

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Tim Kaul called the meeting to order at 9:04 am. Land Preservation Board members present included: Chairman Tim Kaul, Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Rothstein, Supervisor Bill Niehaus, Frank Madden, Jim Melichar (9:10 am), Mike Paulus (9:10 am), and Marjie Tomter (alternate). Members excused included: Caroline Torinus. Staff present included: County Administrator Tom Meaux (10:41 am), UW-Extension Community Resource Development Educator Nicole Sidoff, UW-Extension Agriculture Agent Dan O'Neil, and Planning and Parks Department Director Andrew Struck. Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) staff present included: Principal Planner Rick Kania.

**2. ASSURANCE THAT THE MEETING HAS BEEN PROPERLY NOTICED / ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

Chairman Kaul asked staff if the meeting had been properly noticed and agenda posted. Nicole Sidoff noted that the meeting was properly noticed and the agenda had been posted.

**Motion by Supervisor Bill Niehaus and seconded by Marjie Tomter to adopt the agenda as printed. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (AUGUST 29, 2011)**

**Motion by Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Rothstein and seconded by Frank Madden to approve the minutes for the August 29, 2011 meeting of the Land Preservation Board as written. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public comments or written communications.

**5. UPDATE ON RESIGNATION OF ALTERNATE PAUL HAYES**

Chairman Kaul noted that Paul Hayes had called him and sent a letter indicating that he wished to resign from the Land Preservation Board (LPB). Mr. Hayes noted that he was beginning another book project and would not be able to dedicate the time he thought necessary to the LPB efforts. He indicated that he enjoyed being on the Board. Andrew Struck noted that he had not yet spoken with County Administrator Tom Meaux about a replacement for Mr. Hayes. Because Mr. Hayes was an alternate, it is not as urgent to refill the position. Supervisor Niehaus indicated that he thought Chris Ford, a Saukville resident, would be a good candidate to fill this position, noting that Mr. Ford is very energetic and interested in these types of issues. Andrew Struck noted that he has had ongoing contact with Mr. Ford and that he is very interested in getting involved in land preservation efforts in the County. He further noted that Mr. Ford has been reviewing both the Comprehensive Plan and the recently adopted Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County.

Frank Madden asked when the LPB would terminate. Mr. Struck indicated that the LPB is tasked with developing a land preservation plan and recommending it to the County Board. The land preservation plan would be the combination of two other plans reviewed by the LPB, namely the Park and Open Space Plan (POSP) and Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP). The timeline for adopting the FPP will likely be mid-2012, and the land preservation plan efforts would begin after the adoption of the FPP. Chairman Kaul noted that the Natural Resource Committee (NRC) has had conversations on funding for the implementation of the FPP. He then indicated that he did not see the LPB dissolving anytime soon.

Jim Melichar and Mike Paulus joined the meeting at 9:10 am.

Chairman Kaul requested that staff work with the County Administrator on a new appointment to the LPB. Dan O'Neil indicated that an application to serve on a County committee or board is on the County website. Mr. Struck noted that he will speak with Administrator Meaux about the LPB opening and will also speak with Chris Ford about the possibility of applying to be on the LPB.

#### 4. PUBLIC COMMENT AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Chairman Kaul permitted returning to agenda item four after agenda item five was discussed.

Jim Melichar shared an update on farmland preservation discussions in the Town of Port Washington. He indicated that one of the primary concerns amongst farmers is that they do not want to be required to follow conservation plans that require compliance with the new land and water conservation standards. Additionally, farmers that rent out land would have to be in compliance with the conservation standards if required by the owner's participation, while the owner would be the one collecting the tax credits.

Chairman Kaul indicated that it would be important to call out the importance of educating landowners about the SWOT results summary. This is an important function that the County could be doing now.

