



**MINUTES**  
**ROCK COUNTY PDR/PACE AD HOC COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY, MAY 18, 2010, 6:30 P.M.**  
**COUNTY COURTHOUSE - CONFERENCE ROOM 250**  
**JANESVILLE WI**

1. **Call to Order:** Chair Sweeney called the meeting of the PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee to order at 6:30 p.m.  
  
**Committee Members Present:** Chair Alan Sweeney, John Lader, Rich Bostwick, Ron Combs, Brad Cantrell, Ramona Flanigan, Neil Walter, Neil Deupree, Julie Christenson, Doug Marklein, Archie Morton, Dave Rebut, Ray Henschler, and Mark Gunn.  
  
**Committee Members Absent:** Julie Backenkeller, Charley Rusch, Bill Barlass, Don Jones, Scott Farrington, Todd Schmidt, and Fred Hookham,  
  
**Staff Present:** Tom Sweeney, LCD; Randy Thompson, UWEX; Paul Benjamin, Planning; Steve Schraufnagel, Planning; Carrie Houston, Planning; and Wade Thompson, Planning.  
  
**Others Present:** Bob Fizzell and Larry Wiedenfeld.
2. **Adoption of Agenda:** Chair Sweeney entertained a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Rich Bostwick motioned to approve the agenda, seconded by Neil Deupree. **Motion Carried.**
3. **Adoption of Minutes:** Chair Sweeney entertained a motion to adopt the minutes from the April 5, 2010 meeting. Mark Gunn motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Dave Rebut. **Motion Carried.**
4. **Citizen Participation, Communications, and Announcements:** Neil Deupree noted that the Janesville Sustainability Committee would be having a study session with the City Council this evening.
5. **Discussion of LESA Scoring Scales:** Wade Thompson, Planning reviewed the LESA scoring scales exercise conducted at the last Ad Hoc Committee meeting. Wade noted that a few adjustments were needed for various reasons and each change would be addressed. Staff integrated Committee comments and further evaluated each factor and developed the information to be discussed. Old scales and new scales were presented.

Factor 2a, Field Size was adjusted to reflect the true average field size, working land found on a tax parcel, found in Rock County. The scoring was reduced from five options to four. Staff utilized the USDA data sets on working lands for each parcel. Each tax parcel is a field. Neil Deupree asked for an example of the data set used by staff to make recommended changes. Wade Thompson noted that only one parcel scored the ten-points when this factor was run. The new scale represents the actual county field size data. Doug Marklein asked if multiple tax parcels, which are contiguous, would be considered as one. Wade Thompson stated the data is generated on a tax parcel basis. John Lader provided an example under the model, if purchased neighbor land is integrated into existing farm, would two be one or two farms. Neil Deupree recalled that the highest score should reflect the median field size found in a county. Wade stated the new scale does just that.

Factor 2b, Use-Percent of Parcel in Workland was reduced from five options to four. The change was implemented from staff analysis of USDA data sets. Staff found a larger portion of land tillable than first estimated. Neil Walter asked for clarification regarding portions of the farms that are dedicated to erosion control such as waterways, etc. Tom Sweeney stated that CRP lands and other areas dedicated to water quality protection would be included as a field under USDA. Ray Henschler asked if buildings were removed to provide percentage. Wade Thompson stated this to be true. Doug Marklein requested clarification as to other factors that will reduce the percent of workland. Wade stated yards, woodlots, wetlands, etc are factors adjusted for.

Factor 2c, Surrounding Use Compatibility – Zoning District Within 0.5 miles was adjusted. Industrial land use was changed from 5 to 0 points. This change was recommended through the committee exercise. A long discussion took place regarding this factor and the proposed changes. Neil Deupree noted the distance was changed for the buffer from 1.0 mile to 0.5 mile. Doug Marklein requested an explanation. Wade Thompson stated that a composite (land use score) compatibility would be completed. In reality nobody will get a pure score as identified in the table, but a composite of the different nearby zoning districts, thus generating a score of 6.3. Brad Cantrell requested clarification regarding the definition of agricultural transition areas and urban transition areas. Carrie Houston explained. Archie Morton requested the weight of this factor should be reduced based on activities outside the control of landowners. Wade stated the factor weight is low and the composite will average out this issue. Mark Gunn requested clarification on Agricultural Transition on a plat versus actually being zoned as such. Paul Benjamin noted that the Agricultural Transition Areas came out of the old Agricultural Preservation Plans. Ron Combs asked if the transition areas would be eligible for the program. Since the underlying zoning is A-1, they would remain eligible. Doug Marklein recommended changing the zoning districts to reflect the smart growth plans that depict the future. Dave Rebut noted that the units of government having jurisdiction developed the smart growth and most landowners didn't make any comments on the plans. Ron Combs stated that maps of the Agriculture Transition Zones would benefit the Committee.

