

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

KENOSHA COUNTY

Adelene Greene, Secretary Robert W. Pitts Michael J. Skalitzky

MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Marina Dimitrijevic William R. Drew, Vice Chairman John Rogers

OZAUKEE COUNTY

Thomas H. Buestrin David W. Opitz Gus W. Wirth, Jr.

RACINE COUNTY

Gilbert B. Bakke David Eberle Peggy L. Shumway

WALWORTH COUNTY

Charles L. Colman Nancy Russell, Treasurer Linda J. Seemeyer

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Daniel S. Schmidt Daniel W. Stoffel David L. Stroik, Chairman

WAUKESHA COUNTY

Michael A. Crowley Jose Delgado James T. Dwyer

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF

Kenneth R. Yunker, PE Executive Director
Stephen P. Adams Public Involvement and Outreach Manager
Nancy M. Anderson, AICP Chief Community Assistance Planner
Michael G. Hahn, PE, PH Chief Environmental Engineer
Christopher T. Hiebert, PE Chief Transportation Engineer
Elizabeth A. Larsen Business Manager
John G. McDougall Geographic Information Systems Manager
Dr. Donald M. Reed
Donald P. Simon, RLS Chief Planning Illustrator
William J. Stauber Chief Land Use Planner

OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CITIZEN APPOINTEES

Lee Schlenvogt, Chairperson Shawn Graff, Vice Chairperson Benjamin Arnold Dale Buser William Fleming Cathy Jones Young Kim Bryan Kligora Mary Korte Edward Miller Christine O'Neil Erin Ortiz Bob Roden Lynde Uihlein Pat Wilborn Mike Winker

OZAUKEE COUNTY LAND PRESERVATION BOARD

Jennifer Rothstein, Chairperson Franklin Madden, Vice Chairperson Barbara Jobs Donald Korinek James Melichar Mike Paulus Caroline Torinus Chris Ford, Alternate Marjie Tomter, Alternate

LOCAL GOVERNMENT APPOINTEES

John Blasczyk Mike Didier Ron Heinritz Lynda Huebner Barbara Jobs Francis Kleckner John Riordan, Alternate Eric Ryer Kathryn Smallish, Alternate Roy Wilhelm Steve Wilkinson Jac Zader

OZAUKEE COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD

Thomas Richart, Chairperson Cindy Bock, Vice Chairperson Barbara Jobs Irena Macek Glenn Stumpf Donald Korinek, Alternate

Special acknowledgement is due the following individuals who regularly served on the Land Preservation Board (LPB) or Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) during the course of the planning program: the late Timothy Kaul, former LPB Chairperson and CPB Vice Chairperson; Robert Walerstein, former LPB and CPB member; Paul Hayes and William Niehaus, former LPB members; and Alan Kletti, former CPB member. Special acknowledgement is also due to the staff, plan commissions, and governing bodies of the cities, villages, and towns in Ozaukee County for their participation and assistance during the planning process.

STAFF SUPPORT PROVIDED BY:

OZAUKEE COUNTY

PLANNING AND PARKS DEPARTMENT

Andrew Struck	Director
Tom Dueppen	Specialist
Lisa Haselow	Intern
Steven Kunst	
Laura Catherman	
Cvnthia DeGroot	Office Assistant IV
- ,	

LAND AND WATER MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Andy Holschbach	Director
leffrey Bell	Coordinator

ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

I nomas MeauxCounty Administrato	Thomas MeauxC	ounty	Administrator
----------------------------------	---------------	-------	---------------

UW-EXTENSION

Dan O'Neil	Agricultural Agent
Nicole Sidoff	Former Community Resource
	Development Educator

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Nancy Anderson	Chief Planner
Richard Kania	Principal Planner
Robbie Robinson	Planner
Joyce Gramz	Senior GIS Planning Specialist

Community Assistance Planning Report No. 87 (2nd Edition)

A FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035 OZAUKEE COUNTY, WISCONSIN

Prepared by the

Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission W239 N1812 Rockwood Drive P.O. Box 1607 Waukesha, Wisconsin 53187-1607 www.sewrpc.org

and the

Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department 121 W. Main Street P.O. Box 994 Port Washington, WI 53074 www.co.ozaukee.wi.org

The preparation of this plan was financed in part through a farmland preservation planning grant from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection.

December 2013

(This page intentionally left blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

REPORT SUMMARY	xi
Vision Statement	xi
Introduction	xi
Planning Committee and Process	xii
Inventory and Analysis	xii
Agricultural and	
Environmental Resources	xii
Demographic Information and	
Existing Plans and Ordinances	xii
LESA Analysis	xii
Existing Farms and	
Agricultural Products	xiii
Land Use-Related Information	xiii
Trends and Projections	xiii
Population, Household, and	
Employment Projections	xiii
Agricultural Products	xiv
Agricultural Innovations	xiv
Public Involvement	XV
Farmland Preservation Areas	XV
Recommendations	xvi
Implementation	xvi
Conclusion	xvii

Chapter I—INTRODUCTION AND

1
1
2
3
9
10
10
11
11

Designation of Agricultural	
Enterprise Areas	11
Identification of Issues, Goals,	
Policies, Strategies, and Actions	12
Public Participation Plan	12
Plan Review and Adoption	12
Consistency Between the	
Farmland Preservation Plan and	
Comprehensive Plans and Ordinances	13
Planning Committee and Process	13
Committee Structure and By-Laws	13
Planning Process	13
Plan Implementation	14
Report Format	14
Chapter II—INVENTORY	
AND ANALYSIS	15
Introduction	15
Part 1: Soils and Agricultural Resources	15
Soil Associations	15

Page

	15
art 1: Soils and Agricultural Resources	15
Soil Associations	15
Saturated Soils	17
Soil Suitability for Agricultural Production	17
Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site	
Assessment (LESA) Analysis	19
Soil Erosion Potential	
for Agricultural Lands	24
Farm Drainage Districts	24
Existing Farmland	26
Farm Production and Revenue	27
Sales Value by Agricultural Sector	27
Production Value for Certain Crops	29
Crops and Livestock	29
Corn	30
Forage	30
Soybeans	30
Small Grains	31
Livestock	31
Agricultural Products	
Produced by Farms	31
2	

iv

Farm Income and Labor	31
Number of Farms by	
Agricultural Product Sales Value	32
Number, Size, and Value of Farms	33
Farms Enrolled in State and	
Federal Preservation Programs	34
Agricultural Infrastructure	
and Support Services	35
Specialty Crops and Other	
Types of Agriculture	35
Part 2: Other Related Natural	
and Cultural Resources	39
Topography and Geology	39
Water Resources	40
Major Watersheds,	
Subwatersheds, and Subbasins	40
Surface Water Resources-	
Lakes, Rivers, and Streams	40
Wetlands	42
Floodplains and Shorelands	44
Groundwater Resources	45
Forest Resources	45
Woodlands	45
Managed Forest Lands	47
Natural Areas, Critical Species	
Habitats, and Geological Sites	47
Natural Areas	48
Critical Species Habitat and Aquatic Sites	48
Significant Geological Sites	48
Environmental Corridors and	
Isolated Natural Resource Areas	48
Park and Open Space Sites	60
Park and Open Space Sites	
Owned by Ozaukee County	62
Park and Open Space Sites	
Owned by the State of Wisconsin	62
Park and Open Space Sites	
Owned by the Federal Government	62
Park and Open Space Sites Owned by	
Local Governments, School Districts,	
or Other Public Districts	63
Private and Public Interest Resource-	
Oriented Park and Open Space Sites	63
Conservation Easements	63
Environmentally Sensitive Lands	
and Potential Natural Limitations	
to Building Site Development	68
Climate	68
Cultural Resources	68
Historic Sites	68

i are of Emissing and instoriour
Population, Household, and
Employment Characteristics
Population Trends
Age Distribution
Households
Employment
Farm Employment
Part 4: Existing Land Uses, Utilities,
and Community Facilities
Historical and Existing Land Uses
Historical Urban Growth
Urban Service Areas
Existing Land Uses
Urban Land Uses
Nonurban Land Uses
Transportation
Streets and Highways
Public Transportation
Other Transportation
Facilities and Services
Rail Freight Services
Ports and Harbors
Airports
Utilities
Sanitary Sewer Service
Private Onsite Wastewater Treatment
Water Supply
Stormwater Management Facilities
Electric Power Service
Natural Gas Service
Telecommunications Service
Solid Waste Management Facilities
Community Facilities and Services
Health Care Facilities
Government and Public
Institutional Centers
Police Services
Fire Protection Services
Emergency Medical Services
Dispatch Centers

National and State Registers

Cultural Venues, Events,

Part 3: Existing and Historical

of Historic Places

Local Landmarks.....

State Historical Markers.....

Additional Historic Sites

Archaeological Resources

Local Historical Societies and Museums......

and Organizations.....

71

71

71

71

71

75

75

75

75

77

79

79

80

80

80

81

81

84

84

86

86

86

86

87

87

87

88

88

88

88

89

89

89

91

91

91

92

92

92

92

92

92

93

Public and Private Schools	93
Part 5: Existing Plans	93
Farmland Preservation Plan	
for Ozaukee County	93
Land Use and Comprehensive Plans	96
Areawide Land Use Plan	96
Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional	
and Local Comprehensive Plans	96
Park and Open Space Plans	97
Ozaukee County Park	71
and Open Space Plan	97
City Village and Town	71
Park and Open Space Plans	100
Pagional Natural Areas Dlan	100
Comprehensive Conservation	100
Dian for the Leonald Watland	
Management District	100
Wincernein Statemide Communication	100
Out law Respective Diag	100
Outdoor Recreation Plan	100
Conservation and Greenway	101
Connection Plans	101
North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife	
and Farming Heritage Area Plan	101
Water Quality and Supply Plans	101
Water Quality Management Plan	101
Water Quality Management Plan Update	102
Regional Water Supply Plan	102
Ozaukee County Land and	
Water Resource Management Plan	102
Part 6: Existing Regulations	103
Zoning	103
County Shoreland and	
Floodplain Zoning Ordinances	103
Local Zoning Ordinances	105
Extraterritorial Zoning Regulations	105
Land Division Regulations	105
Extraterritorial Platting Authority	108
Official Mapping Ordinances	108
Nonmetallic Mining Reclamation	108
Erosion Control and	
Stormwater Management	109
Summary	110
Part 1: Soils and Agricultural Resources	110
Part 2: Other Related Natural	
and Cultural Resources	112
Part 3: Existing and Historical	
Population, Household, and	
Employment Characteristics	114
F	

Page

Part 4: Existing Land Uses, Utilities,	
and Community Facilities	114
Part 5: Existing Plans	115
Part 6: Existing Regulations	115
6 6	_
Chapter III—TRENDS	
AND PROJECTIONS	117
Introduction	117
Population, Household, and	
Employment Trends and Projections	117
Population and Households Projections	118
Employment Projections	120
Land Use Conditions and Trends	122
Existing Land Use Conditions	122
Land Supply and Demand	122
Land Price	125
Changes in Nature/Scope of Agriculture	125
General Agricultural	
Market Value Trends	126
Agricultural Sector Sales	126
Production	128
Processing	128
Supply and Demand	129
Distribution	129
Enterprises	130
Urban Agriculture	130
Agricultural Diversification	131
Organic Farming	131
Organic Dairy Farming	132
Aquaculture	132
Aquaponics/Hydroponics	133
Specialty Crops and Foods	133
Orchards	134
Horticulture	135
Agri-tourism	135
Value-Added Agriculture	136
Equine Industry	137
Others Types of Farming Industries	138
Apiculture (Bee-Keeping)	138
Maple Syrup Farms	139
Forest Products	139
Farms, Land Leases, and	
Renewable Energy	139
Wind Power and Cell Towers	139
Solar Power	140
Geothermal Energy	140
Anaerobic Digestion	141
Innovations in Agriculture	141
Biotechnology	141
Biofuels	142

Biodiesel Production	142
Ethanol Production	142
Supporting Agriculture	143
Promoting and Marketing	
Locally Grown Foods	143
Something Special from Wisconsin	144
Grocers Buy Local	144
Savor Wisconsin	144
Buy Fresh/Buy Local	145
Local Dirt	145
Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin Program	145
Community Supported Agriculture	145
Rare Earth Farm	146
Wellspring Farm	146
Willoway Farm	146
Farmers' Markets	146
Community Gardens	147
Farm to School Program	148
Farm to Restaurant Program	148
Culinary Incubators	148
Events	149
Marketing Farming and Products	149
Summary	150
Chapter IV—PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT	153
Introduction	153
Planning Website	153
Working Lands Initiative	
Information Meetings	153
Kick-Off Meetings	154
Public Opinion Survey	154
Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities,	
and Threats (SWOT) Analyses	155
FPPCAC, LPB, and CPB SWOT	
Analyses Results – Top Priorities	155
Strengths	155
Weaknesses	158
Opportunities	158
Threats	158
Focus Groups	159
Town of Dunn Tour	159
Public Events	160
Countywide Public Information	
Meetings and Public Hearing	160
Other Public Input	160
Summary	160
•	
Chapter V—FARMLAND	1.02
PRESERVATION AREAS	163
Introduction	163

Criteria Used to Identify	
Farmland Preservation Areas	163
Farmland Preservation Areas	166
Farmland Preservation Plan	168
Farmland Preservation Areas and	100
Other Agricultural and Rural Lands	175
Farmland Preservation Areas	175
Other Agricultural and Rural Lands	175
Urban Development	175
Environmentally Significant Areas	175
Primary Environmental Corridor	175
Socondary Environmental Corridor	176
Japlated Natural Descurses Areas	176
Other Concernance	170
J anda to be Dressmand	176
Lands to be Preserved	170
Nonfarmed Wetlands	1/6
Farmed Wetland (Overlay)	1//
Surface Water	1//
100-Year Floodplain (Overlay)	177
Project Boundaries	177
Summary	178
Chapter VI—VISION, ISSUES,	170
AND RECOMMENDATIONS	179
Introduction	179
Vision Statement	179
Basic Concept and Definitions	179
Key Land Use Issues Related	100
to Preserving Farmland	180
Land Use and Urban Development	181
Public Opinion Survey	181
SWOT Analyses	181
Focus Group Workshops	182
Agricultural-Related Recommendations	182
Overall Agricultural Resources	
Goals and Objectives	183
Soil Suitability for Agricultural	
Production Recommendations	183
Local Recommendations	184
Farmland Protection and	
LESA Analysis Recommendations	185
Local Recommendations	187
Protection of Farms and	
Farming Recommendations	188
Local Recommendations	190
Other Related Recommendations	190
Protection of Natural Resources	191
Invasive Species	192
Water Quality	193
Cultural Resources	195

Page

Page

211

212

213

214

214 214

214

215

215

216

220

221

221

221

222

222

222

223

223

224

224

Land Uses	196	Tax Credit Eligibility Requirements
Housing	197	Soil and Water
Transportation	197	Conservation Compliance
Utilities and Community Facilities	198	Agricultural Enterprise Areas
Economic Development	199	Farmland Preservation Agreements
Summary	200	Agreement Conversion Fees
		Conservation Easements
Chapter VII—IMPLEMENTATION	203	Purchase of Development
Introduction	203	Rights (PDR) and Purchase
Plan Review, Adoption, and Integration	203	of Agricultural Conservation
Plan Amendment Procedure	204	Easements (PACE)
Consistency Between the Farmland		Other Conservation Techniques
Preservation Plan and Comprehensive		Transfer of Development
Plans and Ordinances	205	Rights (TDR)
Plan Implementation Program Priorities	205	Conservation Subdivisions
High Priority Programs	206	Lot Averaging
Program Rankings		Density Bonus Incentive
(About top 30 percent)	206	Fee-Simple Purchase
Farmland Preservation Tools		Donations
Under the State Program	208	Right-To-Farm Ordinances
Farmland Preservation Zoning	208	Agricultural Nuisance Notices
Zoning Districts	209	Recommendations to
Farmland Preservation Zoning		Increase Housing Density
Ordinance Certification and		Funding and Support Programs
Updates/Recertification	210	Intergovernmental Cooperation
Rezoning	210	and Agreements
Conditional Use as an		Plan Updates
Alternative to Rezoning	210	Summary

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
А	Chapter 91, "Farmland Preservation," of the Wisconsin Statutes	227
В	Public Participation Plans for Amending the Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan and for the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan	239
С	Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee By-Laws	251
D	Local Government Zoning District Maps and Regulations	255
Е	Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resource Programs Available in Ozaukee County	277
F	Public Opinion Survey	289
G	Results of Focus Group Meetings on Farmland Preservation in Ozaukee County	335

Appendix

Table

Η	Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors Resolutions and Ordinance Adopting the Farmland Preservation Plan	343
Ι	Program Priority Results	351
J	The Conservation Subdivision Design Process	367

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Page

Chapter I

1	Comparison of Previous	and Existing Farmland	Preservation Planning	Requirements	4
	r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r r	0	0	1	

Chapter II

2	Agricultural Soil Capability in Ozaukee County	21
3	Soil Productivity Ratings for Cropland (Land Evaluation Ratings) in Ozaukee County	21
4	Ozaukee County LESA Scores: 2007.	24
5	Agricultural Land in Ozaukee County: 2000	27
6	Value of Sales by Commodity or Commodity Group in	
	Ozaukee County and Wisconsin: 2007	29
7	Value of Production for Selected Commodities in Ozaukee County,	
	Southeastern Wisconsin, and Wisconsin: 2010	30
8	Land in Agricultural Production in Ozaukee County and Wisconsin: 1990-2002	30
9	Agricultural Products Produced by Ozaukee County Farms: 2007	31
10	Farms in Ozaukee County and Wisconsin by	
	Value of Agricultural Product Sales: 1997-2007	32
11	Farm Size in Ozaukee County and Wisconsin: 1997-2007	33
12	Agricultural Trends in Ozaukee County: 1976 - 2009	34
13	Farms Enrolled in State and Federal Farmland	
	Preservation Programs in Ozaukee County	35
14	Agricultural Infrastructure and Support Services	
	Located in or Serving Ozaukee County: 2010	37
15	Examples of Specialty Farm Operations in Ozaukee County: 2010	38
16	Woodlands, Surface Waters, Floodplains, and Wetlands in Ozaukee County	42
17	Classification of Potential Water Recharge Areas in Ozaukee County: 2008	47
18	Natural Areas in Ozaukee County: 2009	50
19	Critical Species Habitat Sites in Ozaukee County: 2009	56
20	Critical Aquatic Habitat Areas in Ozaukee County: 1994	57
21	Significant Geologic Sites in Ozaukee County: 2009	59
22	Existing Environmental Corridors and Isolated	
	Natural Resource Areas in Ozaukee County: 2000	60
23	Existing County Owned Park and Open Space Sites: 2010	65
24	Existing State and Federal Park and Open Space Sites in Ozaukee County: 2010	65
25	Lands Under Conservation Easements in Ozaukee County: 2010	67
26	Century and Sesquicentennial Farms Honored within Ozaukee County: 1952-2010	72
27	Historic Resident Population Levels in Ozaukee County,	
	Southeastern Wisconsin, and Wisconsin: 1850-2010	76
28	Population Trends in Ozaukee County Communities: 1980-2010	77
29	Age Distribution of the Population of Ozaukee County	
	and Southeastern Wisconsin: 1980-2010	78

Table

30	Number of Households in Ozaukee County and Southeastern Wisconsin: 1970-2010	79
31	Number of Jobs in Ozaukee County and Southeastern Wisconsin: 1970-2010	79
32	Number of Jobs in Ozaukee County Communities: 2000	80
33	Farm Employment in Ozaukee County,	
	Southeastern Wisconsin Region, and Wisconsin: 1970 - 2009	81
34	Land Uses in Ozaukee County: 2007	84
35	Planned Land Uses in Ozaukee County: 2035	99
36	Scope of County and Local Subdivision Ordinances in Ozaukee County: 2010	107

Chapter III

37	Selected Population and Household Projections for Communities in Ozaukee County: 2035	118
38	Employment Projection by Sub-Area in Ozaukee County	
	Under the Regional Land Use Plan: 2035	121
39	Land Use Trends in Ozaukee County: 1980-2007	124
40	Equalized Value by Real Estate Class in Ozaukee County: 2000 and 2010	125
41	Market Value of Agricultural Products Sold in the	
	Southeastern Wisconsin Region and Wisconsin: 1997 to 2007	127
42	Value of Sales/Revenue of Agricultural Sector and All Business Sectors in	
	Ozaukee County, Southeastern Wisconsin, and Wisconsin: 1997 to 2007	127

Chapter V

43	Farmland Preservation Areas in Ozaukee County:	2035	166
44	Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County:	2035	172

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
	Chapter I	
1	Farmland Preservation and Tax Credit Mechanisms in Ozaukee County	2
	Chapter II	
2	Resident Population Levels in Ozaukee County: 1860-2010	76
	Chapter III	
3 4	Actual and Projected Population in Ozaukee County: 1950-2035 Actual and Projected Number of Jobs in Ozaukee County: 1970-2035	119 121
	Chapter IV	
5	Results of Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) Analyses for the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan	156
	Chapter VII	
6	Comparison of Conventional and Conservation Subdivision Designs	217

Figure

7	Conservation Subdivision Designs within Agricultural Areas	219
8	Example of Lot Averaging	220

LIST OF MAPS

Мар

Chapter II

1	General Soil Associations in Ozaukee County	16
2	Saturated Soils in Ozaukee County	18
3	Agricultural Soil Capability in Ozaukee County	20
4	Agricultural Land Evaluation Rating for Soils in Ozaukee County	22
5	Parcels Included in the LESA Analysis for Ozaukee County: 2007	23
6	LESA Scores for Agricultural Parcels in Ozaukee County: 2007	25
7	Generalized Existing Agricultural Lands in Ozaukee County: 2000	28
8	Enrolled Farmland Preservation Program Lands in Ozaukee County: 2005	36
9	Watershed Features in Ozaukee County	41
10	Surface Waters, Wetlands, Woodlands, Managed	
	Forest Lands, and Floodplains in Ozaukee County	43
11	Groundwater Recharge Potential in Ozaukee County: 2008	46
12	Natural Areas, Critical Species Habitat Sites, Aquatic Habitat Sites,	
	and Significant Geological Sites in Ozaukee County	49
13	Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas in Ozaukee County: 2000	61
14	Existing County, State, and Federal Park and Open Space Sites in Ozaukee County: 2010	64
15	Lands Under Conservation Easements in Ozaukee County: 2010	66
16	Environmentally Sensitive Lands in Ozaukee County	69
17	Potential Natural Limitations to Building Site Development in Ozaukee County	70
18	Historical Urban Growth in Ozaukee County: 1850-2000	82
19	Planned Sanitary Sewer Service Areas and	
	Existing Areas Served by Sewer in Ozaukee County	83
20	Generalized Land Uses in Ozaukee County: 2007	85
21	Areas Recommended to be Served by Public Water Utilities in Ozaukee County: 2035	90
22	Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County Adopted in 1983	94
23	Soil and Water Conservation Plans and Practices in Ozaukee County: 1965 - 1982	95
24	Adopted Year 2035 Ozaukee County Land Use Plan Map: May 2009	98
25	Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning in Unincorporated Areas in Ozaukee County: 2010	104
26	Generalized Existing Basic Zoning for Participating Communities in Ozaukee County: 2010	106

Chapter III

27	Change in Agricultural Lan	d Use in Ozaukee County:	1963-2000	123
	0 0	<i>.</i>		

Chapter V

28	Farmland Preservation Areas in Ozaukee County: 2035	167
29	Farmland Preservation Areas in the Town of Belgium: 2035	169
30	Farmland Preservation Areas in the Town of Fredonia: 2035	170
31	Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan: 2035	171
32	Farmland Preservation Plan for the Town of Belgium: 2035	173
33	Farmland Preservation Plan for the Town of Fredonia: 2035	174

Page

REPORT SUMMARY

VISION STATEMENT

"To preserve its economically viable agriculture and rural character, Ozaukee County will create a plan to support and implement policies and programs that balance sustainable rural land uses with urban land uses by preserving productive farmland and ensuring orderly development."

