



## MINUTES

**LAND EVALUATION AND SITE ASSESSMENT (LESA) TECHNICAL ADVISORY WORK GROUP  
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2006 AT 1:30 PM  
OZAUKEE COUNTY ADMINISTRATION CENTER – AUDITORIUM  
121 WEST MAIN STREET, PORT WASHINGTON**

**Attendees:**

Sue Millin	Land Conservation Partnership of Ozaukee County
Michelle Lehner	WDNR
Coreen Fallat	DATCP
Jim Kadow	Town of Saukville
Bill Niehaus	Town of Saukville / County Board Supervisor
Dale Buser	Northern Environmental / Landowner
Kevin Traastad	NRCS
Larry Natzke	NRCS
Betsy Gillen	NRCS
Nancy Anderson	SEWRPC
Ben McKay	SEWRPC
Nicole Sidoff	Ozaukee County – PRLM
Paul Roback	UWEX – Ozaukee County
Andrew Struck	Ozaukee County - PRLM

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Andrew Struck welcomed everyone to the second work group meeting and thanked them for their time and assistance in the comprehensive planning process. Everyone present did self-introductions.

**2. Minutes of September 28, 2006**

Michelle Lehner from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources needs to be added to the attendance list. No action was taken on the minutes.

**3. Discussion and Potential Action on the Selection and Scaling of Site Assessment Criteria for LESA**

Andrew Struck explained that the potential site assessment criteria discussed at the last meeting were grouped by staff according to the LESA Guidebook factors - SA-1 (Agricultural Productivity), SA-2 (Development pressures) and SA-3 (Other public values of a site supporting retention in agriculture). Staff then also identified a potential factor scale for each criteria based on Work Group comments at the first meeting. A handout with the draft criteria and factor scales was distributed. The Work Group reviewed the handout and provided the following comments:

SA-1 (Agricultural Productivity), A. - May need to use parcel data rather than farm units as the basis for the analysis, because current digital farm data is not available. Larry Natzke stated it would be preferable to scale each criterion using fewer point values in order to obtain a clearer picture of which parcels were better candidates for long-term farmland protection. Larry also recommended that the ideal or preferred condition for each criteria be identified and that condition given the full 10 points. For example, under this criterion, parcels of 80 acres or more are well-suited for farming and should receive 10 points. The work group agreed and changed the scaling to assign 0 points for parcels less than 35 acres, 5 points for parcels between 35 and 79 acres, and 10 points for parcels of 80 acres or greater.

SA-1, B. - Drop conservancy lands; measure size of contiguous farmland only. Change the factor scale for contiguous farmland between 100 and 319 acres from 6 to 4.

SA-1, C. - This scale has too many rankings to provide a clear picture of which parcels are more suitable for agricultural use due to compatible adjacent uses. Change the scale to 10 points for 90-100 percent compatible adjacent uses; 7 points for 70 to 90 percent compatible adjacent uses; 4 points for 50 to 70 percent compatible adjacent uses; and 0 points for less than 50 percent of adjacent lands in compatible uses.

SA-1, D. - Revise to use a scale similar to the one above for compatible uses within 0.5 mile of the subject parcel.

The Work Group discussed the impact on the number of nearby homes and residents on farming operations, and felt that this was an important criterion that may not be fully addressed by analyzing the percentage of compatible land uses. A criterion will be added to measure and scale population density within 0.5 mile of the subject parcel.

SA-2 (Development pressures impacting a site's continued agricultural use), A. - The scale for distance from a planned sewer service area was simplified and changed to 0 points for 0-0.5 miles, 5 points for 0.5-1 mile, and 10 points for more than one mile.

SA-2, B. - Distance from a city or village duplicates SA-2, A, and does not take into consideration the rural nature of the western portion of Mequon. The criterion was eliminated.

SA-2, C. - Change the scale for distance from IH 43 interchanges similar to SA-2, A.

SA-2, D. - Remove the criterion for distance to the intersection of two State highways and all State and County Highway intersections.

SA-3 (Other public values of a site supporting retention in agriculture), A. - Rather than scaling this criterion based on the percentage of a parcel with natural resources, assign 10 points to parcels containing primary environmental corridor, 7 points to parcels containing secondary environmental corridors, 3 points to parcels containing isolated natural resource areas (INRA), and 0 points for parcels with no environmental corridors/INRA.

A criterion was added regarding lowland conservancy resources (the presence of wetlands less than 5-acres or 100-year floodplains) on a parcel, with 10 points to be assigned if either resource is present and 0 points if neither resource is present.

SA-3, B. - The scale for proximity to permanently protected land was changed to eliminate a distance of greater than 1 mile; therefore, 0.5 mile or more is 0 points, within 0.5 miles is 5 points, and adjacent (touching) is 10 points.

SA-3, C. - Add frontage on a rustic road to the criterion for historic resources present on a parcel. The point values were not changed.

Additional potential criteria identified by the LESA Work Group (proximity to streams and lakes, Century Farms, and approved conservation practices) were discussed and removed.

#### **4. Discussion on Weighting the Site Assessment Criteria for LESA**

There was not enough time to discuss weighting at this meeting. Staff will develop preliminary weighting in order to conduct the initial analysis for review by the Work Group.

## **5. Next Steps**

Staff will work on the draft criteria, scaling and weighting for review by the Work Group at the next meeting. A handout was provided showing a sample of the resultant map that will be produced as part of this process. The sample was from St. Croix County, Wisconsin LESA Program effort (dated June 6, 2002).

## **6. Next Meeting Date – December 6, 2006 at 1:30 PM**

This meeting may be rescheduled due to the time needed to develop and run the GIS program to analyze the data.