to herein.

VOTE REQUIREMENT FOR PASSAGE: Majority

RESOLUTION SUMMARY: Adoption of A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County as Appendix T – Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Plan for Washington County: 2035.

Introduced by members of the PLANNING, CONSERVATION and PARKS COMMITTEE as filed with the County Clerk.

Michael R. Miller, Chairperson
2013 ORDINANCE 18

AN ORDINANCE to amend Section 21.09 of the code; relating to: Comprehensive Plan - Amendment No. 2 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035.

The people of the County of Washington, represented in the Board of Supervisors, do ordain as follows:

SECTION 1. The Planning, Conservation and Parks Committee, by a majority vote of the entire Committee at a meeting held on September 30, 2013, recommended the adoption of the County's Farmland Preservation Plan as required by Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The County's Farmland Preservation Plan will be made a part of the Comprehensive Plan by adoption of an amendment known as Amendment No. 2: Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County to A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035.

SECTION 2. Section 21.09 of the Code is amended to read:


- Amendment No.1 of A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Washington County: 2035
- Amendment No. 2 - Appendix T – A Farmland Preservation Plan for Washington County

SECTION 3. The County Clerk is directed to send a copy of this ordinance and the plan amendment to the parties listed in Section 66.1001(4)(b) of the Wisconsin Statutes.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVE DATE. This ordinance shall become effective upon passage by the Board of Supervisors and publication as provided by law.

SECTION 5. SUMMARY. Ordinance amendment to incorporate Comprehensive Plan Amendment No. 2 into the text of the Washington County Code.
VOTE REQUIREMENT FOR PASSAGE: Majority

APPROVED: Kimberley A. Nass, County Attorney
Dated 12/11/13

Considered 12-10-13
Adopted 12-10-13
Ayes 23 Noes 4 Absent 3
Voice Vote

Countersigned:
Herbert J. Tennies
County Board Chairperson

(No fiscal effect.)

Introduced by members of the PLANNING, CONSERVATION and PARKS COMMITTEE as filed with the County Clerk.

Michael R. Miller, Chairperson