

WASHINGTON COUNTY
MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING
AGRICULTURAL, NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES ELEMENT WORK GROUP
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 1, 2006

The meeting was called to order by John at 7:05 p.m. at the Public Agency Center in Room 1113A/B.
Those present included:

Work Group Members Present:

Marilyn John, Chairperson.....	Town of Trenton
Mary Krumbiegel.....	Washington County Board Supervisor
Melvin Ewert	Washington County Board Supervisor – PCPC
Robert Bingen.....	Town of Addison
Joe Peters	Town of Barton
Helmut Wagner.....	Town of Erin
Sue Yogerst.....	Town of Hartford
Michael Heili	Village of Newburg
Ike Roell.....	Town of Farmington
Albert Schulteis.....	Town of Polk
Kieth Kriewaldt.....	Town of Wayne
Andy Pesch	Village of Kewaskum
Jeff Truman.....	Town of Erin Citizen
Roger Walsh.....	Lake Protection and Rehabilitation District
Norbert Dettmann	Landmarks Committee
Rod Bartlow	Ice Age Trail Foundation
Sue Millin	Land Conservation Partnership

Excused Members:

David Baldus, Vice-Chairperson	Town of Polk Citizen
Dale Dhein	Town of Germantown
Daniel Schmidt.....	Town of Kewaskum

Absent:

Chris Borchert.....	Washington County Historical Society
Ross Bishop	Agribusiness Cluster Council
Kevin Dittmar	Metropolitan Builders Association

Staff:

Herb Wolf

Assistant Administrator
Washington County Planning and Parks Department

Nancy Anderson.....

Chief Planner
SEWRPC

Todd Roehl

Planner
SEWRPC

Joshua Glass.....

Planner
Washington County Planning and Parks Department

Paul Sebo

Senior Technician
Washington County Planning and Parks Department

Kelly Hahm.....

Administrative Secretary
Washington County Planning and Parks Department

Others:

Charlene Brady
Mike Dricken
Paul Metz
Dennis Panicucco
Dan DeThorne
Margaret Burlingham
Kevin Traastad
Betsy Gillen
Bob Burgen

Dan Wolf
Barb Kohler
Vicki Heideman
Mark Pamperin
Leander Herriges
Tom Nelson
Larry Natzke
Daniel Spies

FIRST ORDER OF BUSINESS: Call Meeting to Order/Review Agenda

John called meeting to order and reviewed agenda items

SECOND ORDER OF BUSINESS: Approval of August 2, 2006 Minutes

Motion by Heili, seconded by Yogerst to approve the August 2, 2006 minutes. Motion carried.

THIRD ORDER OF BUSINESS: Background on the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) process

Wolf introduced Kevin Traastad, Betsy Gillen and Larry Natzke from the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Traastad gave a brief presentation on the LESA process. Wolf stated there has been a staff subgroup created which has gone through the LESA guidebook and looked at three other counties that have completed a LESA process. Wolf briefly highlighted the LESA handout. (See Attached).

Anderson explained how Washington County is planning to use the information. Anderson added that Ozaukee County is also going through the LESA process. Anderson explained the three parts for the site analysis. Anderson presented and reviewed the "Potential Site Assessment Criteria for LESA Evaluation For Washington County" handout. (See Attached). Anderson added that page 64 of the LESA Guidebook provides a "menu" of possible site assessment factors. Wolf added that handouts regarding the LESA process in other counties were also used. (See Attached). Walsh asked Anderson to state the reasons why some of the factors were not chosen. Anderson went through all the site assessment factors listed on page 64 and gave the reasoning behind why each one was or was not chosen for Washington County. Walsh stated he would like to revisit "Environmental Limitations on Agricultural Practices."

Anderson reviewed the SA-2 Factors that were chosen and why. Anderson stated "Distance to Hamlets Without Sewer Service Areas" was added to the list which was not included in the LESA guidebook. Anderson presented a handout listing hamlets in Washington County and those identified by towns as future growth areas. (See Attached).

Anderson reviewed SA- 3 Factors. Walsh stated he didn't see the protection of lakes, streams, and rivers and that he thought it needs to be looked at. Wolf stated that those are negative factors and not something that would fall into the national or local process. Walsh stated the proximity to lakes, streams, and rivers are important. Discussion ensued on where the lakes, streams and rivers are covered in LESA. Sebo agreed with Walsh's concern, but added that protection of waterways is included in portions regarding environmental corridors. Krumbiegel added that farmers are hopefully good stewards of the land, and that they have to be good stewards to be successful. Walsh asked if there are positive points given for good stewardship practice. Sebo stated that data wouldn't be available. Millin commented that LESA is only one of many tools to be used when making final decisions regarding preservation. Sebo asked if a motion could be made to look at shoreland zoning. Wolf added that he would be reluctant to use shoreland boundaries because of distance variables. Krumbiegel commented that there are a lot of programs that reflect good stewardship and preservation along streams. Millin added that there are a lot

of programs focusing on waterways. Traastad added that farmers today have good management practices and are good stewards of the land.

Anderson presented and reviewed the “Potential Site Assessment Criteria and Scores for LESA Evaluation for Washington County”. (See Attached).