INTRODUCTION

In 2009, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted Wisconsin Act 28, which repealed and recreated the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program set forth in Chapter 91 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, and related tax credits under subchapter IX of Chapter 71 of the *Statutes*. The new program, which is also referred to as the "Working Lands Initiative," created new tools to help identify and preserve farmland. The law also requires counties to update their farmland preservation plans. The Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County adopted in 1983 was required to be updated and recertified by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) by the end of 2013, under an extension approved by DATCP, to enable the County and local governments within the County to continue participation in the State farmland preservation program. With assistance from the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), Ozaukee County in cooperation with UW-Extension and 10 cooperating local governments has prepared this updated farmland preservation Plan to meet the requirements set forth in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*. A Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee was formed to help guide the planning work and to encourage public participation throughout the process. This updated County farmland preservation plan updates and replaces the plan adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors in 1983.

The intent of the original farmland preservation program was to encourage farmland preservation by providing tax credits to eligible farmland owners who voluntarily chose to enter into an agreement with the State through farmland preservation agreements, or through the enactment of exclusive agricultural zoning by the local government in which the land is located. The new Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program provides landowners the opportunity to continue to claim farmland preservation tax credits through zoning or through agreements with DATCP for areas within Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs). The new State program also includes a process for establishing AEAs and created a Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) Program.

Agriculture is considered an important part of the County's economy and, due to changes in agricultural practices as well as the demand for new agricultural products and technologies, there is potential growth for agricultural industries and supporting businesses. In addition to its impact on the economy, farmland preservation is considered important to providing scenic beauty, preserving natural ecological systems, producing fresh locally-grown produce, and preserving the rural character and lifestyle in much of the County. The agriculture industry continues to be a vital element of Ozaukee County's economic, cultural, and ecological landscape. To retain these attributes, implementing a farmland preservation plan is essential, and provides a foundation and guide for many preservation methods and tools that can be utilized by County and local governments and nonprofit conservation organizations to protect farmlands.

PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PROCESS

In 2010, the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC) was established by the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) to guide the preparation of the updated Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. During this process, the FPPCAC also prepared a public participation plan, created a vision statement, reviewed draft plan chapters and other plan materials, and developed a recommended farmland preservation plan for consideration by the County Land Preservation Board (LPB) and CPB. All cities, villages, and towns within the County were invited to appoint a representative to serve on the FPPCAC. The Advisory Committee was comprised of representatives from each local government that elected to participate, and included one representative each from the City of Mequon and Villages of Newburg, Saukville, and Thiensville; one representative from each Town in the County; and 16 citizen members. Members of the Advisory Committee are listed on the inside front cover of this report. Throughout the planning process, the active participation and input of citizens, farmers, landowners, County and local government officials, and interest groups were essential for identifying important issues and preparing a farmland preservation plan with realistic goals.

INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

The inventory and analytical data presented in this report includes information about agricultural and natural resources, existing demographic and economic levels, past and present land use patterns, and adopted plans, programs, and regulations affecting farmland preservation. The data are essential for identifying farmlands suitable for preservation and for designing a plan to accomplish long-term preservation. The following provides some key information regarding the data in this report. The information is summarized more thoroughly in the Summary section at the end of Chapter II.

Agricultural and Environmental Resources

The inventory consists of soils and agricultural resources data, which identified and mapped soils suitable for agriculture and those that are vulnerable to erosion or contain wet soils, shallow bedrock, or other features that could limit development or farming. Natural and cultural resources data, which identifies wetlands, woodlands, environmental corridors, natural areas, water resources, floodplains, and National, State, and local landmarks in the County are identified. Preservation of these resources helps achieve strong and stable physical and economic development as well as maintaining community identity.

Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas include the best remaining concentrations of woodlands, wetlands, plant and wildlife habitat areas, and other natural resources and have truly immeasurable environmental and recreational value. In 2000, about 32 square miles, comprising about 14 percent of the County, were encompassed within primary environmental corridors. Secondary environmental corridors encompassed about eight square miles, or about 3 percent of the County, and isolated natural resource areas encompassed about six square miles, or about 2 percent of the County.

Demographic Information and Existing Plans and Ordinances

Existing and historical population, household, and employment data are included to provide a context for projections that anticipate changes in these factors in the foreseeable future. Existing plans and ordinances that affect farmland preservation were inventoried, including land use and comprehensive plans, park and open space plans, water quality and supply plans, and zoning and land division ordinances.

LESA Analysis

An analysis using the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system for rating potential farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County was conducted in 2007 as part of the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning process. Land evaluation (LE) ratings are determined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) based on soil type, slope, agricultural capability class, and soil productivity for producing corn and soybeans. The site assessment (SA) component of the LESA rating system is based on geographic variables, which were determined specifically for Ozaukee County by the LESA Technical Advisory Workgroup.

A total of 3,620 parcels encompassing 71,210 acres in agricultural use were analyzed. Parcels received a score ranging from 1 to 10, with 10 identified as the best land for long-term agricultural use and 1 being the least suitable. The average score for the parcels analyzed was 6.3, and the median score was 6.4 (half of all parcels received a higher score and half received a lower score than 6.4). A total of 54,674 acres, or 77 percent of agricultural lands in the County, scored 6.4 or higher, and the remaining 16,536 acres, or 23 percent of the area analyzed, received a score below 6.4.

Existing Farms and Agricultural Products

In 2007, there were 513 farms in Ozaukee County, and the average farm size was 138 acres, while the median farm size was 56 acres. This compares to 194 acres and 95 acres, respectively, for farm sizes in the State. Of the 513 farms in Ozaukee County in 2007, 448 farms, or about 87 percent, were between 10 acres and 499 acres in size; 35 farms, or about 7 percent, were less than 10 acres in size; and 30 farms, or about 6 percent, were 500 acres or greater in size. Dairy farming was the predominant source of agricultural revenue in the County in 2007, accounting for about 56 percent of total agricultural sales revenue. Grain crops and horticulture were the second and third predominant sources of agricultural revenue, respectively, each accounting for about 14 percent of agricultural revenue.

Land Use-Related Information

Information about existing land uses, utilities, and community facilities, including the historic conversion of rural lands to urban use, is also provided in Chapter II. In 2007, urban land uses encompassed about 62 square miles, or about 26 percent of the County. Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in the County, about 34 square miles, or about 15 percent of the total area in the County. Nonurban land uses, such as agricultural lands, natural resource areas, landfills, nonmetallic mining sites, and other open lands encompassed about 175 square miles, or about 74 percent of the County in 2007. Agricultural land was the predominant land use in the County in 2007 as it encompassed about 122 square miles, or about 51 percent of the total County. Agricultural uses include croplands, pasture lands, orchards, nurseries, and farm buildings, including farm residences on agricultural parcels of 20 acres or more. Residential buildings on parcels less than 20 acres were included in the residential category. Natural resource areas consisting of surface water, wetlands, and woodlands combined to encompass about 41 square miles, or about 17 percent of the total County.

The amount of land in agricultural use in the County declined by about 22,950 acres, or about 22 percent, between 1963 and 2000. This represents an average annual loss of about 620 acres of agricultural lands over this period. Most of the loss occurred within and near urban (sanitary sewer) service areas.

TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

Section 91.10(1)(b) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires County farmland preservation plans to identify, describe, and document trends, plans, or needs related to population and economic growth, housing, transportation, utilities, communications, business development, community facilities and services, energy, waste management, municipal expansion, and environmental preservation, which may affect existing and future farmland preservation. The farmland preservation plan identifies the quantity and spatial distribution of agricultural land that should be maintained in agricultural use, areas of environmental significance which should be maintained in essentially natural open uses, and areas which are anticipated to be converted to urban use. Information regarding existing and anticipated future population, household, and employment levels in Ozaukee County is also required to help determine the amount and location of areas that may be required for conversion to urban development. The following provides information regarding the trends and projections of this report. Trends and projections information is summarized more thoroughly in the Summary section at the end of Chapter III.

Population, Household, and Employment Projections

Local governments in Ozaukee County developed population and household projections for 2035 as part of their local comprehensive plans. These projections were used to plan for land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and other community facilities in each local comprehensive plan through the planning design year of 2035. The

population projection for Ozaukee County (not including the Villages of Bayside and Newburg which lie largely in Milwaukee and Washington Counties, respectively) would increase from 86,209 persons in 2010 to about 116,186 persons in 2035, or an increase of about 35 percent. The number of households in the County would increase from 34,148 households in 2010 to 46,260 households in 2035, or an increase of about 36 percent. In 2010, there were about 53,700 jobs located in the County and a total of 62,135 jobs are projected in the County in 2035, an increase of about 16 percent. Agricultural employment is expected to decrease by 19 percent, from 5,900 jobs in 2000 to about 4,800 jobs in 2035, in the seven-county Region due to continued technological advances in genetics and mechanization, cost pressures from National and global competition, modern management practices, and continued conversion of farmland to urban uses.

Agricultural Products

In Ozaukee County, 513 farms sold \$59,056,000 of agricultural products in 2007, which is about 84 percent more than the 1997 level of about \$32,047,000. The average market value of agricultural products sold per farm in Ozaukee County was \$115,120 in 2007, which was an increase of about 53 percent from the 1997 level of about \$75,052. Dairy farming continues to be the predominant agricultural industry in Ozaukee County as dairy sales totaled about \$33.2 million in the County, and increased about 73 percent from 2002 to 2007. Dairy sales comprised about 56 percent of total agricultural sales in the County in 2007, a 6 percent increase since 2002.

Agricultural Innovations

Although traditional farming practices are the predominant agricultural business, agricultural innovations are providing farmers with primary or supplementary agricultural opportunities and income. Examples include alternative goods and products, where farmers produce non-traditional crops or raise specialty livestock; direct marketing, including roadside stands, Farmers' Markets, participation in Community Supported Agriculture (CSAs), or allowing consumers to independently pick the product (U-pick); public events, such as farm breakfasts or festivals on a farm; hospitality and tourism, such as operating a Bed and Breakfast or offering tours of the farm while providing opportunities for consumers to purchase products; and educational activities, where farmers selling carbon offsets by installing methane capture systems over animal waste lagoons and wind power generators and cell towers, where farmers lease land for wind or cell towers.

Agricultural diversification is the re-allocation of a farm's productive resources, such as land and capital, to new activities and is an important mechanism for sustainability and economic growth. Some methods of diversification farmers may consider include organic farming or dairying, aquaculture, aquaponics, hydroponics, specialty crop and food production, orchards, horticulture, agri-tourism, value-added agriculture, or renewable energy sources. Agricultural diversification may provide stability and profitably to farming businesses and industries in Ozaukee County.

Because of technological improvements in agricultural production and food processing systems, farmers continue to produce higher-valued products, as well as gain a better perspective on changing consumer preferences. Developments in science and technology have contributed to better soil, nutrient, water, and pest management, and more efficient methods of harvesting, storing, processing, and transporting farm products to the market. As a result of these recent agricultural innovations, producers have been able to increase crop yields and increase flexibility and control. Biotechnology and biofuels, such as biodiesel and ethanol production, may create demand for additional agricultural products.

The State of Wisconsin, in cooperation with county and local governments, institutions, businesses, and organizations, has been developing and promoting an increasing number of programs that support farmland preservation and local agriculture. These programs include the implementation of various marketing strategies intended to promote locally produced agricultural products through marketing and tourism. Some examples of programs or methods that promote local agriculture while acknowledging the need to preserve local farmlands include promoting and marketing locally grown foods, the Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin Program, Community Supported Agriculture (CSA), farmers' markets, community gardens, and farm to school and restaurant programs.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

For any planning process, it is good practice to provide opportunities for the public to become acquainted with the planning process and to solicit public involvement in the development of plan recommendations. To ensure community involvement, a public participation plan (PPP) was adopted by the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board specifically for the preparation of this plan. The PPP outlined a series of outreach efforts and public participation sessions designed to gain input from County farmers as well as residents and business owners throughout the farmland preservation planning process. In addition to input by an Ozaukee County citizen advisory committee and review boards, public participation efforts included County farmland preservation kick-off and local information meetings; a countywide public opinion mail-out survey; three Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis workshops; and two agriculture focus group sessions. The comments and suggestions obtained were used to help guide the preparation of a vision statement and the goals, objectives, and plan recommendations contained in this plan.

An overall general consensus obtained from these public input methods is the desire to preserve farmlands and other related natural and cultural resources as well as the County's rural character.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

Ozaukee County encompasses significant amounts of farmland and environmentally sensitive areas as well as expanding urban areas. In recent decades, there has been a substantial conversion of farmlands and other open lands to urban uses. Future population and employment increases are expected, which may result in converting additional land in the County from rural to urban uses. This plan is focused on attaining orderly development in Ozaukee County, and minimizing, insofar as practicable, the loss of productive farmland and other important components of the natural resource base.

In accordance with Section 91.10(1)(d) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, a county farmland preservation plan must clearly identify areas that the county plans to preserve for agricultural and agricultural-related uses. Criteria for identifying farmland preservation areas (FPAs) were developed as part of the planning process. In accordance with the *Statutes*, FPAs include undeveloped natural resource and open space lands, but do not include areas planned for nonagricultural development. Parcels met the following criteria to be included in a FPA:

- Parcels must be located entirely within the City of Mequon or a Town in Ozaukee County, and the local government must agree with the County to designate FPAs within the City or Town;
- Parcels must be located entirely outside a planned sanitary sewer service area adopted by a community and approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources;
- Parcels must have a LESA score of 6.4 or higher;
- Parcels must be located entirely within certain planned (non-urban) land use categories based on the adopted Ozaukee County comprehensive plan; and
- Parcels must be located entirely within specific identified (non-urban) zoning districts based on each participating local government zoning ordinance.

FPAs are shown on Map 28 in Chapter V and occupy about 29,109 acres, or about 19 percent of Ozaukee County. The FPAs include entire parcels, which include portions of lowland and upland conservancy lands, which are shown as overlays on Map 28. FPAs have been identified in the Towns of Belgium and Fredonia. Uses allowed within farmland preservation areas, which are set forth in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*, include crop production; keeping livestock; beekeeping; nursery, sod, and Christmas tree production; floriculture; fur farming; forest management; agricultural equipment dealerships; storage and processing facilities for agricultural products; and land enrolled in a Federal or State agricultural land conservation or agricultural commodity payment program. Additional uses specified in Section 91.46 of the *Statutes* may be permitted by conditional use permit if included in a local government farmland preservation zoning district.

The farmland preservation plan for Ozaukee County is shown on Map 31 in Chapter V. The plan map depicts portions of parcels in FPAs that are outside lowland and upland conservancy areas (generally, lands in agricultural use), which occupy 25,383 acres, or about 17 percent of the County. For the remaining areas on the plan, other agricultural and rural lands occupy 29,517 acres, or about 20 percent of the County; existing natural resource areas (conservancy areas) occupy 34,910 acres, or about 23 percent of the County; and existing and planned urban uses occupy 60,784 acres, or about 40 percent of the County.

The farmland preservation plan is designed to help achieve the objectives identified in this report based, in part, on public input and adopted local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances and maps. The plan provides information for County and local officials to use over time when making decisions about land development and preservation in Ozaukee County.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning is a rational process for formulating and meeting goals and objectives. A set of planning goals and objectives, along with supporting policies and programs, were formulated as part of this farmland preservation plan. A "vision" statement, located at the beginning of this summary, was also developed by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Committee, and Comprehensive Planning Board to help provide an overall framework for farmland preservation in Ozaukee County.

Planning goals and objectives were developed to refine the vision for farmland preservation. The goals and objectives provide the framework for preserving farmlands and other related natural resources in Ozaukee County. Each set of goals and objectives also include a set of recommended policies and programs to facilitate and help attain the goals and objectives. These goals and objectives were based, in part, upon inventory data, public input results, and past and current planning efforts. Other interrelated goals, objectives, policies, and programs that affect farmland preservation were also established and pertain to natural resources, invasive species, water quality, cultural resources, land uses, housing, transportation, utilities and community facilities, and economic development.

IMPLEMENTATION

The farmland preservation plan recommendations are not complete until the steps required to implement the plan have been specified. This includes a description of the plan adoption and amendment processes in compliance with the *Wisconsin Statutes*; the integration of the plan as an amendment to and component of the Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan; the consistency requirement between the farmland preservation plan and County comprehensive plan; the identification of priority programs relative to farmland preservation; and identifying farmland preservation tools and techniques that Ozaukee County farmers and the County and local governments can use to protect farmlands and other valuable natural resource areas. Farmland preservation tools and techniques described in Chapter VII include farmland preservation area certification and zoning, conservation easements, conservation subdivision design, lot averaging, and incentive-based development. The designation of farmland preservation tax credits under local farmland preservation zoning, to request designation of an Agricultural Enterprise Area, or to participate in the Purchase of Agricultural Easements (PACE) program.

The plan also recognizes the importance of continuing intergovernmental cooperation, which would provide effective communication and coordination between units of government with the goal of establishing consistent development policies for urbanized areas and the preservation of farmlands. Implementation of the plan also includes identifying and utilizing funding and support programs for farmland preservation. All require continuing intergovernmental cooperation and commitment by County and local governments to implement the plan. Cooperation is especially important with regard to implementation of this plan, because Chapter 91 of the *Statutes* assigned the responsibility for identifying farmland preservation areas to the County; but the authority to adopt and map farmland preservation zoning districts is under the authority of the participating City and Towns.

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of the County farmland preservation plan is to provide information and recommendations that the general public and County and local officials can use when making decisions about future development and the preservation of agricultural lands and environmentally significant areas in Ozaukee County. The plan provides farmers and other private interests, such as supporting businesses that provide supplies and services to the farmers, a clear indication of the County's agricultural planning objectives. This enables farmers, developers, and the public to understand the objectives when development and redevelopment proposals are prepared or reviewed. It also provides the basis for the enactment of farmland preservation zoning in participating local governments, and makes owners of parcels within designated farmland preservation areas eligible to receive tax credits available under the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program if other statutory requirements are met. (This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

INTRODUCTION

The loss of productive farms and agricultural resources are of increasing public concern. The agriculture industry is a vital part of Ozaukee County's economic, cultural, and ecological landscape. It continues to provide important economic, social, and ecological functions by providing food and other agricultural products, controlling floodwater, recharging groundwater supplies, sustaining wildlife habitat, and providing scenic beauty.

In 2009, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted Wisconsin Act 28, which repealed and recreated the Wisconsin farmland preservation law under Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes and related tax credits under subchapter IX of Chapter 71 of the Statutes. This new law, known as the "Working Lands Initiative," also created other new programs described later in this Chapter. Importantly, the law requires counties to update their farmland preservation plans. The Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County adopted in 1983¹ was required to be updated and recertified by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) by the end of 2013, under an extension approved by DATCP, to enable the County and local governments within the County to continue participation in the State farmland preservation program. Ozaukee County requested and was awarded a State farmland preservation planning grant to provide reimbursement for up to half of the County's cost of preparing the plan. Ozaukee County requested that the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) assist the County in preparing an updated farmland preservation plan, in cooperation with UW-Extension and 10 participating local governments, to meet the requirements set forth in Chapter 91 of the Statutes. A copy of Chapter 91, as published in the November 16, 2013 issue of the Wisconsin Statutes, is provided in Appendix A. To further help guide this planning process, a Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee was created. This report documents the planning effort and presents the resulting updated County farmland preservation plan, which replaces the plan adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors in 1983.

