



MINUTES
ROCK COUNTY PDR/PACE AD HOC COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2009, 8:00 A.M.
COUNTY COURTHOUSE CONFERENCE ROOM
JANESVILLE WI

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Sweeney called the meeting of the PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee to order at 8:03 a.m.

Committee Members Present: Chair Alan Sweeney, John Lader, Rich Bostwick, Neil Deupree, Julie Christenson, Neil Walter, Doug Marklein, Mark Gunn, Bill Barlass, Ray Henschler, Julie Backenkeller, Archie Morton, Dave Rebout, Robert Fizzell, Don Jones, Fred Hookham, Brad Cantrell, and Charley Rusch.

Committee Members Absent: Ramona Flanigan, Scott Farrington, and Todd Schmidt.

Staff Present: Tom Sweeney, LCD; Randy Thompson, UWEX; Steve Schraufnagel, Planning; Carrie Houston, Planning; and Wade Thompson, Planning.

Others Present: Paul Benjamin and Mary Robb.

2. **Adoption of Agenda:** Chair Sweeney entertained a motion to adopt the agenda. Bostwick motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Jones. **Motion Carried.**

3. **Adoption of Minutes:** Chair Sweeney entertained a motion to adopt the minutes from the December 1, 2009 meeting. Fizzell motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Lader. **Motion Carried.**

4. **Citizen Participation, Communications, and Announcements.** NONE

5. **LESA Factor Weighting Exercise Results – Wade Thompson, Planning**
Thompson started by reviewing the discussion items which include: Eligibility verses priority; the LESA factor weighting exercise results; State and Federal eligibility and priority criteria; and conclude with discussing potential County program eligibility criteria.

Thompson reviewed the issue of eligibility verses priority for the program. First was the issue of coordinating the county, state and federal programs eligibility criteria. What lands are we looking to include in our program. The first issue filtered into the second issue of priority; how lands that meet the basic eligibility criteria will be prioritized.

Thompson discussed the results from the exercise given to the Committee at the October 21, 2009 meeting. The results are in the order of highest to lowest: Soil Quality, Field Size, Percent of site in Ag Use, Compatibility with surrounding land uses, Distance to other protected lands, Distance to municipal sewer service area, Distance to major transportation corridor, Distance to subdivisions, and Percent of site covered by environmental sensitive areas.

At this point Chair Sweeney called for questions.

Marklein noted that three survey takers might have answered the questions inversely to their meaning. The three rated soil quality low and the lowest average items high.

Thompson noted that the averages would not change the results of the exercise.

Thompson continued with the “Whoville” exercise. Parcel A (very high development pressure) versus Parcel B (very low development pressure). Thompson noted that the majority chose Parcel A as their choice for protection.

Much discussion ensued regarding the “Whoville” parcel question.

6. Federal eligibility requirements – Carrie Houston, Planning

Houston reviewed the Eligibility requirements to receive Federal-matching funds: Includes 50% prime, unique, or statewide-important farmland soils, or eligible historical or archeological sites; Economically viable agricultural operation; Privately owned; Development not already restricted or physically impossible; Facing development pressure; Does not contain more than 2/3 forestland; Existing agricultural infrastructure and markets support continued agricultural use.

Houston continued with the federal program Priority Criteria to receive matching funds: Percent of prime, unique and statewide-important soils; Percent of working lands (cropland, pastureland, etc.); Ratio of total acres to the median County farm size; Population density (population per square mile); Proximity to other protected land; Proximity to other agricultural operations and infrastructure; Ecosystem service or public benefit and Within targeted areas.

7. State eligibility requirements – Carrie Houston, Planning

Houston reviewed the Priority Criteria to receive State-matching funds: Percent of prime, unique and statewide-important soils; Percent of working lands (cropland, pastureland, etc.); Ratio of total acres to the median County farm size; Consistency with planning and zoning; Percent adjacent to developed land; Percent of developed land in Town; Distance from nearest urban service area boundary; Distance from nearest highway interchange; Environmental, conservation, historic, archeological and scenic values; Adjacency to protected land; Community support; and Financial considerations.

8. County eligibility requirements – Wade Thompson, Planning

Thompson reviewed the potential program eligibility criteria. He noted the criteria would be broken into three sub categories for discussion purposes; certain, fairly certain, and uncertain. The eligibility criteria are considered the minimum criteria that a parcel must have for further consideration in the program.

Certain criteria includes: **1)** Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) land evaluation soil score of 70 or greater and; **2)** 35 acres or larger, with at least 50% classified as working lands.

Fairly certain includes: **1)** Not currently within any Town/Village/City planned development areas (per Town/City Village comprehensive plans) or existing municipal sewer service area and; **2)** located within a Township containing a City or Village, or within 2 miles of a Village, 3 miles of a City with a population between 4,000 - 10,000 and 5 miles of a City with a population between 10,000 - 80,000 (per the most recent Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) population estimate).

Uncertain includes: **1)** Not currently within any Town/Village/City planned development areas (per Town/City Village comprehensive plans) or existing municipal sewer service area and; **2)** located within a Township containing a City or Village, or within 2 miles of a Village, 3 miles of a City with a population between 4,000 - 10,000 and 5 miles of a City with a population between 10,000 - 80,000 (per the most recent Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) population estimate).

Thompson presented a series of maps and discussed the impacts from each of the criteria represented; the first map included Agricultural Preservation Areas, the second map included Agricultural Preservation Areas and lands outside the city/village/town future expansion areas, and the third map included the criteria from the second map plus a town containing a city or village or an area within 2 miles of a village or 3 miles of a city. And the fourth map displayed the results of the exercise with the three aforementioned criteria color coded.

9. **Questions and Discussion** – Chair Sweeney opened the floor for questions regarding the presentations by Wade Thompson and Carrie Houston.

The requirement of a 35-acre minimum was discussed. After much discussion, staff will review a composite of multiple contiguous parcels that make up the 35-acre minimum will be reviewed by staff.

The ETJ was discussed as it relates to this program. Also included was the time period.

The criteria of; located within a Township containing a City or Village, or within 2 miles of a Village, 3 miles of a City with a population between 4,000 - 10,000 and 5 miles of a City with a population between 10,000 - 80,000 (per the most recent Wisconsin Department of Administration (WDOA) population estimate) was discussed in great detail. Staff will review these criteria and report back to the committee.

10. **Future Meeting Date** – Chair Sweeney recommended January 11, 2010 with a 4:00 p.m. start time as the next meeting date. January 18, 2010 with a 4:00 p.m. start time is the alternate date.
11. **Adjournment:** Rusch motioned to adjourn the PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee at 9:25 p.m., seconded by Jones. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Sweeney
County Conservationist

Minutes are not official until adopted by the PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee.

g:office/PDR/AdHoc120109mi