Mr. Melichar continued that more landowners were against changing the Town's planned land use map to allow for farmland preservation areas (FPAs) than were in favor of the change, primarily for the aforementioned issues with complying with land and water conservation standards. Mike Paulus agreed with that fact that many farmers he knows are not interested in collecting tax credits due to the conservation standard compliance issue. Dan O'Neil indicated that oftentimes landowners do not live in the area and trust the operator, and therefore do not check up on them very often. Andrew Struck noted that Andy Holschbach and his department would suggest that some of those conservation practices would save the operator money in the long-term. Mr. Melichar suggested that it would be helpful to have Mr. Holschbach and his department go out and speak with the farmers.

Mr. Struck noted that this feedback from farmers, operators and landowners is critical to the process and is part of the reason for extending the farmland preservation planning process along with coordination with the local municipalities on consistency with the County Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Kaul noted that the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) has discussed this issue and the fact that towns and the City of Mequon were still trying to determine if they were in or out for the FPAs. Chairman Kaul asked if it would be possible to amend the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) a year or two down the road if towns decide then that they would like to have an FPA. Mr. Struck indicated that the FPP has to be certified by DATCP, which is a long process. The State Statutes require that the FPP be updated every ten years, and it is unlikely that it would be updated more frequently than that based on existing county staffing and the DATCP certification process in addition to the requirements for amending the County Comprehensive Plan. Likely, if a town or city is not going to participate in the FPAs now then they will not be able to participate until the next update of the FPP for Ozaukee County.

Jim Melichar noted that he believes that the current situation is perfect for farmland preservation, with commodity prices being high and development being low. He also noted that producers who cannot dig themselves out of a financial hole now when things are so good will likely not be able to succeed in the future. Dan O'Neil and Mr. Melichar both noted that there are more financial issues amongst farmers in the County than the public may understand. Frank Madden indicated that it is currently a very difficult real estate market, but Wisconsin is in better shape than Florida, Arizona, and many other states. Supervisor Niehaus questioned if the pressure that has historically been on the land will change in the future. Mr. Madden noted that people likely will not get rich quick on the land like they had in the past. Mr. Melichar noted that he believes people are more willing to give up a mortgage than their recreational amenities, such as cars and boats. Vice-Chairperson Rothstein noted that this is a watershed time and this document requires the group to look out ten years into the future. She also noted that she appreciated the leadership roles Mr. Melichar, Mr. Paulus, and Chairman Kaul have provided in the farming community and to the LPB. Supervisor Niehaus noted that the farther he gets into this issue, the less sure he is of where the County should go, but the more sure he is of the value of the land. Chairman Kaul noted that he has heard many times that this farmland preservation planning effort should have been undertaken ten or twenty years ago, as no one would have conceived that the economic situation would be what it is today. He then thanked Jim Melichar and Mike Paulus for their updates on the farming community.

**6. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON TABLE II-4, II-5, AND II-(X) OF CHAPTER TWO – INVENTORY/ANALYSIS – PART I (SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES) OF THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN**

Chairman Kaul returned to the original order of the agenda, following the additional discussion on agenda item 4.

Andrew Struck noted that Tables II-4, II-5, and II-(X) of Chapter Two Part I were being brought back to the LPB because the Board had either requested reformatting of the tables or requested that additional data be collected for a potentially new table to be created. Rick Kania indicated that Table II-4 was amended per the LPB recommendation to have easier to read headings. Table II-5 was amended per the LPB recommendation to break down the “grains” category further. Mr. Kania noted that more current data was not available for Table II-5. Mike Paulus noted that Ozaukee County revenue from dairy is higher than the State average for that category. Dan O’Neil indicated that the sale of cattle and calves is largely related to the dairy industry in Ozaukee County as well.