The main intent of the original program was to encourage farmland preservation by providing tax credits to eligible farmland owners who voluntarily chose to enter into an agreement with the State through farmland preservation agreements or through exclusive agricultural zoning. The new Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative provides landowners the opportunity to continue to claim farmland preservation tax credits through participation in its program as illustrated in Figure 1. The new tax credit program provides income tax credits that are applied

¹Documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 87, A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, May 1983.

Figure 1



FARMLAND PRESERVATION AND TAX CREDIT MECHANISMS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

Source: Ozaukee County, DATCP, and SEWRPC.

against tax liability and are available annually, and are no longer income-based. The Working Lands Initiative program expands and modernizes the existing farmland preservation program, allows the establishment of Agricultural Enterprise Areas, and creates a Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easement (PACE) Program, as shown on Figure 1.

History and Overview of Farmland Preservation Planning in Ozaukee County

The initial Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program was enacted in 1977 to provide income tax credits to eligible farmland owners. The program was administered by County and local governments, but the Wisconsin Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB) had to first certify that the county farmland preservation plan met the standards specified in Chapter 91 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. Of the 72 counties in Wisconsin, 70 have certified farmland preservation plans. The Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors and certified in 1983.

To be eligible to enroll in the former State program, farmland preservation areas had to be designated in the county farmland preservation plan. Farmland preservation areas identified in the 1983 plan are shown on Map 22 in Chapter II. At that time, qualified farm units had to contain a minimum of 35 contiguous acres and produce a minimum of \$6,000 in gross farm receipts in the previous year or \$18,000 in the previous three years. The 1983 plan further identified "prime" agricultural land as being part of a relatively homogeneous concentration of similar farms or blocks of farmland having a minimum combined area of at least 100 acres in size, with at least 50 percent of each individual farm covered by soils meeting USDA-Soil Conservation Service (now called the

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service) criteria for national prime farmland or farmland of statewide importance. Generally, national prime farmlands are Class I or II soils and farmlands of Statewide significance are Class III soils. Map 3 in Chapter II shows the farmland capability classification of soils in the County. Farmland owners could participate in the program one of two ways: through exclusive agricultural zoning or through individual farmland preservation agreements with DATCP. Participation through exclusive agricultural zoning could only occur if the local jurisdiction having zoning authority (city, village, or town units of government in Ozaukee County) had a zoning ordinance certified by the LWCB as meeting the standards of Chapter 91 in effect prior to the 2009 amendment. The only uses permitted in exclusive agricultural zoning districts at that time were agricultural uses and uses consistent with or related to agricultural uses, which were specified in the *Statutes*.

The continued preservation of Wisconsin's working lands (farmlands and forest lands) is important to sustain the State and its residents by producing food, fiber, and sources for bio-fuel. Over the years, the acreage of Wisconsin's working lands continued to decrease and be fragmented by encroaching urban development. In response to those concerns, the Working Lands Initiative (WLI) was launched by DATCP in 2005 and a steering committee was established to improve the program and develop a consensus vision on managing Wisconsin's farm and forest lands. In August 2006, the WLI Steering Committee issued a report with a set of recommendations intended to modernize and expand policies and programs affecting Wisconsin farmlands and forests. The report recommended an update to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, which would include setting a flat per-acre tax credit for landowners instead of basing the credit on household income: requiring all land in the program to be zoned for exclusive agricultural use; and streamlining the process of applying for the program and claiming the tax credits. Proposed changes to the Farmland Preservation Program were included in DATCP's 2007-09 budget request. The Committee's report recommended establishing a number of new programs, including an Agricultural Enterprise Areas program under Subchapter VI of Chapter 91 of the Statutes and a purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) program under Section 93.73 of the Statutes. Changes to the old Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program were approved by the Wisconsin Legislature as part of the 2009-2011 budget bill. The 2011-2013 biennial budget amended the program to delete the provisions that required a conversion fee to be paid by property owners rezoning existing farmland preservation areas out of farmland preservation zoning districts in communities that have a State certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance. Table 1 identifies the differences between the requirements in the original Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program and the new Working Land Initiative Program under the amended Chapter 91.

Overview of Comprehensive Planning

In 1999 the Wisconsin Legislature enacted a comprehensive planning law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, requiring County and local governments that enforce general zoning, shoreland and floodplain zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances to have an adopted comprehensive plan. The new requirements supplement earlier provisions in the *Statutes* for the preparation of county development plans (Section 59.69 (3) of the *Statutes*) and local master plans (Section 62.23 of the *Statutes*). The new law further includes a "consistency" requirement, whereby zoning, subdivision, and official mapping ordinance actions of counties, cities, villages, and towns must be consistent with the comprehensive plan adopted by the county board, common council, village board, or town board, respectively, beginning on January 1, 2010. To address the State comprehensive planning requirements, a multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning process was undertaken by Ozaukee County, 14 participating local governments, UW-Extension, and SEWRPC. As a result of the multi-jurisdictional process, comprehensive plans that satisfy the planning requirements set forth in Section 66.1001 of the *Statutes* were developed for the County and each of the 14 local government partners. The Ozaukee County 2035, on April 2, 2008. An amendment to incorporate land use plan maps adopted by cities, towns, and villages in the County was adopted by the County Board on May 6, 2009.

Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* requires that, if a county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The county may incorporate information contained in other parts of the

Table 1

COMPARISON OF PREVIOUS AND EXISTING FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

Category	Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)	Working Lands Initiative (January 15, 2011)
Farmland Preservation Planning		
Plan Certification Process	 Required certification by the Land and Water Conservation Board (LWCB). DATCP staff review all submissions and make recommendations for certification, denial or certification with conditions. Minor plan amendments are subject to 	 Required certification by Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). DATCP staff have discretion to review plans or to accept self- certification by county. Certification with conditions is avoided, except where county board has not yet
	same review requirements as complete plans. - There is no deadline for turnaround of plan review.	 Staff have discretion to avoid certification review of minor plan amendments. There is a 90-day turnaround time for plan review.
Certification Expiration Date	 No expiration date on original plans. Those submitted since 1995, and approved, were granted 10-year certification terms. 	- May be certified for up to 10 years.
Public Process	 Public hearing under s. 59.69 required prior to plan adoption. Copies of the plan or plan amendment must be submitted, at least 60 days prior to the public hearing, to all cities, villages and towns within the county, to the Regional Planning Commission, and to all adjoining counties. 	 Requires county to follow s. 66.1001(4) (comprehensive planning process) for plan adoption. This includes sending copies of the plan or amendment to all cities, villages and towns within the county, to the Regional Planning Commission, and to all adjoining counties.
Focus of Plans	- Preservation of agricultural land.	 Preservation of agricultural land, and economic development of agriculture (ag).
Consistency Requirements	 Ag Preservation Plan must be consistent with and a component of county development plan under s. 59.69. 	 Farmland Preservation (FP) Plan must be included in and consistent with county comprehensive plan under s. 66.1001.
Inclusion of Town Ag Preservation Plans	- Chapter 91 recognizes only county ag preservation plans. However, the county ag preservation plan must include municipal ag preservation plans if these comply with requirements under s. 91.55 and s. 91.57, <i>Statutes</i> (2007)	 Chapter 91 recognizes only county ag preservation plans.
Preservation Areas	 Establish minimum size of 100 acres for each contiguous agricultural preservation area, and 35 acres for each contiguous ag transition area in plan. 	 No minimum size for farmland preservation areas. No transition areas allowed.
	 Areas must be devoted to agricultural use, though natural resource and open space areas are allowed. 	 Areas must be devoted to either primarily ag use, primarily ag-related uses, or both, though natural resource and open space areas are allowed.
Rationale For Exclusion Areas	- Under s. 91.05, <i>Statutes</i> (2007), reasons for excluding areas previously mapped for Farmland Preservation (FP) must be provided, and meet one of four criteria.	- All that is required is a general statement identifying differences from the previous plan; no specific rationale for removal of ag preservation lands in previous plan is required.
Planning Assistance	 No grant funding available for plan development. 	 Planning grants available to reimburse counties for up to 50 percent of eligible costs to develop plan, not to exceed \$30,000 in State funding.

Category	Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)	Working Lands Initiative (January 15, 2011)		
Farmland Preservation Zoning				
Ordinance Certification Process	 Required certification by the LWCB. DATC staff review all submissions and make recommendations for certification, denial or certification with conditions. Minor ordinance text and map amendments may be subject to same review requirements as comprehensive ordinance revisions. There is no deadline for turnaround of ordinance review. 	 Required certification by DATCP. DATCP staff will review for certification in cases where there is: 1) a comprehensive revision; 2) ordinance coverage is being extended to a new local government; or, 3) there are provisions that materially affect compliance with s. 91.38, <i>Statutes</i>. Certification is not required for routine rezones (s. 91.48 (1)), and DATCP may accept self-certification by county for minor ordinance text and routine map amendments submitted (rezones). Certification with conditions is avoided, except where county board has not yet adopted zoning ordinance at time of review. There is a 90-day turnaround time for zoning ordinance review. 		
Certification Expiration Date	 No expiration date on original ordinances. Those submitted and approved since 1995 were granted 10-year certification terms. 	- May be certified for up to 10 years.		
Uses Allowed In FP Zoning Districts	 Listed permitted and conditional uses; uses "consistent with ag use" as defined in s. 91.01, <i>Statutes</i> (2007). Ag-related uses are required to be conditional uses. Ancillary uses are required to be "consistent with ag use" or conditional uses. 	 Listed permitted and conditional uses. Ancillary uses are permitted uses. Ag-related uses are permitted uses. 		
Residential Uses	 Farm residences can be permitted or conditional uses. Non-farm residences are limited to prior nonconforming uses. Other residences, which can be classified as permitted or conditional uses, must be found "consistent with ag use" as defined in s. 91.10, <i>Statutes</i> (2007), and occupied by the owner, or current or former family members of the farm owner or operator. 	 Farm residences, including single-family or duplex structures, occupied by owner, farm family members or migrant labor camp under s. 103.92 are permitted uses. Non-farm residences up to four in number, that don't exceed a 1:20 density ratio to farm acreage on the base farm parcel, and meeting requirements of s. 91.46 (2) for consistency with ag use are permitted uses as part of a non-farm cluster conditional use. Individual non-farm residences must be a conditional use (see s. 91.44(1)). 		
Minimum Lot Sizes	- Local government must adopt a minimum lot size for parcels in exclusive ag districts; this lot size is at their discretion. Lot size may be more restrictive than the minimum 35 acres required in order to collect the tax credit.	- There are no minimum lot sizes required by the <i>Statutes</i> in farmland preservation districts, but local governments may establish one. The density ratio for non- farm residences may be more restrictive than the 1:20 ratio to farm acreage in s. 91.46 (2)(a).		
Requirements for Rezoning Land Out of Certified Ag Zoning Districts	- Lands rezoned from an exclusive ag zoning district must be suitable for development with adequate public facilities, and not have an adverse impact on soil erosion or water pollution.	- Lands rezoned from FP zoning district must not impair or limit ag use on surrounding parcels, must be consistent with certified FP plan and adopted county comprehensive plan, must be better suited for non-farm use, and must not be able to be accommodated as a conditional use.		

Category	Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)	Working Lands Initiative (January 15, 2011)		
Farmland Preservation Zoning (continued)	Farmland Preservation Zoning (continued)			
Notification of Rezones to the State	 Local government is required to notify DATCP of each rezoning out of Exclusive Agricultural Zoning (EAZ); in practice this was left to discretion of local governments and not audited. 	 Local government must submit at least once every two years information on land rezoned out of FP zoning districts. 		
Notification of Conditional Use Adoption	 Local government is required to notify DATCP of conditional use permits granted within EAZ districts; in practice this was not enforced. 	 There are no requirements for reporting to DATCP. 		
Farm Family Businesses	 Non-farm businesses allowed as a conditional use, if limited to existing farm residences or structures, portions of existing farmstead not dedicated to ag use, and utilizing no more than two non- family employees. 	 Non-farm businesses allowed as a permitted use if limited to existing farm residences or structures that are an integral part of an ag use, that does not impair or limit current or future ag use on the farm, or on other parcels under FP zoning or agreements, and that utilizes no more than four full-time employees annually. 		
Farm Consolidations	- Where two or more farm operations are consolidated, residences separated from a larger farm parcel as a result of the consolidation can be permitted as conditional uses, not subject to lien under rezoning.	- Not addressed.		
Classes of Conditional Uses	- Limited to ag-related, religious, utility, institutional and government uses consistent with ag use, and necessary after considering alternative locations available for such uses; nonmetallic mineral extraction if subject to locally approved reclamation plan; farm family businesses, or to ag uses, ancillary uses or residences qualifying under s. 91.75 (2), <i>Statutes</i> (2007) at discretion of local government.	- Limited to uses specified under s. 91.46. This includes government, institutional, religious and non-profit community uses, nonmetallic mineral extraction, licensed oil and gas exploration, qualifying non-farm residences and residential clusters, transportation, communications, pipeline, electric transmission, utility and drainage uses, as well as ag, accessory and ag- related uses at discretion of local government. Subject to requirements of livestock siting law, s. 93.90.		
Consistency with Farmland Preservation Plan	- Exclusive Ag zoning ordinance must be consistent with the certified Ag Preservation plan. All land zoned for exclusive ag must be in designated ag preservation or transition area of the plan.	 Farmland Preservation zoning ordinance must be "substantially consistent" with the certified farmland preservation plan. All land zoned for farmland preservation must be in a designated farmland preservation area of the plan. 		
Consistency with Ag Use Provision	- All non-ag uses, conditional or otherwise, as well as structures or improvements must be "consistent with ag use" as defined in s. 91.01, <i>Statutes</i> (2007), i.e. the activity will not convert land devoted primarily to ag use, limit potential ag use on surrounding land, conflict with ag operations on land subject to an agreement, or conflict with ag operations on other properties.	- Similar content to the previous statutory provision on "consistency with ag use" is provided for conditional uses, but not in general. Conditional uses must be consistent with the purpose of the FP zoning district, be sited reasonably and appropriately after considering alternative locations, be designed to minimize conversion from or damage to land in ag use, and not substantially impair or limit current or future ag use of surrounding parcels under FP zoning or agreements.		

Category	Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)	Working Lands Initiative (January 15, 2011)	
Tax Credits			
Eligibility	 Farmland owned must be 35 acres or more of contiguous land devoted "primarily to ag use", and provide at least \$6,000 of gross Farm profits (or \$18,000 over last 3 years), or be enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program. 	 There is no minimum acreage required to collect the tax credit. Farmland must be in common ownership and devoted "primarily to ag use", and provide at least \$6,000 of gross farm profits (or \$18,000 over last three years), or be enrolled in a farm commodity or conservation program. 	
Tax Credit Calculation	- Complicated formula to compute tax credit based on landowner's household income and excessive property taxes accrued. The schedule of credit amount increases with property taxes accrued, and decrease with household income up to a maximum of \$4,200 a year. (s. 71.60, <i>Statutes</i> (2007)).	 Flat rate, not based on income or property taxes paid; based only on the qualifying acreage of land in parcel devoted primarily to ag use multiplied by fixed rate per acre. No maximum tax credit. (s. 71.613 (2)). 	
Different Levels of Tax Credit	 Landowners collect 100 percent of computed credit if their land is under a certified exclusive ag zoning ordinance and ag preservation plan. 	- Landowners can collect \$5.00 per acre credit if their land is under an individual agreement, and after July 1, 2009, within a certified Ag Enterprise Area (AEA).	
	 Landowners can collect 80 percent of computed credit if they are under an individual agreement. 	 Landowners can collect \$7.50 per acre if their land is within a certified Farmland Preservation (FP) Zoning District. 	
	 Landowners can collect 70 percent of computed credit if they are under EAZ but not under a certified ag preservation plan. Those under an agreement of EAZ are 	 Landowners can collect \$10.00 per acre if their land is both under an individual agreement within an AEA and within a FP zoning district. In all cases, to collect, they 	
	guaranteed a minimum credit of 10 percent on property taxes up to \$6,000.	must be on land designated for farmland preservation under a certified FP plan.	
Agreements			
Land Eligibility	 Eligible land must be either an ag preservation area or transition area of the certified county ag preservation plan map; or under a certified EAZ ordinance even if the county lacks a certified ag preservation plan. Land is not eligible in counties with 	 Requires location within an agricultural enterprise area certified by DATCP, and within a farmland preservation area of a certified county ag preservation plan. Application for AEA certification requires landowners of five eligible farms, and the local government's participation. 	
	square mile unless the county has a certified EAZ ordinance.	 Land which is expected to develop within 15 years (i.e. formerly transition areas) is not eligible. 	
Criteria for Review of Application	- County reviews agreement application based on criteria in s. 91.13 (4) including productivity of ag land, predominance of ag use, consistency with certified ag plan, in addition to eligibility of land, and other discretionary county criteria consistent with Ch. 91.	- County reviews agreement application based only on eligibility of land, specifically: 1) is land in FP area of certified FP plan map; and 2) is land within a certified Ag Enterprise Area. There is no county discretion in review criteria.	
Relinquishment	- Owner may apply to the LWCB for an agreement relinquishment; a lien against the property assessed for the total amount of all credits received by all owners of such lands during the last 10 years plus compounding interest.	- Requires payment of a per acre conversion fee equal to three times the per acre value of the highest class of tillable ag land present in the municipality.	
Conditions for Relinquishment	 Requires approval of local government based on "consistency with ag use" and approval of LWCB. 	 Requires approval by DATCP based on condition that it "will not impair or limit ag use" of other farmland under FP zoning or under agreement. 	
Agreement Length	 Not less than 10 years nor more than 25 years. 	- At least 15 years.	
Transition Area Agreement	- Allowed.	- Not allowed.	

Category	Farmland Preservation Program (Prior to July 1, 2009)	Working Lands Initiative (January 15, 2011)
Monitoring And Reporting		
Soil and Water Standard Compliance Inspections	- Inspections required every six years.	- Inspections required every four years.
Soils and Water Standards	- Requires county to develop standards and get approval from the LWCB based on ATCP 50.04 and 50.16, and s. 92.104 and s. 92.105, <i>Statutes</i> (2007)	 Relies on State standards identified in Chapter 281 and Chapter 92. (See s. 92.05 (3) (c) and (k); s. 92.14 (8); and s. 281.16(3) (b) and (c), Statutes)
PACE Easements	- Not applicable.	 State and county or local co-holder of easement will enforce the easement.
Rezoning Reports	 Requires notification of rezoning, no timeframe. Self-reporting, no DATCP oversight. 	 Requires a report on the number of acres rezoned, a map of the location of the rezoned acres, and the total amount of conversion fees collected.
Definitions		
Agricultural Use	- Beekeeping; commercial feedlots; dairying; egg production; floriculture; fish or fur farming; forest and game management; grazing; livestock raising; orchards; plant greenhouses and nurseries; poultry raising; raising of grain, grass, mint and seed crops; raising of fruits, nuts and berries; sod farming; placing land in Federal programs in return for payments in kind; owning land, at least 35 acres of which is enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program; participating in milk production termination program; vegetable raising.	- Crop or forage production; keeping livestock; beekeeping; nursery, sod or Christmas tree production; floriculture; aquaculture; fur farming; forest management; enrolling land in a Federal agricultural commodity payment program, or Federal or state ag land conservation payment program.
Consistency with Ag Use	- Defined in s. 91.10, <i>Statutes</i> , (2007).	 Similar content incorporated for conditional uses into s. 91.46(2)(c), s. 91.46 (4), s. 91.46 (5) and s. 91.46 (6).
Land Devoted "Primarily to Ag Use"	- Must have been in ag use for at least 12 months of the preceding 36 months.	- Not defined.
Development	- "Development" means change to any use other than agricultural use (s. 91.01 (4), <i>Statutes</i> (2007)).	- Agricultural development is distinguished from non-agricultural development, with the former consistent with ag preservation; some ag-related uses are allowed as a permitted use in FP zoning districts, and allowed within farmland preservation areas of the FP plan.

Source: Ozaukee County, DATCP, and SEWRPC.

comprehensive plan into the farmland preservation plan by reference. This updated Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County, therefore, was prepared as part of, and as an amendment to, the adopted multi-jurisdictional County comprehensive plan.

The County comprehensive plan provides long-range goals, objectives, policies, and programs for Ozaukee County officials and residents to help guide future development and preserve significant natural resources, including productive farmlands, in Ozaukee County to the plan design year 2035. Important agricultural and related natural resource data is also provided in the comprehensive plan document. Farmland preservation was one of many issues identified during the comprehensive planning process and was considered a high priority in a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis and public opinion survey conducted as part of that process. Valuable agricultural information can be found throughout the County's comprehensive plan, including an inventory of agricultural resources in which tables and maps found in the comprehensive plan report are cross-referenced, or updated and included in this report.

PURPOSE OF PROTECTING FARMLAND

A vibrant agricultural presence in the rapidly urbanizing Ozaukee County is important for economic health, quality of life, and business diversification. The preservation of agricultural lands can serve many purposes, including conserving energy, reducing urban sprawl, maintaining open space and rural character, retaining natural ecological systems, controlling public costs, preserving the local economic base, promoting sustainability or self-sufficiency, preserving the rural lifestyle and/or farm living, and preserving productive agricultural lands.