Size of farm in contiguous management by 1 farmer

Wagner commented that there is too much weight on small acreages. Discussion ensued and included the possibility of changing the scale so 80+ acres would receive 10 points and that there would be a 35 acre cut-off, which is the way Ozaukee County has its scale structured. Sebo explained how the data was collected and said that there are many 20 acre parcels in agricultural use. The workgroup directed that the scale and point values for this factor be simplified and that parcels less than 20 acres receive “0” points.

Compatibility of adjacent land uses

Walsh asked if a farmer 70% bordered by a river would receive positive points for active use. Walsh did not believe that would be the proper thing to do. Walsh added that there needs to be a caution for farms along waterways. Wolf stated that the LESA program process should not get bogged down on one issue. Wolf added that there are other programs to cover protection of water quality. There was also discussion regarding the structure of scale regarding this category. The workgroup directed that the scale and point values for this factor be simplified.

Compatibility of surrounding land uses within ½ mile

The workgroup directed that the scale and point values for this factor be simplified, similar to the previous factor.

Percent of farm in agricultural use

Heili commented that there shouldn't be points awarded for lands of which only 10–19 percent are used for agriculture. Heili suggested having 20 acre minimum to have a value. The size of the farm would start at 20 acres as a base number.

Walsh asked if the scale should be structured with fewer numbers and larger differentials. Anderson replied yes. Barlow commented that he didn't think the need exists for linear scales. Natzke commented that the St. Croix County LESA analysis could have made the breaks between points broader.

Distance to adopted sewer service areas

Millin suggested making the scale: >1=10 points, 0.5-0.99=5 points, and <0.49=0 points.

Distance to hamlets without sewer service areas

Heili suggested using the same criteria used for “Distance to adopted sewer service areas.” Krumbiegel stated there may be different opinions regarding individual townships. Krumbiegel suggested each town choose its own criteria. Kriewaldt stated the Town of Wayne has already chosen its criteria, and this factor should establish how much further you go out from the boundary of the hamlet. The Town of Wayne has established three hamlet areas, each one mile square. You're just setting that distance from the hamlet. Sebo asked if this is making a double negative for surrounding land uses. Bingen stated that may not be a bad thing. Anderson stated that the distance from the exterior boundary of hamlets would have to be uniform for the analysis, but that each Town should identify hamlets they want to include in the analysis (not all hamlets would have to be considered), and that each town should determine the exterior boundary of each hamlet.

Distance to all interchanges along US Highways 41 & 45

Discussion ensued to making the current buffer size half of what it currently is. Kriewaldt suggested the rating should be: outside the ½ mile buffer=10 points, between the ¼ and ½ mile buffer boundaries=5 points, and inside the ¼ mile buffer=0 points. The workgroup concurred.

Distance to all intersections of two State Highways and all State and County Highway intersections

A motion was made by Heili to eliminate this category and was seconded by Bartlow. Motion carried.

Distance to protected farmland

Krumbiegel stated there should be more value assigned protected farmlands.

Primary or secondary environmental corridors or isolated natural resource or natural areas/critical species habitat outside environmental corridors areas present on farm

Floodplains present on farm-using current 100 year floodplain

Discussion ensued regarding the restructuring of the scale. Suggestions included changing the scale so land that were 0-19 percent within the 100 year floodplain receive 0 points, 20-50 percent receive 7 points, and >50 percent receive 10 points.

Motion made by Wagner, seconded by Heili to change the ratings for Primary and secondary environmental corridors or isolated natural resource or natural areas/critical species habitat outside environmental corridor areas present on a farm and floodplains present on farm-using current 100 year floodplain be changed to 5 and 10 with a threshold of 50 percent. Motion carried unanimously.

Proximity to permanently protected land (fee simple and easement; public and Nonprofit Conservation Organization)

Anderson suggested that some minimum be designated and based on the amount of area touching a parcel.

Anderson stated staff will take this back, fine tune the scales, and present the new information next month.

FOURTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Discussion on Developing Criteria for LESA – Site Assessment

(The earlier discussion associated with agenda item 3 covered agenda item 4.)

FIFTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Public Comment on Developing Criteria for LESA – Site Assessment

(The earlier discussion associated with agenda item 3 covered agenda item 5.)

SIXTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Discussion and Possible Action of the Agricultural, Natural and Cultural Resources Element Work Group on Developing Criteria for LESA – Site Assessment

(The earlier discussion associated with agenda item 3 covered agenda item 6.)

SEVENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Update on Interactive Visioning Workshop

Glass presented attendance handout of the visioning workshop. (See Attached). Glass stated the visioning workshop results will be reviewed at the Advisory Committee meeting on November 29th and encouraged all workgroup members to attend.

EIGHTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Public Comment

Yogerst commented that Amish farms, around 40 acres in size, don't get any points because they are too small. Wolf replied staff is going to reassign points and so farms of that size will receive points.

NINTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Discussion Regarding Upcoming Meetings

John stated the next meeting will be December 6, 2006.

TENTH ORDER OF BUSINESS: Adjournment

Motion by Millin, seconded by Peters to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Debora Sielski
Assistant Administrator for Planning

Approved by _____
Marilyn John, Chairperson

Date _____