Rick Kania noted that Table II-(X) was a new table with new data based on the LPB request, but that he felt it that in comparing that table to Table II-5 will likely confuse people, as production value is not equal to revenue. Andrew Struck noted that the production value is the rate placed on the good and is how the USDA defines that value. Frank Madden noted that hay is being consumed and is not necessarily always a commodity. The LPB then discussed the difference between value and sales revenue. Jim Melichar and Dan O’Neil confirmed that the heading on Table II-(X) was correct. Frank Madden noted that the economic impact of farming in Ozaukee County is critical – in particular, the value of the dairy industry. Andrew Struck noted that the production value captures something that is not directly captured by sales revenue alone. Mr. Struck noted that as long as the titles were clear and accurate that there was reason for including both tables.

Chairman Kaul asked if the LPB was comfortable with Table II-(X) as presented. Mr. O’Neil indicated that the table should not total bushels with tons, as they are not the same measurement. Rick Kania noted that he will change that in the table. Andrew Struck suggested that a footnote with the definition for “value of production” be included on the table, so that each table can stand alone and not necessarily have to reference the text of the Plan. The LPB indicated that they were comfortable including both tables in the plan as they measure different things.

**Motion by Supervisor Bill Niehaus and seconded by Jim Melichar to approve Tables II-4, II-5, and II-(X) of Chapter Two – Inventory/Analysis – Part I (Soils and Agricultural Resources) of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan as amended. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**7. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON CHAPTER TWO – INVENTORY/ANALYSIS – PART II (OTHER RELATED NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES) OF THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN**

Andrew Struck noted that the LPB has seen most of this chapter, as much of it was taken from the recently adopted Park and Open Space Plan or the Comprehensive Plan. Rick Kania noted that the FPP CAC made a few minor changes and he will mention those to the LPB. The FPP CAC made the following changes:

- 1.) Change “and recharge” to “recharge and discharge” in the second to last sentence in the first paragraph on page II-1.
- 2.) Add “aggregate” to the end of the last sentence of the first full paragraph on page II-2.

Mr. Kania then noted that some minor changes in some numbers will be made to reflect refinements in GIS data. This will include the year for the surface water data on Table II-14, which will be changed to 2005. Additionally, on page II-4 the total acres of surface water will be changed to 2,704. A sentence will

be added that reads, "The sizes of lakes are based on SEWRPC inventory data." Rick Kania and Andrew Struck then explained the process for deriving these numbers.

Frank Madden asked where the floodplain acreage came from. Andrew Struck noted that the numbers for the acreage come from recently updated FEMA FIRM maps, which were produced by WDNR under contract with FEMA to produce the new floodplain maps for the County. The floodplain maps are the official, adopted maps. Rick Kania noted that he will include a map with farmed and non-farmed wetlands, which will include the 2005 surface water data. Mr. Struck indicated that the farmed wetlands data has been finalized since the completion of the County Comprehensive Plan and will be included in the FPP. Chairman Kaul asked whether wetland restorations completed under Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) involvement were still being counted as wetlands even if farmers did not renew their participation in CRP and are now farming those areas. Mr. Struck noted that some of these restored or enhanced wetlands are considered regulatory, but other created wetlands are not regulatory. He noted that the mapped wetlands are those that are considered regulatory with the WDNR or USACOE. He also noted that the County has a complete digital GIS database of all the wetlands whether they were created, enhanced or restored through these various programs.

Chairman Kaul asked if Table II-15 was the same as the table in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Struck noted that it was incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as part of the 2009 Comprehensive Plan amendment. Mr. Kania noted that the section heading "Managed Forest Law" should read "Managed Forest Lands". Additionally, throughout Table II-17, "american" will be capitalized to "American".

Mr. Kania further noted that the 2010 corridors data will not be available until 2012, so cannot be included in this report. Additionally, Map II-14 was amended to include project boundaries, as per the adopted County Park and Open Space Plan. Mr. Kania distributed a copy and discussed the text about those project boundaries with the LPB members.

Mike Paulus asked if all of the lands discussed on II-12a were open to the public. Mr. Struck indicated that most of those sites have public access, although some may be limited public access, such as the Cedarburg Bog. The US Fish and Wildlife Service sites are generally open to hunting.