Farming is an important part of the Ozaukee County economy. In 2007, about \$5.3 billion of sales and revenue were generated within Ozaukee County. The agricultural industry supported the local economy by contributing approximately \$59 million towards this total. Farming operations serve as a foundation supporting a variety of other businesses, such as implement dealers, feed mills, granaries, crop consultants, veterinarians, retail stores, restaurants, and food processing plants. This is a symbiotic relationship, however, where the farm operations need the support businesses and vice versa. If farms are economically affected, support businesses will also be impacted. Thus, by promoting, supporting, and preserving agriculture and associated agricultural industries as a viable economic sector, communities also protect their local agricultural economic base.

Ozaukee County has experienced significant growth. The population of the County increased about 59 percent, from 54,461 residents in 1970 to 86,395 in 2010. This growth, combined with trends toward larger areas of land used per household, a decreasing number of persons per household, and a desire to live near open space, has created development pressures on the rural landscape of the County.

Farmers need land with good soils to farm just as manufacturers need raw materials. Without basic resources, neither can survive. Productive agricultural soils require less energy to farm than other soils, and when maintained near primary markets such as urban centers, energy is conserved and transportation costs are reduced. Energy savings are due mainly to the natural characteristics of the soil, good moisture content, depth and texture, biochemical composition, good drainage, adequate sunlight, and proper wind protection. Because of these natural qualities, less energy is expended on soil and water conservation practices, fertilizer and pesticide applications, the development and application of irrigation and drainage systems, and the operation of farm equipment. By preserving highly productive, self-sufficient soils in agricultural use, including near urban centers, energy is conserved that would otherwise be spent in transportation and on the more energy-intensive practices required to farm inferior soils.

The historic urban growth map, Map 18 in Chapter II, identifies areas of urban development expanding into rural portions of the County, away from municipal sewer and water services. This type of development frequently creates land use conflicts for the agricultural industry and can be costly to provide with community services. Communities that promote compact urban development discourage such growth into rural areas. The costs of supporting diffused low-density urban development are high in terms of dollars and loss of nonrenewable natural resources and surface and groundwater recharge areas made possible by open lands. Impervious roofs, roads, and parking lots do not allow rainwater to seep into the soil, but direct it off-premises. By saving farmsteads, more compact and efficient forms of urban development can be attained.

Preserving farmland and open space provides locally grown food for markets, replenishes groundwater supplies, provides wildlife habitat, and preserves the County's rural heritage and scenic vistas. Farmland preservation helps maintain open space that can give desirable form and structure to urban and rural development and can significantly contribute to the overall environmental quality and scenic beauty of an area. In this context, farmland preservation may be considered as part of an overall program to protect resources by maintaining natural systems and natural processes, sometimes referred to as natural ecological systems, since farmland oftentimes contains natural features. These objectives are met by preserving wetlands, woodlands, floodplains, surface and groundwater resources including recharge areas, and aquatic and wildlife habitat areas, in addition to the preservation of productive agricultural soils. The preservation of these features and farmstead characteristics such as barns, silos, and stone walls contribute to the visual natural and agrarian countryside character of an area. By preserving existing farms and farmland, communities are able to maintain their rural lifestyle and the unique agrarian cultural heritage associated with farm living.

The public service costs of farmsteads are low in comparison to scattered low-density urban development. In general, the tax returns to the community from farms are greater than the public service and facility outlays that farms require. Unplanned development or the conversion of productive land can weaken a community's tax base and impact its character. Scattered low-density urban development is less efficient and public costs to provide public services and facilities generally exceed tax revenues. By controlling the timing, rate, and/or location of such development through a farmland preservation program, communities maintain the stability of their tax base and control public costs.

By protecting productive farmland, current and future farmers have some form of stability. They will be more likely to invest in their operations. In addition, tools such as purchase of development rights (PDRs) or purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE) programs may make productive farmland affordable for the next generation of farmers. In addition, many County residents will continue to enjoy the unique agricultural heritage of Ozaukee County. By establishing a farmland preservation program and promoting compact development, Ozaukee County can support a significant part of its economy, agriculture and its related businesses. Such a program will help farmers withstand some of the development pressures they face due to urban encroachment into rural areas.

In promoting compact urban development through preservation of local agricultural areas, communities also contribute to preserving agricultural resources. Without a farmland preservation program many farmers would likely be forced to turn to other more marginal lands for agricultural production. Additionally the State and Nation would lack the reserves of good productive agricultural lands that may be required to meet or help sustain national and international needs in times of disasters as well as in times of changing market conditions such as, for example, meeting increasing demands for food and bio-fuel.

STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS

The specific planning requirements for obtaining State certification of a county farmland preservation plan are identified in Chapter 91, Subchapter II of the *Statutes*, and are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Plan Certification Expiration and Recertification Process

In accordance with Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*, certifications of all existing county farmland preservation plans are scheduled to expire by December 31, 2015. Seventy of the 72 counties in the State had an existing county farmland preservation plan when the revised Chapter 91 was enacted in 2009. The *Statute* established a staggered time frame for plan expirations based on population growth per square mile from 2000 to 2007. Based on these criteria, Ozaukee County's earlier plan would have expired on December 31, 2011, without an extension approved by DATCP. The County requested and received an extension from DATCP to December 31, 2013 for this update of the farmland preservation plan.

Once a farmland preservation plan is developed or updated, the county must apply to DATCP for plan certification or recertification. By completing the "County Application for Farmland Preservation Plan Certification,"² a county self-certifies to DATCP that the plan meets the applicable requirements for certification identified in State law. Based on a county's self-certification, DATCP can certify the plan if all certification requirements are met. DATCP must make a certification decision within 90 days if the application submitted is complete. There is no requirement to seek certification from a State level board such as the Land and Water Conservation Board, and a farmland preservation plan may be certified for a period of up to 10 years.

Self-certification of the plan requires the county corporation counsel and county planning director or county chief elected official to review the farmland preservation plan and certify that it meets State law. DATCP has the authority to conduct additional review of the plan to ensure that the plan meets the requirements of Chapter 91. If a county plan is denied certification, the county can re-submit a revised application that addresses the issues cited by DATCP in denying the earlier certification request.

²Available at <u>http://datcp.wi.gov</u>/Environment/Working_Lands_Initiative/

Inventory and Trends

Section 91.10(c) of the *Statutes* requires farmland preservation plans to identify, describe, and document the following agricultural resources and trends:

- 1. Agricultural uses of land in the county at the time the farmland preservation plan is adopted, including key agricultural specialties, if any.
- 2. Key agricultural resources, including available land, soil, and water resources.
- 3. Key infrastructure for agriculture, including key processing, storage, transportation, and supply facilities.
- 4. Significant trends in the county related to agricultural land use, agricultural production, enterprises related to agriculture, and the conversion of agricultural lands to other uses.
- 5. Anticipated changes in the nature, scope, location, and focus of agricultural production, processing, supply, and distribution.

The plan must also identify, describe, and document development trends, plans or needs that may affect farmland preservation and agricultural development in the county, including:

- Population and Economic Growth
- Housing
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Communications
- Business Development

• Energy

Community Facilities and Services

- Waste Management
- Municipal Expansion
- Environmental Preservation

Designation of Farmland Preservation Areas

A key component of development of a county farmland preservation plan is the identification of "farmland preservation areas." The *Statutes* define a farmland preservation area as an area that is planned primarily for agricultural use or agriculture-related use, or both, which is identified as an agricultural or farmland preservation area in a state-certified farmland preservation plan. Essentially, a farmland preservation area (FPA) is an area where the county plans to preserve agriculture and agricultural-related uses. The plan may also include undeveloped natural resource areas, such as wetlands and woodlands, and open space areas, but not areas planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years from the adoption date of the farmland preservation plan. The rationale used to determine which areas to designate as farmland preservation areas must also be described in the plan. The mapping of FPAs has direct implications for development of farmland preservation zoning district be located within a FPA. Similarly, agricultural enterprise areas and PACE easements must be located in an area identified as a FPA in order to receive grant funds from DATCP.

Designation of Agricultural Enterprise Areas

As described in Subchapter VI of Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*, DATCP may designate agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs) targeted for agricultural preservation and agricultural development, up to a combined area of not more than 1,000,000 acres Statewide. Designation of an AEA allows owners of eligible land to enter into a Farmland Preservation Agreement with DATCP to receive farmland preservation tax credits. An AEA must meet the following criteria:

- 1. DATCP must receive a petition, which complies with Section 91.86 of the *Statutes*, requesting an AEA designation.
- 2. Parcels within an AEA must be contiguous. Parcels that are only separated by a lake, stream, or transportation or utility right-of-way are considered contiguous.

- 3. The area must be located entirely in a farmland preservation area identified in a certified County farmland preservation plan.
- 4. The area must be primarily in agricultural use.

DATCP will give preference to areas that include at least 1,000 acres of land when designating AEAs.

Identification of Issues, Goals, Policies, Strategies, and Actions

A farmland preservation plan must state the county's policy related to farmland preservation, agricultural development, and the development of enterprises related to agriculture. In addition, the plan must identify, describe, and document the following:

- Key land issues related to preserving farmland and promoting agricultural development, and plans for addressing these issues.
- Goals for agricultural development in the county, including goals related to the development of enterprises related to agriculture.
- Actions that the county will take to preserve farmland and actions that the county will take to promote agricultural development.
- Programs and other actions that the county and local governmental units within the county may use to preserve designated farmland preservation areas.
- Policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions to increase housing density in certain areas planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years from the date on which the plan is adopted.

Public Participation Plan

In accordance with Section 91.10(3) of the *Statutes*, the adoption of a farmland preservation plan must follow the same procedures specified in Section 66.1001(4) of the *Statutes* for the adoption of a comprehensive plan, which includes the adoption of written procedures to ensure public participation in the development of a plan. The public participation plan must be designed to foster public participation, including open discussion, communication programs, information services, and public meetings for which advance notice has been provided, in every stage of the preparation of a plan. An amendment to the public participation plan (PPP) for the Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors in December 2011, and is included in Appendix B. The amendment to the PPP addresses public participation procedures for amendments to the comprehensive plan, and authorizes the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) to approve additional public participation procedures or separately-documented public participation plans to obtain public input for comprehensive plan amendments.

The Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC) and Land Preservation Board (LPB) recommended that the CPB approve a separate public participation plan (PPP) for the farmland preservation plan. On October 18, 2011, the CPB approved public participation procedures for the development of this updated Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County which meets the requirements of Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the *Statutes*. The Farmland Preservation Plan PPP is also included in Appendix B. The Farmland Preservation Plan PPP describes the methods the County will use to distribute the farmland preservation plan, or amendments thereto, and the opportunity for written comments on the plan to be submitted by the public to the County, as well as for the County to respond to such comments. The PPP also includes a description of public meetings, a public opinion survey, and other methods used to solicit public input during the planning process, which are summarized in Chapter IV.

Plan Review and Adoption

Section 91.10(3) of the *Statutes* requires that the County adopt the farmland preservation plan by following the same procedures under Section 66.1001(4) of the *Statutes* for the adoption of a comprehensive plan or amendments thereto. The farmland preservation plan or plan amendments, therefore, must be adopted by an

ordinance enacted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors. The comprehensive planning law also requires that at least one public hearing be held prior to adopting the plan. Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* further requires that the county farmland preservation plan be included in its comprehensive plan and that the county ensure the two plans are consistent with each other. The farmland preservation plan was, therefore, integrated into the multijurisdictional County comprehensive plan through a plan amendment process. Section 66.1001 requires that an adopted comprehensive plan, or an amendment to such a plan, be sent to all governmental units within and adjacent to the county or local government preparing or amending the plan; the Wisconsin Department of Administration; the regional planning commission (SEWRPC); and the public library that serves the area in which the county or local government is located. Information regarding the plan review and adoption process is provided in Chapter VII.

Consistency Between the Farmland Preservation Plan and Comprehensive Plans and Ordinances

As indicated above, Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* requires counties to ensure that their farmland preservation plan is consistent with the county comprehensive plan if the county has such a plan. To comply with this consistency requirement of the farmland preservation planning law, Ozaukee County will make the changes needed, if any, to ensure the multi-jurisdictional County comprehensive plan, as well as county shoreland and floodplain zoning regulations, are consistent with the County farmland preservation plan following its adoption. Each community participating in the State's farmland preservation program should also amend, if necessary, its comprehensive plan, as well as zoning, subdivision, and official mapping ordinances, to ensure that their comprehensive plan and implementation tools are consistent with the farmland preservation plan. Additional information regarding consistency between the farmland preservation plan and comprehensive plans and implementing ordinances is provided in Chapter VII.

PLANNING COMMITTEE AND PROCESS

This updated farmland preservation plan was prepared under the guidance of the FPPCAC, and included preparation of a public participation plan, creation of a vision statement, review of draft plan chapters and other plan materials, and development of a recommended farmland preservation plan for consideration by the LPB and CPB. The CPB reviewed the recommendations of the FPPCAC and LPB and recommended a farmland preservation plan for adoption by ordinance of the County Board.

Committee Structure and By-Laws

During 2010, Ozaukee County staff attended Plan Commission, Town and Village Board, and Common Council meetings in all communities in Ozaukee County to present an overview of the Working Lands Initiative and the County's intent to prepare an updated Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. The Ozaukee County FPPCAC was established by the CPB, based on a recommendation from the LPB, at the end of 2010. All cities, villages, and towns within the County were invited to appoint a representative to serve on the FPPCAC. All six towns in the County and three of the eight cities and villages located entirely within the County appointed representatives to the FPPCAC. The Village of Newburg, which straddles the Ozaukee-Washington County line, also appointed a representative to the FPPCAC. The FPPCAC also included 16 citizen members. The FPPCAC approved by-laws, included in Appendix C, to establish committee rules-of-order. A list of committee members is provided on the inside front cover of this report.

Planning Process

The farmland preservation plan presented in this report was developed through a process consisting of the following steps, along with ongoing public input during the process: 1) start up tasks, 2) inventory and analysis, 3) identification of trends and projections, 4) delineation of farmland preservation areas, 5) visioning, issue identification, and recommendations, 6) preparation of implementation measures, and 7) plan review, refinement, and adoption. Another key step in the farmland preservation planning process will be the implementation of the plan by Ozaukee County and by local governments participating in the State farmland preservation program. Throughout the planning process, the active participation and input of citizens, farmers, landowners, County and local government officials, and interest groups was essential for identifying important issues and preparing a farmland preservation plan with realistic goals.

Plan Implementation

While planning provides many important public benefits, it is important to recognize that an adopted plan is not an "end result," but rather provides recommendations for future action. Plan recommendations will be fulfilled over time in generally small, incremental steps. A farmland preservation plan provides a foundation and guide for implementing many preservation tools, which may include community zoning ordinances and maps, subdivision ordinances, and other County and local ordinances, programs, and policies.

Suggestions for local government consideration are included in this document. Local governments will have an influence over farmland preservation along with County government, especially with regard to preserving agricultural lands through local comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances, and land division ordinances. Participating communities should review and refine farmland preservation goals, objectives, policies, and programs for potential inclusion in their local comprehensive plan. Alternatively, local governments may choose not to consider suggestions that are inconsistent with their local comprehensive plan or which are not relevant to their community's needs.

Although a community may be participating in the farmland preservation planning process, some communities may decide not to designate areas for farmland preservation at this time. Nevertheless, it is still important that good inventory and analysis data be provided herein, as well as farmland preservation goals and objectives, since the community may change its policies in the future and wish to designate certain parts of the community as farmland preservation areas. At that time, the County farmland preservation plan, as well as the community's comprehensive plan, could be amended accordingly to include the designated farmland preservation areas. Or communities may desire to support and/or save some agricultural lands or activities in a different manner by, for example, locating a farmer's market in their urban center, city, or village; promoting connection or direct marketing of surrounding local farm produce to schools or restaurants in their urban setting; or implementing conservation subdivisions or small hobby farms under an agricultural zoning classification that is less restrictive than the farmland preservation zoning requirements set forth in Chapter 91 (which would not allow owners of farmland in the less restrictive zoning district to collect farmland tax credits based on zoning).

REPORT FORMAT

The findings and recommendations of the farmland preservation planning effort are set forth in this report. The document consists of a report summary and seven chapters. Following this introductory chapter, Chapter II presents existing and historical data, including descriptions and analyses of agricultural and natural resources, including important natural resources that should be preserved; existing demographic and economic characteristics; historical and existing land use patterns, including urban development; and adopted plans and regulatory devices in the County relevant to farmland preservation. Chapter III describes agricultural trends and probable future population, household, and employment levels in Ozaukee County to the year 2035. Chapter IV describes results of a public opinion survey and public input meetings, as well as additional public input during the planning process. Recommended farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County are set forth in Chapter V. Chapter VI includes a vision statement, issue identification, and recommended farmland preservation goals and supporting objectives, policies, and programs pertaining to preserving agricultural areas as well as those related to other natural resources and land uses that may affect farmland preservation. The last chapter, Chapter VII, discusses programs and actions to facilitate the implementation of plan recommendations.

This report was adopted as a component of and an amendment to the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035. The *Statutes* require the farmland preservation plan to be consistent with the County's comprehensive plan. To avoid the repetition of some information, such as extensive inventory data, and to conveniently include the farmland preservation plan as a part of the comprehensive plan, portions of the farmland preservation plan or parts thereof. The cross-references identify where the relevant information can be found within the comprehensive plan report.³

³*The Ozaukee County comprehensive plan is documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No.* 285, A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035, *April 2008, Amended May 2009.*

Chapter II

INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

This Chapter provides data about agricultural and natural resources, existing demographic and economic levels, past and present land use patterns, and adopted plans, programs, and regulations affecting farmland preservation. Such data are essential for identifying farmlands best suited for preservation and for designing a plan to accomplish long-term preservation. The planning recommendations set forth in Chapters V and VI are directly related to the information presented in this Chapter.

PART 1: SOILS AND AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Conservation Service, now the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), issued a soil survey for Ozaukee County in 1970. Soils were identified and mapped and organized by soil association, soil series, and soil type. The soil survey results, including the attributes of each soil type, are now available on the NRCS website as part of the Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database. The soil survey plays an important role in land use decisions. This information can be used in managing farms and to help identify areas of the County that are suitable for agriculture, vulnerable to erosion, or contain wet soils, shallow bedrock, or other features that could limit development or farming.

Soil Associations

A soil association is a landscape that has a distinctive pattern of soils. It normally consists of one or more major soils and at least one minor soil, and is named for the major soils. Map 1 shows soil associations in Ozaukee County. Planning decisions should be based on the more detailed soils information, including soil mapping units and interpretations for various land uses, contained in the soil survey. The following paragraphs describe the five soil associations in Ozaukee County:

- The Kewaunee-Manawa association contains well-drained to somewhat poorly drained soils that have a subsoil of clay to silty clay loam formed in thin loess and silty clay loam glacial till on uplands. Most of this association is cultivated. Erosion control and drainage of low, wet areas are the main concerns in managing these soils. This is the largest soil association within the County, encompassing about 46 percent of the County, mostly in the eastern half of the County.
- The Ozaukee-Mequon association contains well-drained to somewhat poorly drained soils that have a subsoil of silty clay loam and silty clay formed in thin loess and silty clay loam glacial till on uplands. Most of this association is cultivated with erosion control and drainage of low wet areas being the chief management concerns. This association encompasses about 10 percent of the County and is located mostly in the southwestern portion of the County.

Map 1



GENERAL SOIL ASSOCIATIONS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY
- The Hochheim-Sisson-Casco association contains well-drained soils that have a subsoil of loam to clay loam underlain mainly by loamy till, outwash, and lake-laid deposits on uplands, terraces, and in lakebeds. Most areas suitable for cultivation have been cleared and are cultivated. This association also contains more woodlands than other associations found in the County. This is located mostly in the western half of the County and is the second largest soil association, encompassing about 34 percent of the County.
- The Houghton-Adrian association contains very poorly drained organic soils in basins and depressions. Most areas of this association are wooded and provide habitat for wildlife. Crops grow well on areas that are adequately drained and are protected from soil blowing. Throughout most of the year the water table is high and the soils are highly compressible under heavy loads. Use of the soils for residential and industrial development and for highways is severely limited. This association encompasses about 3 percent of the County and is located in limited areas throughout the County.
- The Casco-Fabius association contains well drained and somewhat poorly drained soils that have a subsoil of clay loam and sandy clay loam; shallow over gravel and sand and on stream terraces. Most of the soils in this association are cultivated. The soils are easy to cultivate and erosion is generally not a serious hazard. These soils are a good source of sand and gravel. This association encompasses about 7 percent of the County and is located mostly in limited central areas of the County.

Saturated Soils

Soils that are saturated with water or that have a water table at or near the surface, also known as hydric soils, pose significant limitations for most types of development. High water tables often cause wet basements and poorly-functioning septic tank absorption fields. The excess wetness may also restrict the growth of landscaping plants and trees or prevent the use of land for crops, unless the land is artificially drained. Map 2 depicts hydric soils in Ozaukee County, as identified by the NRCS. About 30 percent of the County, or about 44,698 acres, is covered by hydric soils, not including surface water areas. Although hydric soils are generally unsuitable for development, they may serve as important locations for restoration of wetlands, as wildlife habitat, and for stormwater detention. There are additional non-hydric soils in the County, especially in the southern and eastern portions of the County, with hydric inclusions (the NRCS allows for up to 25 percent hydric inclusions in non-hydric soils).