Factor 3a, Distance from Existing Sewer Service Areas was unchanged. Wade Thompson explained that the factor would buffer the sewer service area. John Lader asked if a map was available that defines all sewer service areas. Brad Cantrell explained the distance of sewer service areas from the city limits, approximately ½ mile. Neil Walters felt that areas excluded via this factor would be ceded to development.

Factor 3b, Distance from Subdivisions was changed. Wade noted that the change was precipitated from recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee. Wade noted that the definition of a rural subdivision for this exercise is based on a high concentration of rural housing units, specifically five or more. Julie Christenson noted a typographic error in both tables, new and old factors; specifically 0.05 miles should be 0.5 miles. This will be changed. Doug Marklein noted that this factor should be based on a bell curve. Doug recommended a point system. A discussion on the proposal occurred. Wade noted that once the committee sees a map, it might clear up this issue.

Factor 3c, Distance from Other Protected Lands was unchanged. Definition of protected lands is only ownership protected, easements or public realm. No discussion took place.

Factor 3d, Distance from Major Transportation Corridors: Wade Thompson discussed this factor and the proposed change. Specifically the 10 point category would be changed from 0.75 mile to 1.0 mile and the 0 point category would be any thing less than 0.99 mile. Discussion centered on the Interstate corridor and the potential economic impact if this area was removed from consideration. Doug Marklein asked if this is based on intersections or roads? Controlled access on interstate would come into play with this factor and therefore only the intersections of the interstate would be factored. Neil Deupree asked for clarification on the factor scores. Ron Combs recommended placing names of roads on the factor list versus using the statement principal and minor arterials. This may defuse

potential confusion. Carrie Houston stated at the next Ad Hoc Committee Meeting, factor maps would be made available to the committee. Brad Cantrell questioned the factor of interstate intersections versus the interstate corridor. Brad stated that a businesses visibility on the interstate is a viable economic consideration and should be accounted for. Archie Morton stated he disagrees with Brad Cantrell regarding this issue. Archie noted that the farmers along the interstate corridor should remain eligible for this program. A long discussion occurred based on the two points of view. Archie stated that the intersections are not at issue. Julie Christenson noted that the economics of this corridor are higher in this area than other areas. Mark Gunn noted Kerry Ingredient as an example of Interstate visibility. Julie Christenson explained the situation of Kerry Ingredients. John Lader noted a map of the interstate with interchanges would help this discussion. Wade Thompson stated a map of this factor would be available. The discussion continued addressing the merits of development at the interchanges of the interstate specifically the reception of agricultural type businesses versus non-agricultural businesses.

Factor 4a, Environmentally Sensitive Areas. Wade Thompson discussed this factor. Staff reviewed percent of coverage of parcels. Add the presence of wetlands and 30% or greater of groundwater recharge and shore lands. Maps are available for each factor from various studies. Ron Combs noted that this factor is one of the lowest scored factors. Neil Deupree asked isn't all agricultural lands considered groundwater recharge. Alan Sweeney noted that some areas, specifically kettles have a greater significance regarding groundwater recharge.

Wade Thompson closed the factor discussion, noting that each factor we discussed will be mapped and a final LESA map will be constructed. All maps will be provided to the committee at the next Ad Hoc meeting.

6. **Discussion of Program Manual Structure and Content:** Carrie Houston, Planning distributed and discussed an outline of the Program Manual. The three major components of the manual are as follows: Executive Summary, Introduction and Overview, and Development and Implementation. She continued with a breakdown of the sub components of the Program Development, which includes a County profile, Eligibility, Priority and Rank. The Program implementation subsection will include Administration, Funding, Education and Outreach, Application, Purchase and Donations, Data Entry, Storage, and maintenance, and finally Evaluation and Modifications. Doug Marklein brought up that a section for definitions should be included in the manual. Staff will develop the manual and present to Ad Hoc Committee for review and comment. A public hearing will need to be conducted at the county board since an ordinance will be developed to authorize the grant management, holding of easements, and expenditures.
7. **Discussion of Program Accomplishments and Timeline:** Wade Thompson, Planning discussed the Program accomplishments thus far and tasks yet to be completed. Wade continued with the PACE Program timeline of the yet to be completed tasks.
8. **Questions and Discussion:** Chair Sweeney called for any questions or further discussion. Hearing none Chair Sweeney moved to the next item.
9. **Future Meeting Date:** Chair Sweeney recommended June 29, 2010 with a 6:30 p.m. start time as the next meeting date.
10. **Adjournment:** John Lader motioned to adjourn the PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee at 8:11 p.m., seconded by Neil Deupree. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Thomas Sweeney  
County Conservationist

**Page 4**  
**Rock County PDR/PACE Ad Hoc Committee**  
**Minutes – May 18, 2010**

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

g:office/PDR/AdHoc051810mi