Mr. Struck, per the recommendation of the LPB in the POSP, indicated that he recently expressed interest to MMSD Executive Director Kevin Shafer about the possibility of extending the Greenseams project boundaries farther north into Ozaukee County. Mr. Shafer noted that MMSD is interested in expanding the program geographically; however, there are some political and funding issues that need to be resolved before this could happen. Vice-Chairperson Rothstein noted that although parts of Ozaukee County are not within MMSD's service area, they are within the Milwaukee River Watershed, which feeds into MMSD's district.

Rick Kania handed out a copy of Map II-14, which the FPP CAC suggested be included in the FPP rather than just cross-referenced. Andrew Struck noted that a number of the easements in the North Branch area are being preserved for farmland. He will try to work with Dale Katsma to come up with acreage of lands being protected for farmland. Supervisor Niehaus asked if the recently-acquired Schanen property northeast of Hwy 33 should be included on this map. Mr. Kania noted that the cut-off date for this data set was 2010. Mr. Struck noted that staff will try to get this data from the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust or from Supervisor Niehaus. Dan O'Neil noted that number 35 on Table II-23 "Granbinger" should read "Grabinger". Marjie Tomter asked if staff would like the Town of Grafton's open space easements and corridors data. Mr. Struck indicated that the County would like that information.

Andrew Struck noted that staff was going to add a paragraph and table on Century Farms in Ozaukee County. This came up at the FPP CAC, and that data was a criterion in PACE applications. The data the State has may not be completely accurate; however, as they do not drop farms off the list if they become inactive. Dan O'Neil noted that he has files on a lot of the approved applications for Century Farms, as

well as some farms applying for 150 year status. Mr. Struck noted that he and Rick K. would coordinate with Dan O'Neil and any other resources to provide this data.

Andrew Struck noted that the watershed map included in this chapter is a reflection of data agreed upon by SEWRPC and WDNR. These two datasets typically do not match, but this map reconciles those issues.

**Motion by Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Rothstein and seconded by Marjie Tomter to approve Chapter Two – Part II (Other Related Natural and Cultural Resources) of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan as amended. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**8. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON CHAPTER TWO – INVENTORY/ANALYSIS – PART III (EXISTING AND HISTORICAL POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS) OF THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN**

Andrew Struck indicated that this chapter utilized data from both the County Comprehensive Plan and the recently adopted Park and Open Space Plan. Rick Kania noted that he also used 2010 Census data to update as much of this section as possible. It was noted that on page II-2 in the second sentence of the second paragraph, "I" should be "It," and "having" should be "have."

Mike Paulus asked about the age distribution chart, noting that the population 65 and older is growing and the younger population is decreasing. He asked if that is related to the size of families, namely families having fewer children. Andrew Struck noted that it could partially be a function of that, and could also be attributed to in-migration and out-migration. Rick Kania noted that household size is also projected to decrease.

Tom Meaux joined the meeting at 10:41 am.

Rick Kania noted that he will have a figure for employment in Chapter III, as that chapter discusses trends. Jim Melichar noted that some factor of increased efficiency of farming operations has had an effect on farming employment trends. Andrew Struck also indicated that some migrant labor is not tracked or captured very well.

**Motion by Jim Melichar and seconded by Frank Madden to approve Chapter Two – Part III (Existing and Historical Population, Household, and Employment Characteristics) of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan as amended. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**9. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON CHAPTER FOUR – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT – OF THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN**

Andrew Struck noted that Chapter Four sums up all the public involvement activities conducted throughout the FPP planning process.

Vice-Chairperson Rothstein noted that on page IV-3 on the third bullet from the bottom, the second "private donations" should be deleted. Chairman Kaul noted that the "opportunity to educate landowners on farmland preservation programs" should be added as an opportunity in the summary of the SWOT results. Nicole Sidoff indicated that education had come up as an opportunity in the SWOT analyses by the LPB, CPB, and FPP CAC, so it would be added.