Soil Suitability for Agricultural Production

The NRCS has classified the agricultural capability of soils based on their general suitability for most kinds of farming. These groupings are based on the limitations of the soils, the risk of damage when used, and the way in which the soils respond to treatment. Generally, lands with Class I and II soils are considered "National Prime Farmlands." About 65 percent of the County is covered by prime farmland soils. Lands with Class III soils are considered "Farmlands of Statewide Significance," which cover about 22 percent of the County. Class I soils have few limitations, the widest range of use, and the least risk of damage when used. Class II soils have some limitations that reduce the choice of plants that can be grown, or require moderate conservation practices to reduce the risk of damage when used. Class III soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices, or both, and Class IV soils have very severe limitations. The soils in the other classes have progressively greater natural limitations. Class V, VI, and VII soils are considered suitable for pasture but not for crops, and Class VIII soils are so rough, shallow, or otherwise limited that they do not produce economically worthwhile yields of crops, forage, or wood products.

The location and amount of Class I, II, and III soils, as set forth in Map 3 and Table 2, were an important consideration when identifying farmland preservation areas in the County farmland preservation plan adopted in 1983 and town land use and master plans adopted in the 1980's and 1990's. Areas recommended in those plans to be preserved for agricultural use were typically parcels of 35 acres or more covered by at least 50 percent Class I, II, or III soils and located in blocks of existing farmland at least 100 acres in size.

SATURATED SOILS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY



Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Analysis¹

Following preparation of the County farmland preservation plan adopted in 1983, the NRCS developed an alternative method for identifying areas to be preserved as farmland. This method is known as the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system. LESA is a numeric system for rating potential farmland preservation areas by evaluating soil quality (LE or land evaluation) and geographic variables (SA or site assessment).

An analysis using the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) system for rating potential farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County was conducted in 2007 as part of the County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning process. The analysis was based on the land evaluation (LE) ratings developed by the NRCS and the site assessment (SA) factors developed by the LESA Technical Advisory Workgroup and reviewed and approved by the Agricultural and Natural Resources (ANR) Workgroup, the Comprehensive Planning Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) during the comprehensive planning process.

Land evaluation ratings are determined by the NRCS based on soil type, slope, agricultural capability class, and soil productivity for producing corn and soybeans. The best soils for crop production are assigned a value of 100 and all other soils are assigned lower values based on how they compare to the highest-rated soils. The NRCS provided land evaluation (LE) values for soils in Ozaukee County based on LE values for all soil types in Wisconsin. Soil LE values were "normalized" for Ozaukee County, meaning that each soil was rated in a relative value to other soils in Ozaukee County, rather than to soils in the State. Map 4 depicts the LE ratings for soils in Ozaukee County, grouped by various ranges. Acres within each range in each participating local government and the County are listed in Table 3.

The site assessment component of the LESA rating system is based on geographic variables, which were determined specifically for Ozaukee County by the LESA Technical Advisory Workgroup. The 11 SA factors include:

• SA-1 factors (agricultural productivity)

- SA-1A. Size of parcel in agricultural use
- SA-1B. Size of contiguous agricultural land block
- SA-1C. Compatibility of adjacent land uses
- SA-1D. Compatibility of land uses within 0.5 mile
- SA-1E. Population density within 0.5 mile

• SA-2 factors (development pressures impacting continued agricultural use of a parcel)

- SA-2A. Distance from planned sanitary sewer service areas
- SA-2B. Distance from IH 43 interchanges

• SA-3 factors (other public values of a parcel)

- SA-3A. Primary or secondary environmental corridor, isolated natural resource area, natural area, or critical species habitat present on parcel
- SA-3B. Wetlands less than five acres or floodplains present on parcel
- SA-3C. Proximity to permanently protected land greater than 20 acres in size
- SA-3D. Parcel has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places, designated as a local historic landmark, or is adjacent to a rustic road

¹A detailed description of the LESA analysis, including maps of each site assessment factor, is provided in SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 170, Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Analysis of Farmlands in Ozaukee County: 2007, January 2008.





Local Government	Class I Soils (acres)	Class II Soils (acres)	Class III Soils (acres)	Class IV, V, VI, VII, and VIII Soils and Unclassified Areas ^a (acres)	Total (acres) ^b
City of Mequon	58	23,538	4,004	2,435	30,035
Town of Belgium		17,264	3,348	2,148	22,760
Town of Cedarburg	482	10,205	3,656	1,599	15,942
Town of Fredonia	389	12,078	6,416	3,148	22,031
Town of Grafton	11	7,023	2,832	1,571	11,437
Town of Port Washington	2	8,463	1,505	1,485	11,455
Town of Saukville	174	8,936	8,050	3,885	21,045
Other Cities and Villages	102	9,082	3,385	3,320	15,889
Ozaukee County	1,218	96,589	33,196	19,591	150,594
Percent of Total County Lands	0.8	64.1	22.1	13.0	100.0

AGRICULTURAL SOIL CAPABILITY IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

^aUnclassified areas also include surface water areas.

^bTotal acreage by community is based on 2010 civil division boundaries.

Source: USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

Table 3

SOIL PRODUCTIVITY RATINGS FOR CROPLAND (LAND EVALUATION RATINGS) IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

Local Government	95–100 (acres)	90–94.9 (acres)	85–89.9 (acres)	80–84.9 (acres)	75–75.9 (acres)	70–74.9 (acres)	60–69.9 (acres)	Less than 60 or Soil not Rated ^a (acres)	Total (acres)⁵
City of Mequon	6,784	12,225	3,686	834	306	101	2,788	3,326	30,049
Town of Belgium	566	15,161	221	1,400	645	320	1,464	2,984	22,761
Town of Cedarburg	2,783	4,492	1,662	1,379	572	482	2,205	2,367	15,942
Town of Fredonia	2,206	7,536	735	1,969	168	1,314	3,449	4,654	22,031
Town of Grafton	115	6,005	363	693	283	213	1,709	2,056	11,437
Town of Port Washington	64	7,897	22	480	76	116	1,176	1,624	11,455
Town of Saukville	1,672	4,521	833	1,859	472	2,826	3,774	5,088	21,046
Other Cities and Villages	605	7,227	1,058	1,460	318	119	2,411	2,675	15,873
Ozaukee County	14,795	65,064	8,580	10,074	2,840	5,491	18,976	24,774	150,594
Percent of Total County Lands	9.8	43.2	5.7	6.7	1.9	3.6	12.6	16.5	100.0

^aIncludes surface water areas.

^bTotal acreage by community is based on 2010 civil division boundaries.

Source: USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Service and SEWRPC.

The Ozaukee County LESA analysis was conducted using SEWRPC and County Geographic Information System (GIS) data to analyze and assign each agricultural parcel in the County a LESA score between 0 and 10, with 10 being the best possible score. Parcels outside planned sewer service areas with 2 percent or more of the land in agricultural use were included in the analysis, as shown on Map 5. The LE component of the analysis comprises 40 percent of the score. The other 60 percent of the score is comprised of the 11 Site Assessment (SA) factors. Each factor received a weight that varied between high, medium, and low based on its perceived importance to long-term agricultural use by the LESA Technical Advisory Workgroup.



14.000 Feet

AGRICULTURAL LAND EVALUATION RATING FOR SOILS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY





23

	Parcels in Category		Total Acres	in Category ^a	Agricultural Acres in Category ^b		
LESA Score	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Acres	Percent	
9.0-10.0	6	0.2	472	0.5	401	0.6	
8.0-8.9	164	4.5	12,813	13.9	10,450	14.7	
7.0-7.9	807	22.3	33,763	36.6	28,217	39.6	
6.4-6.9	867	24.0	20,144	21.8	15,606	21.9	
Less than 6.4	1,776	49.0	25,085	27.2	16,536	23.2	
Total	3,620	100.0	92,277	100.0	71,210	100.0	

OZAUKEE COUNTY LESA SCORES: 2007

^aIncludes entire area of parcels analyzed, including areas not being used for farming, such as woodlands, wetlands, and surface water.

^bIncludes only those portions of parcels in agricultural use in 2006.

Source: SEWRPC.

Final LESA scores are shown on Map 6, with the scores grouped into general categories. The average score for the parcels analyzed was 6.3, and the median score was 6.4 (half of all parcels received a higher score and half received a lower score than 6.4). The comprehensive plan recommends that parcels in the highest scoring categories, 9.0 to 10.0 and 8.0 to 8.9, be given the highest priority for farmland protection resources. Parcels in the next highest scoring categories, 7.0 to 7.9 and 6.4 to 6.9, should be given the next highest priority for farmland protection resources. Local officials should review parcels that received a score below 6.4 and determine on a case-by-case basis whether they are suitable for long-term protection. Table 4 sets forth the number of parcels and acres in each LESA category in 2007. Only six parcels, with 401 acres in agricultural use, are in the highest scoring category. There are 164 parcels, with 10,450 acres in agricultural use, in the 8.0 to 8.9 category and 807 parcels, with 28,217 acres in agricultural use, in the 7.0 to 7.9 category.

Soil Erosion Potential for Agricultural Lands

The erosion potential from wind and water for agricultural soils in Ozaukee County is summarized on Map 10 and Table 28 in Chapter III of the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan for Ozaukee County. The categories of erosion potential shown on Map 10 are based on the amount of topsoil that has been lost, based on NRCS estimates. About 8 percent of the County, or 11,318 acres, have been identified as having highly erodible soils, and about 26 percent, or 38,497 acres, have been identified as having potentially highly erodible soils.

Farm Drainage Districts

Farm drainage districts are special-purpose units of government authorized under Chapter 88 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. Farm drainage districts are formed to plan and carry out area-wide drainage improvements to correct problems of high water tables and poor drainage that interfere with agricultural uses and practices. A drainage district may lie in more than one local government and may also cross county lines. Drainage districts are governed by a three member board appointed by the County Circuit Court. The board has the authority to purchase land for the construction and maintenance of drainage systems, which may include ditches, canals, levees, reservoirs, silt basins, and pumps. The costs of improvements are assessed against the lands that are specifically benefited. Properties that benefit from the improvements fund the improvements. A drainage board is also authorized to assess a single landowner for the costs of correction when a landowner adversely impacts downstream water quality. Landowners must receive drainage board approval before taking any drainage-related action, because any unauthorized action could potentially affect a drainage system.

Approximately one-third of Wisconsin farms depend on constructed drains to remove excess water from their land, primarily through small-scale drains. Most drains are operated by a single landowner or by voluntary cooperation among adjacent landowners. There are approximately 228 known drainage districts in the State.



LESA SCORES FOR AGRICULTURAL PARCELS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2007

Drainage districts are required to include a 20-foot corridor on each side of the ditch to be used as a maintenance corridor. No row cropping is permitted and vegetation is required. These requirements can be coordinated with soil and water conservation plans required under the Farmland Preservation Program.

There are two known active drainage districts in Ozaukee County, both located in the Town and Village of Belgium. The districts are shown on Map 11 in Chapter II of the County comprehensive plan and include the Belgium-Holland Drainage District No. 1 and Belgium-Holland Drainage District No. 2. The districts also include lands in the Town of Holland in Sheboygan County. The two districts encompassed an area of 4,078 acres in Ozaukee County in 2006. Both districts are governed by the Ozaukee County Farm Drainage Board. There are other districts considered "active" by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP), but no activity, assessments, or maintenance have occurred in these districts for an extended period of time.

Wisconsin Act 121, enacted on March 20, 2008, amended Section 66.1001 (2) (g) of the *Statutes* to require that the Intergovernmental Cooperation Element of a comprehensive plan analyze the relationship of County and local governments to drainage districts located in the County or local government. The Act also requires the County or local government to notify the drainage district before taking action that would allow the development of a residential, commercial, or industrial property that would likely increase the amount of water that the main drain of the drainage district would have to accommodate. Drainage districts are required under Act 121 to file with the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection; the town board or town zoning committee; the village board, city council, plan commission, or plan committee; and the county zoning administrator in which the district is located, a separate report for the preceding year stating the practices and policies of the district.

Drainage districts must also, beginning in 2009, and every three years thereafter, provide written notice to every person who owns land in the district that such land is in the district, along with contact information for every member of the drainage board. Drainage districts are also required to annually provide contact information for every member of the drainage board to the State drainage engineer and to the clerk of every city, village, town, and county in which the drainage district is located, and to provide the clerk of each taxation district in which the drainage district is located a list of every assessment issued by the district from November 1 of the previous year to October 31 of the current year, specifying the assessment amount for every parcel in the district.

Existing Farmland

Agricultural lands in 2007 were identified in the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan for Ozaukee County. Most farm residences, together with a 20,000 square foot dwelling site, are classified as single-family residential land uses in the 2007 generalized land use inventory shown on Map 20 in this Chapter, except that farmhouses on agricultural parcels of 20 acres or more were designated as an agricultural use rather than a residential use. Table 5 sets forth the number of acres occupied by farmland in the City of Mequon and each town in the County in 2007. Farmlands occupied 77,601 acres, or about 121 square miles, representing about 52 percent of the County. It should be noted that this figure includes lands actually used for agriculture, primarily cultivated lands and lands used for pasture, and excludes the wetland and woodland portions of farm fields.

Map 7 shows areas used for agriculture in 2007, categorized by the following specific types of agricultural use that existed in the year 2000:

- Cultivated Lands, which includes lands used for the cultivation of crops including row crops, grain crops, vegetable crops, and hay.
- Pasture Land and Unused Agricultural Lands, which includes lands used as pasture, or lands which were formerly cultivated or used for pasture which have not yet succeeded to a wetland or woodland plant community.

	Cultivated Land		Pasture a Agricul	and Unused tural Land	Orchards and Nurseries		Farm Buildings		
Local Government	Area (acres)	Percent of Total Agricultural Land	Area (acres)	Percent of Total Agricultural Land	Area (acres)	Percent of Total Agricultural Land	Area (acres)	Percent of Total Agricultural Land	Total Agricultural Land ^a (acres)
City of Mequon	6,365	61.2	3,391	32.6	433	4.2	210	2.0	10,399
Town of Belgium	17,144	93.8	715	3.9	120	0.6	304	1.7	18,283
Town of Cedarburg	5,565	75.8	1,431	19.5	138	1.9	204	2.8	7,338
Town of Fredonia	13,327	91.5	942	6.5	24	0.2	263	1.8	14,556
Town of Grafton	3,352	72.7	1,108	24.0	21	0.5	127	2.8	4,608
Town of Port Washington	7,858	95.6	213	2.6	11	0.1	135	1.7	8,217
Town of Saukville	8,842	80.9	1,751	16.0	61	0.6	273	2.5	10,927
Other Cities and Villages	2,950	90.1	285	8.7	3	0.1	35	1.1	3,273
Ozaukee County	65,403	84.3	9,836	12.7	811	1.0	1,551	2.0	77,601

AGRICULTURAL LAND IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2000

^aTotal agricultural acreage by community is based on 2010 civil division boundaries, and is further based on parcels in agricultural use in 2007. Specific agricultural uses were those existing in 2000.

Source: SEWRPC.

- Orchards and Nurseries, which includes lands used for orchards, nurseries, and sod farms. This category does not include greenhouses, which are shown as commercial on the existing land use map in the comprehensive plan (Map 89 in Chapter VIII of the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan for Ozaukee County).
- Farm Buildings, which includes barns, silos, and other buildings used to store farm equipment or supplies or house farm animals.

Cultivated lands were the predominant type of agricultural use in the County and in each participating local government, accounting for about 84 percent of all land used for agricultural purposes in the County in 2000.

Farm Production and Revenue

In addition to inventory data regarding the suitability of lands and soils in the County for agricultural uses, it is also important to collect farm production and revenue data.² Such inventory data are useful in identifying the economic impact of agricultural operations on Ozaukee County and major types of agricultural products and operations. Data on additional agricultural trends are also discussed in the next chapter.

Sales Value by Agricultural Sector

Agricultural sectors or commodity groups in the County and State in 2007, and the amount and percentage of revenue associated with each sector, are set forth in Table 6. Dairy farming was the predominant source of agricultural revenue in the County in 2007, accounting for about 56 percent of agricultural revenue. A lower percentage, 51 percent, of agricultural revenue Statewide was based on dairy farming. The second and third predominant sources of agricultural revenue were grain crops and horticulture products, respectively, each accounting for about 14 percent of agricultural revenue. Statewide a higher percentage, about 18 percent, of agricultural revenue was based on grain crops, while a much lower percentage, about 3 percent, was from horticulture products. The relative importance of the horticultural industry in the County compared to the State is likely a response to the demand for landscaping material for urban development in the County and the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

²Data included in this section are 2002 and 2007 data for Ozaukee County from the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, unless otherwise noted. Data are only available for the County as a whole.

GENERALIZED EXISTING AGRICULTURAL LANDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2000



	Ozaukee	e County	Wisc	onsin
Commodity or Commodity Group	2007 Sales (in thousands)	Percent of Total Agricultural Revenues	2007 Sales (in thousands)	Percent of Total Agricultural Revenues
Dairy	\$33,219	56.3	\$4,573,294	51.0
Cattle and Calves	4,081	6.9	1,014,553	11.3
Grains				
Corn	4,101	6.9	1,136,931	12.7
Wheat	1,627	2.8	96,576	1.1
Soybeans	2,650	4.5	390,672	4.4
Barley	3	- - ^a	1,272	^a
Other Grains ^b	67	0.1	17,090	0.2
Subtotal	8,448	14.3	1,643,341	18.4
Vegetables ^c	2,027	3.4	422,639	4.7
Horticulture ^d	8,178	13.8	244,216	2.7
Other ^e	3,103	5.3	1,069,315	11.9
Total	\$59,056	100.0	\$8,967,358	100.0

VALUE OF SALES BY COMMODITY OR COMMODITY GROUP IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 2007

^aLess than 0.05 percent.

^bIncludes oilseeds, dry beans, and dry peas.

^cIncludes melons, potatoes, and sweet potatoes.

^dIncludes nurseries, greenhouses, floricultures, and sod.

^eIncludes tobacco, fruits, poultry, eggs, pigs, sheep, goats, horses, aquaculture, and other crops and animals.

Source: USDA National Agriculture Statistics Service, 2007 Census of Agriculture.

Production Value for Certain Crops

The production value of selected agricultural commodities or crops in the County, Region, and State in 2010 are set forth in Table 7. The value of production is an estimated total monetary value of the agricultural commodity produced and harvested in which portions are sold and/or retained for personal use, which often differs from the market value generated from the sale of the product as presented in the above section. Corn for grain had the highest production value in the County in 2010, accounting for about 53 percent of the total crop production value listed in Table 7. The Region and State had a higher percentage, 61 and 64 percent respectively, of corn for grain as part of the total crop production value listed in the Table. Soybeans had the second highest crop production value, accounting for about 29 percent of the total production value in Table 7 for the County, 31 percent for the Region, and 22 percent for the State.

Crops and Livestock

Ozaukee County farms³ produce an array of agricultural products, including many varieties of crops and livestock. Among the most prominent of these agricultural products are corn, forage (hay, grass silage, and greenchop), soybeans, small grains, and dairy products. Table 8 sets forth 2002 land for crop production and changes in land for crop production between 1990 and 1999 and between 1999 and 2002 in the County and the State, based on information compiled by the University of Wisconsin Program on Agricultural Technology Studies.

³*The USDA defines a farm as any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products (crops and livestock) were produced and sold, or normally would have been sold during the census year.*

VALUE OF PRODUCTION FOR SELECTED COMMODITIES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY, SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN, AND WISCONSIN: 2010

		Ozaukee Cou	nty	Sou	theastern Wis	consin	Wisconsin			
Commodity	Production (bushels or tons)	Price Per Bushel or Ton	Value of Production (dollars)	Production (bushels or tons)	Price Per Bushel or Ton	Value of Production (dollars)	Production (bushels or tons)	Price Per Bushel or Ton	Value of Production (dollars)	
Corn for Grain	1,925,000	\$ 5.35 ^a	\$10,298,750	36,190,000 ^a	\$ 5.35 ^a	\$193,616,500	502,200,000	\$ 5.35	\$2,686,770,000	
Winter Wheat	256,000	5.30 ^a	1,356,800	1,934,000 ^a	5.30 ^a	10,250,200	14,720,000	5.30	78,016,000	
Oats	93,000	2.30 ^a	213,900	360,000 ^a	2.30 ^a	828,000	9,860,000	2.30	22,678,000	
Soybeans	490,000	11.40 ^a	5,586,000	8,580,000 ^a	11.40 ^a	97,812,000	82,315,000	11.40	938,391,000	
Hay, Alfalfa (Dry)	17,000	107.00 ^b	1,819,000	151,000 ^b	107.00 ^b	16,157,000	3,770,000	107.00	403,390,000	
All Other Hay (Dry)	2,200	76.50 ^b	168,300	15,0000 ^b	76.50 ^b	1,147,500	756,000	76.50	57,834,000	
Total	2,783,200		\$19,442,750	47,230,000		\$319,811,200	613,621,000		\$4,187,079,000	

^aPrice or quantity of production is based on bushels.

^bPrice or quantity of production is based on tons.

Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Wisconsin 2011 Agricultural Statistics.