Jim Melichar noted that having Nicole Sidoff staff a display at Breakfast on the Farm was very helpful and well-received. Many people have mentioned that they received information at the booth.

Rick Kania indicated that the date of the public information meetings will be included now that they have been held. Nicole Sidoff noted that the weather and time of year, coupled with the content of these initial public information meetings likely contributed to the low attendance.

Rick Kania noted that he was going to add a section on "Additional Public Comments," similar to that included in the Park and Open Space Plan. Andrew Struck noted that these would be the "less formal" comments, namely those collected through emails and phone calls.

Vice-Chairperson Rothstein indicated that she would like to hear more about the Town of Dunn and their ability to start a farmland preservation program in close proximity to the City of Madison. Frank Madden noted that the people living on the lakes in that area wanted to preserve the land around them, and Jim Melichar noted that it helped that large tracts of land were owned by one landowner. Mr. Madden indicated that the money is coming from the people living along the lakes. Marjie Tomter noted that Dakota County, MN has a similar successful program that is largely funded by the wealthy suburban development in the County. Andrew Struck noted that staff is hoping to bring representatives from the Town of Dunn and/or Dakota County, MN to Ozaukee County again at some point.

**Motion by Marjie Tomter and seconded by Jim Melichar to approve Chapter Four – Public Involvement – of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan as amended. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

**10. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE WRITTEN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035 (AS IT RELATES TO THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN AMENDMENT AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN)**

Andrew Struck noted that this item was just an update for the LPB. A few meetings ago, the Farmland Preservation Plan Public Participation Plan (FPP PPP) was presented to and approved by the LPB. Because of how the State Statute is written, the FPP PPP must be considered a subset of the County Comprehensive Plan PPP. Instead of re-adopting an amended County Comprehensive Plan PPP for every planning effort, the CPB will adopt a general Comprehensive Plan PPP that will give the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) more flexibility in adapting a PPP for separate significant planning efforts such as the FPP. The CPB will take up approval of this item, as it deals directly with the Comprehensive Plan. This will also allow the CPB to then take up the FPP PPP subset of the Comprehensive Plan PPP, which the LPB has already reviewed and approved. The CPB will review both the resolution for amending the Comprehensive Plan PPP as well as the color FPP PPP piece at its next meeting. In the future, the LPB would take up the individual planning efforts' PPP subsets of the County Comprehensive Plan PPP, and then recommend that document for approval by the CPB. The only process difference would be that the LPB would not recommend a resolution, as that would not be necessary. Chairman Kaul asked if a motion was necessary, and Andrew Struck noted that it was not necessary, as the LPB was not changing what they already approved regarding the FPP PPP.

Supervisor Niehaus left the meeting at 11:00 am.

**11. REVIEW, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREA (FPA) CRITERIA AS APPROVED BY THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FPP CAC)**

Andrew Struck noted that the LPB received the same handout of the proposed Farmland Preservation Area (FPA) criteria that the FPP CAC received, with the exception that the criteria the FPP CAC recommended to drop were highlighted. He noted that he would share what the FPP CAC recommended to use as criteria and then the LPB can comment and make their recommendation. He also added that the criteria need to be objective, according to DATCP, and cannot be based on which landowners want to participate. Mr. Struck then explained each of the criteria and the FPP CAC recommendation that criteria A (Municipal Boundaries), B (Sewer Service Areas), C (Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Scores), E (Planned Land Uses), and F (Zoning) be the FPA criteria. The FPP CAC recommended that criteria D (Percent Agricultural Use) and G (Contiguous Farm Block Size) not be included as FPA criteria.