Table 8

LAND IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 1990-2002

			Oza	ukee County				Wisconsin	
	Land Area	Land Area	Land Area	Chang 1990 -	e from - 1999	Chang 1999	e from - 2002	Percent Change	Percent Change
Crop	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	1990 - 1999	1999 - 2002
Corn	22,200	16,700	19,900	-5,500	-25.0	3,200	19.0	-3.0	5.0
Forage	21,400	17,800	15,200	-3,600	-17.0	-2,600	-15.0	-11.0	-17.0
Soy	3,000	9,500	9,100	6,500	217.0	-400	-4.0	202.0	17.0
Small Grains	12,100	6,400	6,400	-5,700	-47.0	0	0.0	-50.0	-6.0
Total	58,700	50,400	50,600	-8,300	-14.0	200	0.4	-1.0	-3.0

Source: Program on Agricultural Technology Studies (PATS), UW-Madison and UW-Cooperative Extension.

Corn

In 2002, 19,900 acres were devoted to corn production in Ozaukee County. This represents an increase of 3,200 acres, or 19 percent, from 1999; however, from 1990 to 1999 the County lost 5,500 acres of corn production, which was a 25 percent loss. From 1990 to 1999 the State had a 3 percent loss in land devoted to producing corn, but had a 5 percent gain from 1999 to 2002.

Forage

About 15,200 acres were devoted to forage crops in the County in 2002. This represents a loss of 2,600 acres, or 15 percent, from 1999. The County lost 3,600 acres of forage between 1990 and 1999, which was a 17 percent loss. The State lost 11 percent of its forage land between 1990 and 1999 and 17 percent between 1999 and 2002.

Soybeans

In 2002, 9,100 acres were devoted to soybean production in the County. This represents a 4 percent loss from 1999, although acres devoted to soybeans grew from 3,000 acres to 9,500 acres between 1990 and 1999. The State had a 202 percent increase in acres devoted to soybean production between 1990 and 1999 and a 17 percent increase between 1999 and 2002.

Small Grains

Acres devoted to small grains have decreased sharply in recent years as opposed to acres devoted to soybeans. In 2002, 6,400 acres were devoted to small grain production in the County, which is the same as the number of acres in 1999; however, it is a 47 percent decrease from the 1990 level of 12,100 acres. The State had a 50 percent decrease between 1990 and 1999 and a 6 percent decrease between 1999 and 2002.

Livestock

There is significant agricultural livestock activity in Ozaukee County, in addition to agricultural crop activity. The most prevalent livestock activity in the County is dairy farming. Dairy cows produced about 192,640,000 pounds of dairy products or about 22,400 pounds per cow in 2009. The Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service estimates that Ozaukee County had about 8,600 dairy cows in 2009. This equates to about 119 dairy cows in the average herd or per dairy farm. Average herd size or dairy cows per farm increased about 36 percent in the County from 1998 to 2009. Average herd size also increased about 28 percent between 1990 and 1998.

Agricultural Products Produced by Farms

Table 9 sets forth the different agricultural products grown in Ozaukee County and the number of farms involved in producing each agricultural product. As the table suggests, individual farms in the County have diversified crops and livestock.

Table 9

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS PRODUCED BY OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMS: 2007^a

Agricultural Product	Number of Farms	Percent
Livestock and poultry		
Cattle and calves	145	28.3
Hogs and pigs	15	2.9
Sheep and lambs	26	5.1
Chickens (egg production)	43	8.4
Crops		
Corn for grain	138	26.9
Corn for silage or greenchop	75	14.6
Wheat for grain	86	16.8
Oats for grain	44	8.6
Barley for grain	7	1.4
Soybeans	116	22.6
Forage	193	37.6
Vegetables	54	10.5
Orchards	18	3.5
Total	960 ^b	187.2

^aThe Census definition of a farm is any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sold, or normally would have been sold during the census year.

^bThere were 513 farms in Ozaukee County in 2007. The number of farms total is greater than 513 and the percent total is greater than 100.0 because many farms produce more than one agricultural product.

Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2007 Census of Agriculture.

Based on the 2007 Census of Agriculture conducted by the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Ozaukee County farms produced agricultural products with a market value of products sold of \$59,056,000, consisting of about \$20,898,000, or about 35 percent, in crops and about \$38,159,000, or about 65 percent, in livestock, poultry, and associated products. The average farm in the County produced agricultural products with a market value of about \$115,120, a 60 percent increase from the 2002 level of \$71,901. Farms across the State combined to produce agricultural products with a market value of \$8,967,358,000 in 2007, consisting of about \$2,669,326,000, or about 30 percent in crops and about \$6,298,032,000, or about 70 percent, in livestock, poultry, and associated products. The average farm in the State produced agricultural products with a market value of \$114,288.

Farm Income and Labor

Based on 2007 Census of Agriculture data, the average net cash income from a farm operation⁴ in the County was \$35,205, compared to an average of \$34,909 for the State. Farming in the County was the principal occupation

⁴Total revenue are fees for producing under a production contract, total sales not under production contract, government payments, and farm-related income minus total expenses paid by operator. Does not include the value of commodities produced under production contract by the contract growers. Also, depreciation is not used in the calculation of net cash farm income.

FARMS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND WISCONSIN BY VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCT SALES: 1997-2007

	1997 ^b		20	02	20	07
Value of Sales ^ª	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent
Less than \$2,500	139	32.6	226	42.4	231	45.0
\$2,500 to \$4,999	29	6.8	35	6.6	34	6.6
\$5,000 to \$9,999	33	7.7	33	6.2	23	4.5
\$10,000 to \$24,999	47	11.0	62	11.6	47	9.2
\$25,000 to \$49,999	30	7.0	33	6.2	37	7.2
\$50,000 to \$99,999	52	12.2	31	5.8	42	8.2
\$100,000 or more	97	22.7	113	21.2	99	19.3
Total	427	100.0	533	100.0	513	100.0

OZAUKEE COUNTY

WISCONSIN

	19	1997 ^b		02	2007		
Value of Sales ^a	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	
Less than \$2,500	22,254	28.0	30,491	39.5	30,296	38.6	
\$2,500 to \$4,999	6,711	8.4	5,389	7.0	5,955	7.6	
\$5,000 to \$9,999	7,278	9.2	5,788	7.5	6,732	8.6	
\$10,000 to \$24,999	10,024	12.6	8,362	10.8	7,732	9.8	
\$25,000 to \$49,999	7,700	9.7	5,929	7.7	5,704	7.3	
\$50,000 to \$99,999	9,153	11.5	7,242	9.4	5,397	6.9	
\$100,000 or more	16,421	20.6	13,930	18.1	16,647	21.2	
Total	79,541	100.0	77,131	100.0	78,463	100.0	

^a Gross sales of agricultural products produced per farm (before taxes and expenses).

^b The 1997 County data was not statistically adjusted to account for nonresponses to the Census survey. All other years for the County and all State data have been statistically adjusted, which typically increases the number of farms reported.

Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2007 Census of Agriculture.

(50 percent or more of work time spent on farming or ranching) of the farm operator on 231 farms, or about 45 percent, and was not the primary occupation of the farm operator on 282 farms, or about 55 percent. Statewide, farming was the principal occupation of the farm operator on about 47 percent of farms and was not the principal occupation of the farm operator on about 47 percent of farms and was not the principal occupation of the farm operator on about 47 percent of farms and was not the principal occupation of the farm operator on about 53 percent of farms. Of the total 612 farm laborers hired on 138 farms in Ozaukee County, 257 laborers, or about 42 percent, worked 150 days or more, while 355 laborers, or about 58 percent, worked less than 150 days in 2007. In comparison to the State, about 40 percent of the hired farm labor worked 150 days or more and about 60 percent worked less than 150 days.

Number of Farms by Agricultural Product Sales Value

Table 10 sets forth sales of agricultural products for Ozaukee County farms from 1997 to 2007. In 2007, there were 99 farms, or about 19 percent of farms in the County, with sales of \$100,000 or more, while 231 farms, or about 45 percent, had sales less than \$2,500. About 21 percent of State farms had sales of \$100,000 or more and almost 39 percent had sales less than \$2,500 in 2007. In comparison, there were 97 farms, or about 23 percent of farms in the County in 1997, with sales of \$100,000 or more, while 139 farms, or about 33 percent, had sales less than \$2,500. About 21 percent of \$100,000 or more and about 23 percent, had sales less than \$2,500. About 21 percent of \$100,000 or more, while 139 farms, or about 33 percent, had sales less than \$2,500. About 21 percent of State farms had sales of \$100,000 or more and about 28 percent had sales less than \$2,500 in 1997. The data in Table 10 were statistically adjusted, with the exception of the 1997 County data, to account for nonresponses to the census survey. Adjustments typically result in an increase in the number of

FARM SIZE IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND WISCONSIN: 1997-2007

	19	97 ^a	20	02	20	07
Size (acres)	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent
Fewer than 10 acres	30	7.0	59	11.1	35	6.8
10 to 49 acres	118	27.6	164	30.8	199	38.8
50 to 179 acres	152	35.6	169	31.7	162	31.6
180 to 499 acres	101	23.7	118	22.1	87	16.9
500 to 999 acres	21	4.9	17	3.2	23	4.5
1,000 acres or more	5	1.2	6	1.1	7	1.4
Total	427	100.0	533	100.0	513	100.0
Average Size	164		142		138	
Median Size	40		79		56	

OZAUKEE COUNTY

WISCONSIN

	19	97 ^ª	20	02	2007		
Size (acres)	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	Number of Farms	Percent	
Fewer than 10 acres	4,500	5.6	4,141	5.4	4,861	6.2	
10 to 49 acres	13,915	17.5	17,152	22.2	19,895	25.4	
50 to 179 acres	30,995	39.0	29,458	38.2	29,765	37.9	
180 to 499 acres	24,043	30.2	20,021	26.0	17,837	22.7	
500 to 999 acres	4,592	5.8	4,465	5.8	4,149	5.3	
1,000 acres or more	1,496	1.9	1,894	2.4	1,956	2.5	
Total	79,541	100.0	77,131	100.0	78,463	100.0	
Average Size	227		204		194		
Median Size	154		104		95		

^aThe 1997 County data was not statistically adjusted to account for nonresponses to the Census survey. All other years for the County and all State data have been statistically adjusted, which typically increases the number of farms reported.

Source: USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Census of Agriculture.

farms reported. To qualify for State farmland preservation tax credits based on the new State farmland preservation program, the farmland must be in common ownership, devoted primarily to agricultural use, and produce a minimum of \$6,000 in gross farm receipts in the previous year (or \$18,000 in the previous three years), or be enrolled in a farm commodity or conservation program.

Number, Size, and Value of Farms

Table 11 sets forth the number of farms by size category in Ozaukee County and the State of Wisconsin from 1997 to 2007. There were 513 farms in Ozaukee County in 2007. The average farm size⁵ in the County was 138 acres in 2007, while the median farm size was 56 acres. This compares to 194 acres and 95 acres, respectively, for farms in the State. In 1997, there were 427 farms in the County with the average and median farm sizes in the County being 164 acres and 40 acres, respectively. In the State, the average and median farm sizes were 227 acres and 154 acres, respectively, in 1997.

⁵The farm size is the total land area of a farm as an operating unit and includes land owned and operated as well as land rented from others. Land rented to or assigned to a tenant was considered part of the tenant's farm and not part of the owner's.

AGRICULTURAL TRENDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1976 - 2009

	Year									
Variable	1976	1980	1986	1990	1996	1998	2002	2005	2007	2009
Total number of farms	620	550	530	520	550	500	533 ^a	N/A	513 ^a	N/A
Number of dairy farms	255	217	190	154	110	98	96 ^a	77	69 ^a	72
Number of dairy cows	9,800	10,300	11,100	10,600	9,100	8,600	9,002 ^a	8,200	8,253 ^a	8,600
Total number of cattle	23,600	22,100	21,500	20,700	20,500	19,000	20,658 ^a	20,000	17,737 ^a	18,000
Land in all farms (acres)	105,000	98,300	88,000	89,000	85,000	76,000	75,467 ^a	N/A	70,689 ^a	N/A
Price per acre of all farms (average land sale) ^b	\$1,618	\$3,377	\$2,149	\$2,173	\$5,742	\$2,648	\$6,602	\$13,996	\$11,963	\$5,080

Note: Unless otherwise noted, the data in this table was provided by the Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service. N/A indicates the data is not available.

^aData provided by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), National Agricultural Statistics Service (Census of Agriculture data).

^bSales of all types of agricultural land without buildings or other improvements. Average sale price is for any use. Data provided by the Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Bureau of Equalization.

Source: USDA-National Agricultural Statistics Service; Wisconsin Department of Revenue, Bureau of Equalization; Wisconsin Agricultural Statistics Service; and SEWRPC.

Table 11 shows that 448 farms in Ozaukee County, or almost 87 percent, were between 10 acres and 499 acres in size in 2007. There were 35 farms, or about 7 percent, less than 10 acres, and 30 farms, or about 6 percent, were 500 acres or greater in size. In the State, about 86 percent of farms were between 10 and 499 acres. About 6 percent of farms were under 50 acres, and about 8 percent were 500 acres or greater in size in 2007.

As indicated in Table 12, the number of acres in farms in the County decreased about 33 percent between 1976 and 2007. The conversion of agricultural land to urban development is also indicated by the significant increase in the average sale price per acre of agricultural land in the County during this period, from \$1,618 per acre in 1976 (equivalent to \$5,805 in 2007 dollars⁶) to \$11,963 in 2007, or an increase of 106 percent when comparing the conversion in constant 2007 dollars. The average sales price dropped significantly between 2007 and 2009, to less than the sales price in 1976 when expressed in constant dollars, due to the economic recession.

Farms Enrolled in State and Federal Preservation Programs

A number of Federal and State conservation programs have been created to help protect farmland and related rural land. These programs include the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), and Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program (FPP). Chapter VII identifies various programs that can be used to help support farming operations. One of the key programs for farmland preservation is the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, which allows farmers who agree to maintain farmland in agricultural use to receive annual State income tax credits. In 2006, there were 348 FPP contracts in Ozaukee County and three FPP agreements in the City of Mequon, encompassing a total 21,881 acres of farmland. Lands enrolled in the Wisconsin FPP in Ozaukee County in 2005 are shown on Map 8. Table 13 provides information on the number of contracts and the number of acres in each Town and the City of Mequon enrolled in the FPP in 2006 and in the CRP, CREP, and WRP in 2005.

⁶The 1976 dollars have been converted to "constant" 2007 dollars using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Price Index (CPI), a measure of inflation, to provide a more accurate comparison of the change in dollar value over time.

FARMS ENROLLED IN STATE AND FEDERAL FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAMS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

State Program: 2006			Federal Programs: 2005						
U.S. Public Land	Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) ^a		Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) ^b		Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) ^b		Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)		
Survey Township	Contracts	Acres	Contracts	Acres	Contracts	Acres	Contracts	Acres	
Belgium	128	7,990	21	2,403	1	30	2	26	
Cedarburg	25	1,342	12	535	0	0	0	0	
Fredonia	80	5,465	16	1,156	2	31	2	14	
Grafton	10	581	9	464	0	0	0	0	
Port Washington	49	3,096	8	461	2	60	0	0	
Saukville	56	3,163	7	535	0	0	0	0	
Mequon	3	244	7	338	0	0	0	0	
Total	351	21,881	80	5,892	5	121	4	40	

^aIn 2006 there were 348 FPP contracts in Ozaukee County towns and three FPP agreements in the City of Mequon.

^bIn 2010, there were a total of 149 CRP and CREP contracts covering 1,793 acres in Ozaukee County.

Source: Ozaukee County, Washington-Ozaukee Farm Service Agency, and SEWRPC.

Agricultural Infrastructure and Support Services

Existing agricultural infrastructure and services supporting agricultural industries are important in sustaining a viable agricultural industry in Ozaukee County. Identifying existing infrastructure and services is important to help meet existing needs or to improve farm operation efficiency by accommodating additional agricultural suppliers and maintaining or improving transportation facilities. Table 14 sets forth key agricultural infrastructure and support services located in or serving the County in 2010. Information regarding transportation facilities is provided in Part 4 of this Chapter.

Specialty Crops and Other Types of Agriculture

Opportunity for agricultural diversification is an important mechanism to help sustain the future economic viability of farming. In addition to traditional farming activities, farming activities referred to as specialty or niche farming are located in Ozaukee County. Table 15 identifies such farm operations, which include raising unique animals, aquaculture,⁷ orchards, horticulture, rotational and organic⁸ farming, farmer's market produce, and community-supported agriculture (CSA) operations. Chapter III describes such unique farming operations and their potential contributions to the future of agriculture.

⁷Aquaculture, also referred to as aquafarming, is the farming of aquatic organisms, such as fish, crustaceans, mollusks, and aquatic plants, which involves cultivating freshwater or saltwater populations under controlled conditions and can be differentiated from commercial fishing, which harvests wild fish.

⁸Organic farming is the process of producing food naturally with little environmental impact and by avoiding the use of synthetic chemical fertilizers and pesticides and genetically altered organisms to influence crop growth. Certified organic foods are agricultural products produced by such operations, which also meet the national standards for organically produced agricultural products established by the USDA National Organic Program.



ENROLLED FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM LANDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2005

AGRICULTURAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND SUPPORT SERVICES LOCATED IN OR SERVING OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

Name	Location	Notes		
Processors				
Cedar Crest Ice Cream	Town of Cedarburg	Manufacturer of ice cream		
Cedar Valley Cheese, Inc.	Town of Fredonia	Manufacturer of cheese		
Cereal By-Products	City of Port Washington	Agricultural commodities		
Fromm Family Foods	City of Mequon	Pet food manufacturer		
Kemps Dairy, LLC	City of Cedarburg	Processor of fluid milk		
Lakeside Foods	Village of Belgium	Processing of vegetables		
Level Valley Creamery, Inc.	Town of Jackson (Washington Co.)	Milk and cheese products		
Cooperatives				
Adell Cooperative	Village of Adell (Sheboygan Co.)	Feed, seed, and other farm supplies		
Kettle Lakes Cooperative	Village of Random Lake (Sheboygan Co.)	Feed, seed, and other farm supplies		
Saukville Feeds	Village of Saukville	Feed, seed, and other farm supplies		
United Cooperative	City of Hartford (Washington Co.)	Feed, seed, and other farm supplies		
West Bend Elevator	Town of Barton (Washington Co.)	Feed, seed, and other farm supplies		
Supplier or Other Services				
Century Acres	Town of Saukville	Custom services and grain		
D & R Construction and Manure Hauling	Town of Saukville	Farm construction and manure hauling		
Karrels Milking Supply	Town of Port Washington	Milking equipment		
Matt Thompson	Town of Belgium	Manure spreading		
Dan Gasser	Town of Belgium	Equipment repair		
Dan Feider	Town of Belgium	Cattle hauling		
Buechler Cattle Hauling	Town of Belgium	Cattle hauling		
H & K Concrete Products, Inc.	Town of Grafton	Drain tiling services		
Dan's Grading and Trenching	Town of Grafton	Grading and drain tiling services		
Lochens, Inc.	Village of Newburg	Tractors and other farm machinery		
Lemke Seed Farm	City of Mequon	Seed grower and sales		
Kertchner White-Washing	Town of Farmington (Washington Co.)	White-washing services		
Mid State Equipment	Town of Polk (Washington Co.)	Tractors and other farm machinery		
Agricultural By-Products				
Cereal By-Products	City of Port Washington	Agricultural commodities		
La Budde Group	Village of Grafton	Agricultural commodities		
Farm Veterinary Services				
Cedarburg Veterinary Clinic	City of Cedarburg	Variety of animal care		
Fredonia Veterinary Clinic	Village of Fredonia	Mixed-animal clinic, including horses		
Cedar Grove Veterinary Services	Village of Cedar Grove (Sheboygan Co.)	General and emergency animal services		
Public Farmers' Market				
Historic Cedarburg Farmers' Market	City of Cedarburg	Community public farmers market		
Grafton Farmers' Market	Village of Grafton	Community public farmers market		
Port Washington Farmers' Market	City of Port Washington	Community public farmers market		
Saukville Farmers' Market	Village of Saukville	Community public farmers market		
Thiensville Farmers' Market	Village of Thiensville	Community public farmers market		

Source: Local Governments, Southeastern Wisconsin Farm Fresh Atlas, UW-Extension, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

EXAMPLES OF SPECIALTY FARM OPERATIONS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

Name	Municipal Location	Notes
Unique Animals		
D. A Large, LLC	Town of Belgium	Raises pheasants
Weyker Buffalo	Town of Belgium	Raises buffalo
Kaul Elk	Town of Grafton	Raises elk
Kay's Home Farm, Inc.	Town of Cedarburg	Direct marketing of beef
Aquaculture		
Don Bloecher, Jr.	Town of Saukville	Fish farm
Pheasant Creek Farm	Town of Fredonia	Fish farm
Urban Aquaculture Center, LLC	Town of Port Washington	Fish farm
Port Washington Aquaponics	City of Port Washington	Fish farm
Orchards		
Apple Land	Towns of Belgium and Saukville	Raises apples
Neimann Orchards "The Old Red Barn"	Town of Cedarburg	Raises apples
R-Apples	City of Mequon	Raises apples
Barthel Fruits Farm	City of Mequon	Raises various fruits including apples
Horticulture		
Fransee Nursery	Town of Saukville	Raises trees and shrubs
Minor's Nursery Farms	City of Mequon and Town of Cedarburg	Raises trees and shrubs
Wayside Nursery	City of Mequon	Raises trees and shrubs
Stumpf Trees	Town of Cedarburg	Raises Christmas trees
Nofke Trees	City of Mequon	Raises Christmas trees
Arrow Turf Farm	City of Mequon	Turf/sod grower
Rotational and Certified Organic Farming		
Andy Lange	Town of Belgium	Rotational grazer
John Pipkorn	City of Mequon	Rotational grazer
Brian Behrens	Town of Grafton	Organic vegetables
Wellspring Farm	Town of Saukville	Organic vegetables
Evergreen Lane Farm	Town of Saukville	Organic vegetable and dairy farmer
Farmers Market Produce		
Bob Witte	Town of Cedarburg	Raises farmers market produce
Bob Barthel	Town of Cedarburg	Raises farmers market produce
Elroy Klug	Town of Cedarburg	Raises farmers market produce
Dave Polzin	Town of Cedarburg	Raises farmers market produce
Fondy Market	Town of Port Washington	Raises farmers market produce
Evergreen Lane Farm	Town of Saukville	Raises farmers market produce
Community-Supported Agriculture (CSA)		
Rare Earth Farm	Town of Belgium	Direct marketer/deliveries
Willoway Farm	Town of Fredonia	Direct marketer/deliveries
Wellspring Farm	Town of Saukville	Direct marketer/deliveries

Source: Local Governments, Southeastern Wisconsin Farm Fresh Atlas, Wisconsin Aquaculture Association, UW-Extension, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

PART 2: OTHER RELATED NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The conservation and wise use of agricultural and natural resources and the preservation of cultural resources are fundamental to achieving strong and stable physical and economic development as well as maintaining community identity, including a rural or "countryside" character. Information on the characteristics and location of such resources in the County is needed to help properly locate future urban and rural land uses to avoid serious environmental problems and to ensure protection of natural resources, including productive soils for farming. Natural features such as wetlands and woodlands adjacent to or within cultivated areas also play an important part in proper land management by acting as groundwater recharge and discharge areas or trapping sediments while slowing stormwater runoff from cultivated areas. Ozaukee County recognizes that agricultural, natural, and cultural resources are limited and very difficult or impossible to replace if damaged or destroyed.

Topography and Geology

The landforms and physical features of Ozaukee County, such as the topography and geology, are important determinants of regional growth and development. The physiography (physical geography) of an area must be considered in land use, transportation, and utility and community facility planning and development, and for its contribution to the natural beauty and overall quality of life in an area. Ozaukee County lies on the western shore of Lake Michigan and directly east of a major subcontinental divide between the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River drainage basins.

Glaciation has largely determined the physiography and topography, as well as the soils, within the County. Generalized land forms and topographic characteristics in 100-foot interval contours are shown on Map 14 in Chapter III of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan. Topographic elevations in the County range from a low of 580 feet above sea level in the Town of Belgium along Lake Michigan to a high of 988 feet above sea level in the southwestern portion of the Town of Cedarburg. In general, the topography of the County is relatively level to gently rolling in some areas, with low lying areas associated with streams and wetlands. The nature of the Lake Michigan shoreline in the County is generally characterized by areas of steep slopes, including bluffs and several ravines.

There is evidence of four major stages of glaciation in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region. The last and most influential in terms of present physiography and topography in Ozaukee County was the Wisconsin stage, which ended in the State about 11,000 years ago. Except for a few isolated spots where dolomite bedrock is exposed at the surface, the entire County is covered with glacial deposits ranging from large boulders to fine grain clays such as silty clay loam till, loam to clay loam, and organic mucky peat. Glacial deposits may be economically significant because some are prime sources of aggregate limestone, which has historically been quarried in the County.

Bedrock conditions and the overlaying surface deposits directly affect the construction costs of urban development such as streets, highways, and utilities, particularly those that involve extensive trenching or tunneling, and also affect the location of onsite wastewater treatment systems. The bedrock formations underlying the County consist of the Milwaukee Formation and Niagara Dolomite. The Milwaukee Formation includes shale and shale limestone and dolomite in the bottom third. It is approximately 130 feet thick and is found in a 23,276 acre area, or about 36 square miles, in the eastern portion of the County along Lake Michigan. Niagara Dolomite is approximately 100 feet thick and is found in a 135,520 acre area, or almost 212 square miles in the central and western portions of the County. Map 15 in Chapter III of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan depicts the depth to bedrock found in the County. Significant geological sites are discussed and identified later in this Chapter on Map 12 and in Table 21.

Data on nonmetallic mines (quarries and pits) and mineral resources in Ozaukee County are provided in Chapter II of the County comprehensive plan. Nonmetallic mineral resources include, but are not limited to, gravel, crushed stone, building (dimension) stone, peat, and clay. Nonmetallic mines in Southeastern Wisconsin provide sand, gravel, and crushed limestone or dolomite for structural concrete and road building; peat for gardening and horticulture; and dimension stone for use in buildings, landscaping, and monuments. Nonmetallic mineral

resources are important economic resources that should be taken into careful consideration whenever land is being considered for development. Mineral resources, like other natural resources, occur where nature put them, which is not always convenient or desirable. Wise management of nonmetallic mineral resources is important to ensure an adequate supply of aggregate at a reasonable cost for new construction and for maintenance of existing infrastructure in the future.

Map 18 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan shows the location of areas that have the potential for commercially workable sources of sand, gravel, clay, and peat. The information was developed by the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey (WGNHS) in 2006 using a variety of sources, including geologic studies⁹, data from Road Material Survey records collected by the WGNHS for the Wisconsin Department of Transportation, information on existing extractive sites, and information on closed extractive sites that were recently active. The sand and gravel potential is shown as high, medium, or low based on the glacial geology (Mickelson and Syverson, 1997). Table 38 in that Chapter sets forth the amount of area identified as having the highest potential for significant deposits of gravel and course to moderate sand ("outwash deposits" on Map 18). Although Map 18 shows potential areas of commercially viable clay and peat deposits, many of the areas so depicted are wetlands or environmentally sensitive areas (such as the Cedarburg Bog) that are unlikely to be disturbed for material extraction.

Map 19 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan shows the location of potential commercially workable sources of stone suitable for crushed or building stone. The information was developed by the WGNHS based on areas underlain by Silurian dolomite within 50 feet of the land surface. Areas in Ozaukee County with bedrock near enough to the surface to economically quarry stone are limited to only about 17,863 acres, or about 12 percent of the County. Areas with bedrock near the surface are a northeasterly extension of the ridge of shallow bedrock that is an important stone-producing area around Sussex and Lannon in Waukesha County.

Water Resources

Water resources consist of lakes, rivers, streams and their associated wetlands, floodplains, and groundwater that form important elements of the natural resource base of the County and local communities. The contribution of these resources is immeasurable to economic development, recreational activity, and aesthetic quality of the County.

Major Watersheds, Subwatersheds, and Subbasins

Map 9 identifies watersheds within Ozaukee County, which include five major watersheds and an area that drains directly into Lake Michigan. All of the major watersheds are part of the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River drainage system. The major watersheds include the Milwaukee River, Sauk Creek, Menominee River, Sheboygan River, and Sucker Creek watersheds. The majority of the County is located in the Milwaukee River watershed which covers 151 square miles, or 64 percent of the County.

A subcontinental divide that separates the Mississippi River and the Great Lakes – St. Lawrence River drainage basins crosses Washington County to the west of Ozaukee County. Ozaukee County is located entirely east of the subcontinental divide. The local governments in the County are therefore not subject to limitations on the use of Lake Michigan water that affect areas west of the divide.

Surface Water Resources-Lakes, Rivers, and Streams

Surface water resources consist of streams, rivers, lakes, and associated floodplains and shorelands. Lakes, rivers, and streams constitute a focal point for water-related recreational activities and greatly enhance the scenic beauty of the environment. However, lakes, rivers, and streams are readily susceptible to degradation through improper land development and management throughout their drainage areas. Water quality can be degraded by excessive pollutant loads, including nutrient loads, from malfunctioning and improperly located onsite wastewater treatment

⁹Bedrock geology from Preliminary Bedrock Maps of Ozaukee County (WOFR 2004-16) by T. Evans, K. Massie-Ferch, and R. Peters, WGNHS.

WATERSHED FEATURES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY



Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and SEWRPC.

Local Government ^a	Woodlands (acres in 2007)	Surface Water (acres in 2005)	Floodplains (acres in 2007)	Nonfarmed Wetlands (acres in 2005)	Farmed Wetlands (acres in 2005)
City of Mequon	1,573	763	3,136	2,872	33
Town of Belgium	452	125	2,531	1,941	42
Town of Cedarburg	832	276	2,185	2,635	56
Town of Fredonia	1,325	327	2,408	3,475	124
Town of Grafton	689	316	1,738	1,592	13
Town of Port Washington	370	40	924	829	52
Town of Saukville	1,449	610	4,052	5,094	61
Other Cities and Villages	433	247	1,409	975	19
Ozaukee County	7,123	2,704	18,385	19,413	400

WOODLANDS, SURFACE WATERS, FLOODPLAINS, AND WETLANDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

^aAcres by community are based on 2010 civil division boundaries.

Source: Federal Emergency Management Agency, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and SEWRPC.

systems, from sanitary sewer overflows, from construction and other urban runoff, and from improper urban and agricultural practices. The water quality of surface waters may also be adversely affected by the excessive development of riparian areas and inappropriate filling of peripheral wetlands, which remove valuable nutrient and sediment traps while adding nutrient and sediment sources. Surface waters, shown on Map 10, covered an area of 2,704 acres, or about 2 percent, of the County in 2005. Table 16 sets forth the acres of surface water, floodplains, and wetlands in each participating local government.

Lakes have been classified by the Regional Planning Commission as being either major or minor. Major lakes have 50 acres or more of surface water area, and minor lakes have less than 50 acres of surface water area. There are three major inland lakes located entirely or partially within the County. Based on year 2005 SEWRPC inventory data, the 57 acre Lac du Cours in the City of Mequon and the 148 acre Mud Lake in the Town of Saukville are wholly located in the County, and the 65 acre Spring Lake in the Town of Fredonia is partially located in Ozaukee County. All three major lakes are located in the Milwaukee River watershed. In addition to the major lakes, there are 546 minor lakes and ponds distributed throughout the County. The entire eastern side of the County is bounded by Lake Michigan with approximately 25 miles of shoreline.

Rivers and streams are classified as either perennial or intermittent. Perennial streams are defined as watercourses that maintain a continuous flow throughout the year. Intermittent streams are defined as watercourses that do not maintain a continuous flow throughout the year. There are approximately 94 miles of perennial streams in the County. Major streams in the Menomonee River watershed, which generally includes the area in the southwestern corner of the County, include the Little Menomonee Creek and Little Menomonee River. Major streams in the Milwaukee River watershed, which generally includes the area in the County, include the Milwaukee River and Cedar Creek. Sauk Creek is the major stream in the Sauk Creek watershed, which generally includes the area in the north central portion of the County. The major stream in the County portion of the Sheboygan River watershed is Belgium Creek, which is a tributary to the Onion River in Sheboygan County. Belgium Creek is identified as an intermittent stream. Sucker Creek is the major stream in the Sucker Creek watershed.

Wetlands

Wetlands are generally defined as areas that have a predominance of hydric soils and that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration that is sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of hydrophytic (water loving) vegetation. The location and extent of wetlands in the County in 2005, as delineated by the Regional Planning Commission under contract with the

SURFACE WATERS, WETLANDS, WOODLANDS, MANAGED FOREST LANDS, AND FLOODPLAINS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY



Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) as part of an update of the Wisconsin Wetlands Inventory, are shown on Map 10. At that time, wetlands covered about 30 square miles, or about 13 percent of the County. As shown on that map, wetlands occur in depressions, near the bottom of slopes, along lakeshores and stream banks, and on land areas that are poorly drained. Map 2 presented earlier shows all saturated soils located within Ozaukee County, which may support additional wetlands as such areas revegetate over time when not disturbed.

Wetlands are important resources for the ecological health and diversity of the County. They provide essential breeding, nesting, resting, and feeding grounds and provide escape cover for many forms of fish and wildlife. Wetlands also contribute to flood control, because such areas naturally serve to store excess runoff temporarily, thereby tending to reduce peak flows. They may further serve as groundwater recharge and discharge areas. In addition, wetlands help to protect downstream water resources from siltation and pollution by trapping sediments, nutrients, and other water pollutants. In consideration of the important natural functions of wetlands areas and their recreational value for hunting, fishing, and wildlife viewing, efforts should be continued to protect these areas by discouraging wetland draining, filling, and urbanization, which can be costly in both monetary and environmental terms.

As shown on Map 10, the Wisconsin Wetlands Inventory includes wetlands that have been identified as "farmed wetlands." These areas meet the definition of a wetland but were being actively farmed in 2005. In 2005, farmed wetlands encompassed about 400 acres in Ozaukee County.

Over the past 20 years, Federal, State, and local government agencies have constructed 329 wetland restorations encompassing about 390 acres on private land in Ozaukee County. Their efforts are continuing with several additional wetlands appearing on the map each year through incentives such as those provided by the NRCS, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), WDNR, and County Priority Watershed and Soil and Water Resource Management Programs. These programs encourage landowners to remove highly erodible land from agricultural use and restore natural plant communities. The restoration program goal is to increase wildlife habitat and plant diversity, reduce soil erosion, improve water quality by filtering pollutants and sediment, and provide stormwater storage to reduce flooding. Wetland restorations completed through 2002 are shown on Map 26 and Table 44 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan.

Floodplains and Shorelands

The floodplains of a river are the wide, flat-to-gently sloping areas usually lying on both sides of a river or stream channel and includes the channel itself. The floodplain, which is normally bounded on its outer edges by higher topography, is gradually formed over a long period of time by the river during flood stage as that river meanders in the floodplain, continuously eroding material from concave banks of meandering loops while depositing it on the convex banks. The flow of a river onto its floodplain is a normal phenomenon and, in the absence of flood control works, can be expected to occur periodically. For planning and regulatory purposes, floodplains are defined as those areas subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event. This event has a 1 percent chance of being equaled or exceeded in any given year. Floodplains are generally not well suited for urban development because of the flood hazard, the presence of high water tables, and/or the presence of wet soils.

Floodplain mapping for Ozaukee County was updated as part of the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) "Map Modernization Program" initiated in 2004. The updated maps were approved by WDNR and FEMA in 2007. The new floodplain delineations are shown on Map 10 and encompass about 29 square miles, or about 12 percent of the County.

Shorelands are defined by the *Wisconsin Statutes* as lands within the following distances from the ordinary high water mark of navigable waters: 1,000 feet from a lake, pond, or flowage; and 300 feet from a river or stream, or to the landward side of the floodplain, whichever distance is greater. In accordance with the requirements set forth in Chapters NR 115 (shoreland regulations) and NR 116 (floodplain regulations) of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, the Ozaukee County shoreland and floodplain zoning ordinance restricts uses in wetlands located in the

shorelands, and limits the uses allowed in the 100-year floodplain to prevent damage to structures and property and to protect floodwater conveyance and storage capacity of floodplains. The ordinance also restricts removal of vegetation and other activities in shoreland areas and requires most structures to be set back a minimum of 75 feet from navigable waters. State law requires that counties administer shoreland and floodplain regulations in unincorporated areas. Shorelands in unincorporated portions of the County are shown later in this Chapter on Map 25.

Under Chapter NR 117 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, cities and villages are required to restrict uses in wetlands five acres or larger located in the shoreland area. The provisions of NR 115, which regulate uses in unincorporated portions of the shoreland, apply in cities and villages only in shoreland areas annexed to a city or village after May 7, 1982. The same floodplain regulations set forth in NR 116 for unincorporated areas also apply within cities and villages. Each city and village administers the floodplain regulations within its corporate limits.

Groundwater Resources

Like surface water, groundwater is susceptible to depletion in quantity and to deterioration in quality as a result of contamination and over-usage. The vulnerability of groundwater to contamination is a combination of several factors, including soil type, subsurface material characteristics, and depth to groundwater levels. Thus, land use planning must appropriately consider the potential impacts of urban and rural development on this important resource.

Recharge of the aquifers underlying Ozaukee County is derived largely by precipitation. Areas of groundwater recharge are shown on Map 11. The Map identifies areas based upon the rate of annual groundwater recharge from precipitation in the County. Areas were placed into the following classifications: very high (more than six inches of recharge per year), high (four to six inches of recharge per year), moderate (three to four inches of recharge per year), and low (less than three inches of recharge per year). The protection of recharge areas classified as having a high or very high recharge potential is particularly important in the long term protection and preservation of groundwater resources in Ozaukee County. The protection of these areas may be expected to be largely achieved through the implementation of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan since that plan recommends preservation of the environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, significant natural areas, and much of the agricultural and open areas of the County. In addition, the use of low impact development designs, cluster developments, and other sustainable development designs have the potential to effectively maintain infiltration capabilities in urban areas.

As indicated in Map 11 and Table 17, about 5 percent of the County is rated "very high" for recharge potential, and about 19 percent is rated "high" for recharge potential. Most of the high and very high recharge potential areas are located along rivers and streams, the Lake Michigan shoreline, and around the Cedarburg Bog. About one-half of the County (about 58 percent) is classified as having "moderate" recharge potential, and about 6 percent is classified as having a "low" potential.

Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas were overlaid on Map 11 to indicate the correlation between such areas and groundwater recharge potential. About 18 percent of the areas classified as having very high water recharge potential are located in environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, and also about 18 percent of areas classified as having high recharge potential are located in such areas.

Forest Resources Woodlands

With sound management, woodlands can serve a variety of beneficial functions. In addition to contributing to clean air and water and regulating surface water runoff, woodlands help maintain a diversity of plant and animal life. The destruction of woodlands, particularly on hillsides, can contribute to excessive stormwater runoff, siltation of lakes and streams, and loss of wildlife habitat. For the purposes of this report, woodlands are defined

GROUNDWATER RECHARGE POTENTIAL IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2008



Water Dasharra	Area Within Ea	ch Classification	Portion Within Environmental Corridor and Isolated Natural Resource Area		
Classification	Acres	Percent	Acres	Percent ^b	
Very High	7,379	4.9	1,329	18.0	
High	28,237	18.7	5,036	17.8	
Moderate	86,612	57.5	4,910	5.7	
Low	8,387	5.6	153	1.8	
Undetermined ^c	19,979	13.3	17,465	87.4	
Total	150,594	100.0	28,893 ^d		

CLASSIFICATION OF POTENTIAL WATER RECHARGE AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2008

^aPercent of County within each classification.

^bPercent of each classification included in an environmental corridor (primary or secondary) and isolated natural resource area.

^cAreas for which the recharge potential is undetermined are primarily wetlands.

^dThe acreage does not reflect the total acreage within environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in 2000, as shown in Table 20 (28,937 acres), due to differences in the base mapping used for the farmland preservation plan (cadastral-based mapping) and the groundwater recharge analysis (digital versions of USGS quadrangle maps).

Source: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey and SEWRPC.

as upland¹⁰ areas of one acre or more in area, having 17 or more trees per acre, each deciduous tree measuring at least four inches in diameter 4.5 feet above the ground, and having canopy coverage of 50 percent or greater. Coniferous tree plantations and reforestation projects are also classified as woodlands. As shown on Map 10 and indicated in Table 16, woodlands encompassed 11 square miles, or about 5 percent of the County, in 2007.

Managed Forest Lands

The Managed Forest Law (MFL) program, also called the Managed Forest Land program, is an incentive program intended to encourage sustainable forestry on private woodlands in Wisconsin with a primary focus on timber production. The MFL offers private owners of woodlands a reduced property tax rate as an incentive to participate. All Wisconsin private woodland owners with at least 10 acres of contiguous forestland in the same city, village, or civil town are eligible to apply provided the lands meet the other criteria: 1) have a minimum of 80 percent of the land in forest, 2) the land is primarily used for growing forest products (croplands, pastures, orchards, etc. are not eligible), and 3) there are no recreational uses that interfere with forest management.

Participants enter into a 25 or 50 year contract. If an agreement is terminated before its end, a withdrawal penalty is assessed. Starting with 2008 entries, applications must include a management plan written by a Certified Plan Writer. Currently, a landowner can close 160 acres per municipality to the public. Any land enrolled over that 160 acres must be open to the public. The tax benefit is substantially greater for enrolled acreage that is open to the public. Map 10 shows the general location of 58 participants enrolled in the MFL program in 2005; however, the actual size of the enrolled property is likely smaller than those shown on the Map.

Natural Areas, Critical Species Habitats, and Geological Sites

A comprehensive update to the inventory of natural and geological resources in the County was conducted by SEWRPC in 2009 as part of an amendment to the regional natural areas and critical species habitat protection and management plan.¹¹ This update systematically evaluated physical changes to high-quality natural areas, critical species habitat, and sites having geological significance within the Region, including Ozaukee County, and reflects new findings since the preparation of the original natural areas plan.

¹⁰Lowland woods, such as tamarack swamps, are classified as wetlands.

¹¹SEWRPC Planning Report No. 42, A Regional Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin, September 1997, as amended in 2010.

Natural Areas

Natural areas are tracts of land or water so little modified by human activity, or sufficiently recovered from the effects of such activity, that they contain intact native plant and animal communities believed to be representative of the landscape before European settlement. Natural areas are classified into one of three categories: natural areas of statewide or greater significance (NA-1), natural areas of countywide or regional significance (NA-2), and natural areas of local significance (NA-3). Classification of an area into one of these three categories is based on consideration of the diversity of plant and animal species and community type present, the structure and integrity of the native plant or animal community, the uniqueness of the natural features, the size of the site, and the educational value. Fifty natural areas lying wholly or partially in the County have been identified. These sites, which together encompass 7,657 acres, or about 5 percent of the County, are shown on Map 12 and described in Table 18.