Mike Paulus asked about the sewer service criterion in reference to the Village of Fredonia's sewer service area, namely if the land on the east side of Hwy 57 would not be eligible for an FPA under that criterion. Andrew Struck noted that it is in the Town's formally adopted sewer service area, so it would not be eligible. The LPB then discussed the concept of annexations and whether there has ever been a precedent of un-annexing land, as well as the possibility of preserving farmland in a city or village with a conservation easement. The LPB also discussed the current status and potential future status of the parcel east of Hwy 57 in the Village of Fredonia.

Andrew Struck noted that the FPP CAC wanted to be as encompassing as possible in making land eligible to be in an FPA, hence their recommendation to eliminate criteria D and G. He then indicated that the LESA score (criterion C) was probably the best criterion to go by along with the criteria required by State Statute (criteria A, B, E, and F). The use of criteria A, B, C, E, and F would be consistent with the County Comprehensive Plan and what committees in the comprehensive planning process recommended and adopted. Mr. Struck then asked what the LPB would like to recommend and if they would like a GIS demonstration similar to what the FPP CAC viewed.

**Motion by Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Rothstein and seconded by Frank Madden to approve the Farmland Preservation Area (FPA) Criteria as recommended by the Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC) including the entire criterion except D and G.**

Rick Kania noted that the LESA analysis criterion eliminates some farmland from being eligible for inclusion in an FPA. Andrew Struck indicated that the LESA analysis takes into account many factors that make a farmland parcel likely for long-term agricultural use. This fits with the intention of the FPAs, which are supposed to be used to preserve agricultural lands in the long-term. The LPB then discussed the planned land use map consistency criterion and the Town of Port Washington and Town of Saukville's ongoing conversations on whether or not to amend their planned land use maps to make land eligible for FPAs. Andrew Struck noted that staff knew that the local planned land use maps would be the primary issue, which is why staff has been meeting with local governments on this issue for over a year. Rick Kania noted that the FPA criteria are just for identifying FPAs, and other farmland preservation strategies will be discussed in other sections of the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP). Mr. Struck then noted that Federal funds and any State funds that may become available in the future would likely be focused in FPAs.

The LPB then discussed the topic of current State regulations on lands that would be in FPAs, and the concern that the rules may change in the future and become more restrictive. The LPB also discussed conservation easements, and the perception by some that farmers are not interested in purchase of conservation easements, while other perceive that farmers are interested in that type of program.

Marjie Tomter noted that the function of the Land Preservation Board is land preservation. A large component of the FPP is FPAs; however, the LPB can also help develop strategies for land preservation other than just the State incentives that go along with FPAs.

Vice-Chairperson Rothstein asked staff for their opinion on the FPA criteria, as recommended by the FPP CAC. Andrew Struck indicated that he thinks those criteria are good and that they would meet the State's criteria for establishing FPAs. He also noted that this may not accomplish all desires, particularly in areas in which the local government decides to opt out of the program by not amending their planned land use map. Farmland preservation can still be promoted in those areas through other methods.

Rick Kania noted that he thought the criterion on LESA should have a score of 5.9 as a cut-off instead of 6.4. He indicated that he thought this would be more inclusive. Mike Paulus noted that it is important to have a means of evaluating each property. Andrew Struck explained the process that went into the LESA analysis, including a full statistical analysis, changing the weight of the various criteria two times, and

involvement and approval by four different committees, including the LESA committee, which included significant farmer representation. All of those committees agreed that using the mean/median of 6.4 as a cut-off was appropriate. Nicole Sidoff distributed a copy of page 22 of the LESA report, which showed the distribution of the final LESA scores. Mr. Struck referenced the LESA map, which was on display at the meeting, and noted that most of the parcels that scored below 6.4 were wetlands or environmental corridors, highly parcelized, and/or located in close proximity to a sewer service area. The comprehensive planning process looked at balancing farmland preservation and development, and the LESA analysis took that into account. Mr. Struck noted that all the local governments commented on the LESA analysis during the comprehensive planning process and came to a consensus for accepting those recommendations as well.

Mike Paulus noted that it was important to have this cut-off number in case a flood of people were interested in receiving limited funding. It would help prioritize what lands should receive funding. He also added that the LESA analysis and this cut-off score were discussed and developed by a lot of people who had a lot of buy-in into the decisions that were made. Chairman Kaul noted that some of the parcels that fall below the cut-off may be eligible for other funding, such as natural resource funds. Frank Madden also noted that the decision-making process for LESA was well-vetted. Rick Kania also noted that the decision-making process was well-documented.

**The previous motion and second was subsequently withdrawn by the respective members.**

**Motion by Vice-Chairperson Jennifer Rothstein and seconded by Frank Madden to approve the Farmland Preservation Area (FPA) Criteria as recommended by the Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC) including all the criterion listed in the document except D and G and which includes using a LESA score of 6.4 or higher for Criterion C as recommended. All members present voting aye, motion carried unanimously.**

Chairman Kaul and Marjie Tomter both noted that this discussion was very helpful to them in understanding the criteria and the decision to use 6.4 as the cut-off score for the LESA criterion.

#### **12. UPDATE ON EXISTING ZONING MAPS FOR PARTICIPATING LOCAL COMMUNITIES**

Rick Kania indicated that the existing zoning maps for all the towns and the City of Mequon have been updated to 2010. Staff from each of those local governments will receive a hardcopy map and a digital copy of their respective map if requested. Andrew Struck noted that a few of the communities have approached the County to explore the possibility of the County maintaining their zoning maps in the long-term. The County has tentatively agreed to do this, and would likely only charge the municipalities for time and materials. Mr. Struck noted that the County's ability to maintain these zoning maps would be dependent on staff availability.

Frank Madden asked if the local comprehensive plans (e.g. planned land use map) now match up with the local zoning maps. Andrew Struck indicated that the zoning maps were just compiled from the local municipalities' current zoning and that some of them are inconsistent with the local comprehensive plan planned land uses, and local zoning amendments will need to take place in some of these local municipalities.

#### **13. UPDATE ON PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES FOR THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN**

Nicole Sidoff noted that the First Friday Forum on the Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP) will take place on April 13, 2012 at lunch time. Staff will likely be asking for participation in the panel from LPB and/or FPP CAC members.

#### **14. UPDATE ON THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Nicole Sidoff noted that the Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC) is continuing to meet monthly and attendance continues to be high. The FPP CAC minutes were included in

the packet and have been posted online. Vice-Chairperson Rothstein noted that the City of Mequon representative is not attending meetings. Andrew Struck noted that the Town of Cedarburg had indicated that it may not continue having representation at FPP CAC meetings after the Town decided it would not pursue an FPA; however, they have now agreed that it is important to continue participating, as the FPP is more than just the FPAs. Mr. Struck also noted that he has met with City of Mequon staff, even though they have not had a representative at FPP CAC meetings recently.

**15. UPDATE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT MEETINGS**

Andrew Struck noted that staff is continuing to meet with all the participating local governments, particularly in discussing and refining the FPAs.

**16. LAND PRESERVATION NEWS/EDUCATION & OUTREACH**

Nicole Sidoff noted that the Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) article in the packet highlighted all of the information shared at the AEA workshop that staff (Andrew Struck and Nicole Sidoff) attended. Andrew Struck indicated that it did not appear that the State would be dedicating any resources solely for AEAs; the resources would be available to any farmers or communities who were interested. Going through the State AEA application process would not likely yield additional resources that wouldn't be available otherwise.

**17. DISCUSSION ON REMAINING 2011 MEETING DATES - NEXT MEETING – THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2011**

Andrew Struck noted that the next meeting will be on Thursday, December 1, 2011.

**18. ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made by Mike Paulus and seconded by Frank Madden to adjourn the meeting. All members present voting aye, the motion carried unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 12:27 pm.

*Respectfully recorded and submitted by Nicole Sidoff and Andrew Struck.*