Critical Species Habitat and Aquatic Sites

Critical species habitat sites consist of areas outside natural areas which are important for their ability to support rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species. Such areas constitute "critical" habitat that is important to ensure the survival of a particular species or group of species of special concern. A total of 17 sites supporting threatened or rare plant or bird species have been identified in Ozaukee County. These sites encompass an area of 729 acres and are shown on Map 12 and described in Table 19. There are also 22 aquatic sites supporting threatened or rare fish, herptile, or mussel species in the County. There are about 63 stream miles and 406 lake acres of critical aquatic habitat in the County, which are shown on Map 12 and described in Table 20.

Significant Geological Sites

A total of 16 sites of geological importance, including one glacial feature and 15 bedrock geology sites, were identified in the County in 2009. The geological sites included in the inventory were selected on the basis of scientific importance, significance in industrial history, natural aesthetics, ecological qualities, educational value, and public access potential. The 16 sites selected in Ozaukee County include five sites of statewide significance (GA-1), six sites of countywide or regional significance (GA-2), and five sites of local significance (GA-3). Together, these sites encompass about 274 acres in Ozaukee County. Map 12 shows the locations of geological sites, and Table 21 sets forth a description of each site.

Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas

One of the most important tasks completed under the regional planning program for Southeastern Wisconsin has been the identification and delineation of those areas in which concentrations of the best remaining elements of the natural resource base occur. The preservation of such areas in essentially natural, open uses is vital to maintaining a high level of environmental quality in the Region, protecting its natural heritage and beauty, and providing recreational opportunities in scenic outdoor settings.

Identification of environmental corridors is based upon the presence of one or more of the following important elements of the natural resource base: 1) lakes, rivers, and streams and associated shorelands and floodplains; 2) wetlands; 3) woodlands; 4) prairies; 5) wildlife habitat areas; 6) wet (hydric), poorly drained, and organic soils; and 7) rugged terrain and high relief topography. The presence of elements that are closely related to the natural resource base, including park and open space sites, natural areas, historic sites, and scenic views, are also considered in the delineation of environmental corridors. Most of the natural resource elements which form the basis for corridor delineation have been described in this Chapter. The Ozaukee County park and open space plan adopted in 2011 further describes scenic overlooks within the County, as shown on Map 10 in Chapter II of that document, and also the current protection status of environmental corridors and isolated natural resources as reflected on Map 12 in the same Chapter of the park and open space plan report.

The mapping of these natural resource and resource-related elements results in a concentration of such elements in an essentially linear pattern of relatively narrow, elongated areas which have been termed "environmental

NATURAL AREAS, CRITICAL SPECIES HABITAT SITES, AQUATIC HABITAT SITES, AND SIGNIFICANT GEOLOGICAL SITES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY



NATURAL AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2009

Number						
on		Classification			Size	
Map 12	Area Name	Code ^a	Location	Ownership	(acres)	Description and Comments
1	Fairy Chasm State Natural Area	NA-1 (SNA)	19N, R22E Sections 32, 33 City of Mequon T8N, R22E Sections 4, 5 Village of Bayside (Milwaukee County)	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust and other private	47 (plus 33 in Milwaukee County	An 80- to 100-foot-deep wooded ravine which extends approximately 1.25 miles west from its confluence with Lake Michigan. The steep slopes support white pine, white cedar, and yellow birch on the north-facing slopes and dry-mesic hardwoods on the more exposed south-facing slopes. The ravine has special significance because cold air drainage enables several plant species with more northerly affinities to occur this far south. The flora includes the State-designated endangered pine-drops (<i>Pterospora</i> <i>andromedea</i>). The area extends south into Milwaukee County
2	Kurtz Woods State Natural Area	NA-1 (SNA)	T10N, R21E Section 1 Town of Grafton	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust and other private; protected with conservation easement	70	A mature southern mesic hardwoods that is a remnant of the once- extensive pre-settlement forest which covered this part of the Region. Dominated by sugar maple, beech, and white ash, with a moderately rich ground flora. Several small, dry kettle depressions are present. The woods have been undisturbed for at least 75 years. The younger woods to the southeast are important as a buffer
3	Riveredge Creek and Ephemeral Pond State Natural Area	NA-1 (SNA)	T11N, R21E Sections 7, 8 Town of Saukville	Riveredge Nature Center and other private; protected with conservation easement	100	Second-order streams of exceptionally high water quality, fed by three first-order branches, all of which are spring-fed. Contains a stable, well-balanced, diverse fauna. Surrounding vegetation is a complex of second-growth northern wet-mesic forest, conifer swamp, shrub-carr, alder thicket, and young maple-beech and aspen woods. Contains a good population of the forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>), a State-designated threatened species
4	Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area	NA-1 (SNA)	T11N, R21E Sections 19, 20, 21, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 Town of Saukville	Department of Natural Resources, University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee, and private	2,063	One of the largest and least disturbed bogs in eastern Wisconsin, containing an extensive conifer swamp forest, open bog, a shallow hard-water drainage lake, and mesic woods on isolated islands. A portion of the area contains a string bog, characterized by noticeable ridges running perpendicular to water flow. This is the southern-most example in the world. The very high species diversity includes a large number of regionally rare species, many of which are northern relicts. A National Natural Landmark
5	Sapa Spruce Bog State Natural Area and Black Spruce Bog	NA-1 (SNA)	T11N, R21E Section 30 Town of Saukville	University of Wisconsin and private; protected with conservation easement	63	High-quality acid bog dominated by black spruce at one of its southernmost locations in Wisconsin. The rich, diverse flora includes at least six species of sphagnum moss. Includes privately owned bog adjoining to west

Table 18 (continued)

Number on		Classification	1		Size	
6 6	Area Name Huiras Lake Woods and Bog	NA-1	Location T12N, R21E Sections 8, 9, 10, 16 Town of Fredonia	Ownership Department of Natural Resources, Milwaukee Jewish Welfare Fund, and other private; protected with conservation easement by Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	440	Description and Comments Large lowland and upland forested area that has been relatively undisturbed since last cut. A bog is located in the southern portion. Good diversity of tree and ground-layer species. The small, landlocked seepage lake is valuable for waterfowl migration and nesting. A number of northern relict species are present. Of particular interest is the presence of mature, native white pines on several of the upland islands
	Subtotal	NA-1	6 sites		2,783	
7	Pigeon Creek Low and Mesic Woods	NA-2	T9N, R21E Section 10 City of Mequon	Private	82	A combination of lowland hardwoods, wet-mesic woods, and upland mesic woods, much of which borders the cold, clear, fast waters of Pigeon Creek. On the grounds of a former fox farm. Known to support four critical plant species: the State- designated endangered heart-leaved plantain (<i>Plantago cordata</i>); the State-designated threatened snow trillium (<i>Trilliumnivale</i>) and forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>); and the State- designated special concern chinkapin oak (<i>Quercus</i> <i>muehlenbergii</i>)
8	Donges Bay Gorge	NA-2	T9N, R22E Section 33 City of Mequon	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	22	A deep, steep-sided clay ravine on the Lake Michigan shore, containing a white pine and beech forest. Northern relict species are present. The area has suffered from erosion and encroaching residential development; additionally, over- grazing by deer has seriously affected the native ground flora
9	Abbott Woods and Ravine	NA-2	T10N, R22E Sections 21, 28 Town of Grafton	Private; protected with conservation easement	31	Mesic woods and white cedar-covered ravines along Lake Michigan
10	Milwaukee River Mesic Woods	NA-2	T11N, R21E Section 3 Town of Saukville T12N, R21E Section 34 Town of Fredonia	Ozaukee County and private	382	Morainal deposits along a two-mile stretch of the Milwaukee River support moderate- to good-quality upland mesic woods, with lowland hardwoods in depressions. Species diversity is generally good throughout
11	Ducks Limited Bog	NA-2	T11N, R21E Section 5 Town of Saukville	Ducks Limited and other private	21	Good-quality sphagnum bog on north side of a shallow lake and bordered by a deep moat. Typical acid-bog species present include leather leaf, round-leaved sundew, snake-mouth orchid, grass-pink orchid, bog rosemary, blueberry, winterberry, pitcher plant, and cranberry. Area south of the lake is more disturbed
12	Riveredge Mesic Woods	NA-2	T11N, R21E Sections 6, 7 Town of Saukville	Riveredge Nature Center and other private; protected with conservation easement	212	Good-quality regenerating stand of mesic woods and lowland hardwoods bordering the Milwaukee River. Trees are medium-aged. A variety of habitats supports a rich species complement, including several uncommon species. Disturbed by highway and residences in the southern portion of the woods. Area north of Milwaukee River is wetter and more disturbed, but still diverse. Much of woods owned by Riveredge Nature Center

Table 18 (continued)

Number						
on Map 12	Area Name	Classification Code ^a	Location	Ownership	Size (acres)	Description and Comments
13	Kinnamon Conifer Swamp	NA-2	T11N, R21E Sections 18, 19 Town of Saukville	Private	391	A large wooded lowland, containing a combination of good-quality northern wet-mesic forest of white cedar and northern hardwoods swamp of black ash. Low glacial ridges within the swamp support mesic upland woods. Past disturbance appears, overall, to be minimal. The good, diverse northern understory includes a number of regionally uncommon species
14	Max's Bog	NA-2	T11N, R21E Section 20 Town of Saukville	Private and State of Wisconsin Public Trust Lands	30	Two small, undeveloped, shallow lakes surrounded by good-quality bog mats. The area contains a number of species with more northern affinities
15	South Conifer Swamp	NA-2	T11N, R21E Section 20 Town of Saukville	Private and State of Wisconsin Public Trust Lands	53	Good-quality conifer swamp containing typical northern species. One of the few sites in the Region in which black spruce is present. Small lake is bordered by a narrow cattail fringe. Contains headwaters of Cedarburg Bog
16	Cedarburg Beech Woods State Natural Area	NA-2 (SNA)	T11N, R21E Section 30 Town of Saukville	University of Wisconsin- Milwaukee and private	134	Good-quality, mature, beech- and sugar maple-dominated southern mesic forest in a moraine area of low gravelly hills and kettle holes. Disturbance, including past selective logging and grazing, appears to be minimal. Grades into lowland forest to north and northeast. Historically a site of scientific research
17	Janik's Woods	NA-2	T12N, R21E Sections 29, 30 Town of Fredonia	Private	163	A relatively large, good-quality woodlot that is recovering from past disturbance. Southern portion is an upland containing medium-aged red oak, sugar maple, and basswood, with a diverse ground flora. Lowland hardwoods to the north contain scattered conifers
18	Harrington Beach Lacustrine Forest	NA-2	T12N, R23E Section 19 Town of Belgium	Department of Natural Resources	197	Moderate- to good-quality mature second-growth northern wet-mesic forest, located just west of the shoreline beach ridge. Dominant trees include green and black ashes, basswood, and white cedar. This is a regionally rare community type, heavily used by migratory birds
	Subtotal	NA-2	12 sites		1,718	
19	Highland Road Woods	NA-3	T9N, R21E Section 11 City of Mequon	Private	53	Mesic woods of moderate quality dominated by sugar maple, beech, and basswood. Low areas contain ephemeral ponds
20	Pigeon Creek Maple Woods	NA-3	T9N, R21E Section 15 City of Mequon	Private	13	A small but good-quality mesic woods on sloping uplands above Pigeon Creek. Ground flora is very rich and diverse, including a large population of twinleaf (<i>Jeffersonia</i> <i>diphylla</i>), a State-designated special concern species
21	Solar Heights Low Woods	NA-3	T9N, R21E Sections 20, 21 City of Mequon	Private and City of Mequon	116	Disturbed floodplain forest dominated by red and silver maples and yellow birch. Changing water levels and Dutch elm disease have altered the canopy. Native species diversity is low, and exotic species are proliferating
Table 18 (continued)

Number						
on Map 12	Area Name	Classification Code ^a	Location	Ownership	Size (acres)	Description and Comments
22	Triple Woods	NA-3	T9N, R21E Section 31 City of Mequon	Private and City of Mequon	53	Upland mesic forest of sugar maple and beech. Despite past logging, the spring flora is relatively diverse. Offers protection to tributaries of the Little Menomonee River
23	Ville du Parc Riverine Forest	NA-3	T9N, R22E Sections 18, 19 City of Mequon	City of Mequon and private	111	One of the last remnants of riverine forest along this portion of the Milwaukee River. Contains old river channels. The woods is mostly second-growth, with a mixture of upland and lowland species
24	Mequon Wetland	NA-3	T9N, R22E Section 20 City of Mequon	Private	76	A mixed wetland area consisting of deep and shallow marsh, fresh (wet) meadow, shrub-carr, and young wet to wet-mesic lowland hardwoods. Wetland filling and water-level changes due to ditching and channel realignment have disturbed the area
25	Mole Creek Swamp/Pleasant Valley Park Woods	NA-3	T10N, R21E Section 2 Town of Cedarburg	Town and City of Cedarburg; WE Energies; and private	150	Includes a disturbed, low, wooded area bordering Mole Creek, dominated by green ash, alder, and red-osier dogwood; a black ash—mixed hardwood swamp; and a good-quality mesic woods containing a number of Regionally uncommon species
26	Cedar-Sauk Low Woods	NA-3	T10N, R21E Sections 5, 6 Town of Cedarburg T11N, R21E Section 31 Town of Saukville T11N, R20E Section 36 Town of Trenton (Washington County)	Department of Natural Resources and private	210 (plus 14 in Washington County)	Lowland hardwood forest of silver maple, green and black ashes, and American elm, with evidence of abundant past disturbances, including grazing, power-line right-of-way, and two highways. Stream flows through area from Cedarburg Bog
27	Grafton Woods (Bratt Woods)	NA-3	T10N, R21E Section 13 T10N, R22E Section 18 Town of Grafton	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust; protected with conservation easement	18	Small mesic woods on east side of Milwaukee River. Despite history of grazing and selective cutting, has a good species diversity, including American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum</i> <i>latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
28	Sherman Road Woods	NA-3	T10N, R21E Section 19 Town of Cedarburg	Private	71	Lowland hardwood forest with much second growth due to past grazing
29	Five Corners Swamp	NA-3	T10N, R21E Section 20 Town of Cedarburg	Department of Natural Resources and private	175	A large lowland hardwood forest that is suffering from distur- bance, including selective cutting and a network of wide trails. Dominant trees are red and silver maples and cotton wood. A windstorm in June 1991 snapped or uprooted a large number of mature trees
30	Cedar Creek Forest	NA-3	T10N, R21E Section 23 Town of Cedarburg	Private	23	Sugar maple and beech woods on west bank of Cedar Creek. Threatened by encroaching residential development
31	Cedar Heights Gorge	NA-3	T10N, R22E Section 3 City of Port Washington	Private	9	Disturbed, narrow, steep-sided gorge leading to Lake Michigan. Almost complete dominance by white cedar

Table 18 (continued)

Number						
on Map 12	Area Name	Classification Code ^a	Location	Ownership	Size (acres)	Description and Comments
32	Ulao Lowland Forest	NA-3	T10N, R22E Sections 4, 5, 8, 9, 17 Town of Grafton	Private	342	A large lowland hardwoods area, dominated by red and silver maples and black ash. Adversely affected by changing water levels, selective cutting, and Dutch elm disease, which have opened the canopy. Marshy stands occur throughout
33	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Area	NA-3	T10N, R22E Sections 9, 10 Town of Grafton	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	67	Mix of flooded swamp, old field, clay banks, and young upland woods managed for waterfowl and wildlife. There is a relatively large population of the Regionally uncommon fringed gentian (<i>Gentianopsis crinita</i>)
34	Lion's Den Gorge	NA-3	T10N, R22E Section 10 Town of Grafton	Ozaukee County, Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, and private; includes conservation easement	21	Deep ravine on Lake Michigan shore. Dominated by white cedar and hardwoods, with a relatively good-quality herb layer, including a few northern relicts
35	Hansen's Lake Wetland	NA-3	T11N, R21E Section 4 Town of Saukville	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	16	Small but good-quality lake surrounded by cattails, shrub- carr, and lowland hardwoods, with scattered tamaracks. Lake is stocked with bluegills
36	Knollwood Road Bog	NA-3	T11N, R21E Section 19 Town of Saukville	Private and State of Wisconsin Public Trust Lands; protected with conservation easement	9	Small lake surrounded by a sphagnum mat, shallow marsh, and lowland hardwoods
37	Hawthorne Drive Forest	NA-3	T11N, R22E Section 6 Town of Port Washington	Private	55	Wet-mesic red maple and American elm forest, with an upland forest of red oak, beech, and basswood to the south. Canopy has been opened by disease and logging
38	Spring Lake Beech Forest	NA-3	T12N, R21E Section 2 Town of Fredonia	Private	62	Small mesic hardwood forest dominated by small- to medium- sized beech, sugar maple, basswood, and white ash, with a long history of selective cutting
39	Spring Lake Marsh	NA-3	T12N, R21E Section 2 Town of Fredonia	Private and State of Wisconsin Public Trust Lands	21	Good-quality wetland complex bordering a clear, shallow lake. Good habitat diversity includes shrub-carr, sedge meadow, shallow marsh, and cedar- tamarack swamp
40	County Line Low Woods	NA-3	T12N, R21E Sections 4, 5 Town of Fredonia T13N, R21E Sections 32, 33 Town of Sherman (Sheboygan County)	Private; protected with conservation easement	225 (plus 71 acres in Sheboygan County)	Large but mostly young lowland hardwoods of mixed composition and having a history of disturbance. Many openings in canopy allow dense undergrowth. Extends north into Sheboygan County
41	Beekeeper Bog	NA-3	T12N, R21E Section 5 Town of Fredonia	Ozaukee County and private; protected with conservation easement	21	Good example of a typical kettle- hole bog with shallow marsh, shrub-carr, and northern wet- mesic white cedar forest. The southeastern portion has been ditched. Contains a good number of species with more northerly affinities
42	Department of Natural Resources Lowlands	NA-3	T12N, R21E Section 7 Town of Fredonia	Department of Natural Resources and private	187	Primarily a disturbed lowland hardwood forest with streams. Ponds have been dredged by Department of Natural Resources

Table 18 (continued)

Number						
on Map 12	Area Namo	Classification	Location	Ownorship	Size	Description and Commonts
43	Pioneer Road Lowlands	NA-3	T12N, R21E Sections 8, 17 Town of Fredonia	Private; protected with conservation easement	93	A low, wet woodlot with a history of disturbance. North half contains a dense stand of tamarack, cedar, and black ash, with some large individual trees. South half has large scattered trees and thick undergrowth
44	Cedar Valley Swamp	NA-3	T12N, R21E Sections 10, 11, 15 Town of Fredonia	Private	140	An irregularly shaped lowland area disturbed by Dutch elm disease, logging, and water-level changes. Dominated by black ash, red maple, and white cedar, with small areas of tamarack. A small upland island in the center contains mature trees
45	Evergreen Road Bog	NA-3	T12N, R21E Section 14 Town of Fredonia	Private and State of Wisconsin Public Trust Lands	44	Good-quality tamarack-cedar bog, with a large sedge-shrub area to the north and an upland hardwoods to the southeast. Threatened by residential development
46	Kohler Road Woods	NA-3	T12N, R21E Sections 15, 22 Town of Fredonia	Private	128	Primarily a low, wet woods of medium-aged red and silver maples, yellow birch, and black ash. South half is younger, with many cut stumps
47	Waubeka Low Woods	NA-3	T12N, R21E Sections 31, 32 Town of Fredonia	Ozaukee County and private; protected with conservation easement	162	Primarily a wooded lowland of tamarack, black ash, and yellow birch, but with glacial ridges containing upland trees. There is a history of disturbance
48	Cedar Grove Swamp	NA-3	T12N, R22E Sections 2, 3 Town of Belgium	Private and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	185	Extensive second-growth forest on ditched lacustrine flats with clayey soils. Dominated by red and silver maples, black ash, yellow birch, American elm, and swamp white oak. Repeatedly logged and encroached on by agriculture and ditching
49	Belgium Swamp— North	NA-3	T12N, R22E Section 27 Town of Belgium	Private	152	An extensive, but young, lacustrine forest 2.5 miles from Lake Michigan, with American elm, black ash, and red and silver maples. Disease, logging, and wind throw have opened the canopy, permitting a brushy understory to develop
50	Belgium Swamp— South	NA-3	T12N, R22E Section 34 Town of Belgium	Private	148	Low, flat, wet forested area of black ash and silver and red maples, with some yellow birch and basswood. Old windfalls and dead standing trees are common. There is a history of disturbance, resulting in a very open and brushy appearance
	Subtotal	NA-3	32 sites		3,156	
	Total	All Natural Areas	50 sites		7,657	

^a NA-1 identifies Natural Area sites of statewide or greater significance.

NA-2 identifies Natural Area sites of countywide or regional significance.

NA-3 identifies Natural Area sites of local significance.

SNA, or State Natural Area, identifies those sites officially designated as State Natural Areas by the State of Wisconsin Natural Areas Preservation Council.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and SEWRPC.

CRITICAL SPECIES HABITAT SITES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2009

Number					
Number on				Size	
Map12	Area Name	Location	Ownership	(acres)	Description and Comments
51	Mee-Kwon Park Woods	T9N, R21E Section 10 City of Mequon	Ozaukee County and private	40	Mesic woodland and shrubland partially within county park supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum</i> <i>latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
52	Highland Woods	T9N, R21E Section 15 City of Mequon	City of Mequon; conservation easement with Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	48	Small, moderate-quality mesic woodlot supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum latifolium</i>), a State- designated special concern species
53	Garvey Woods	T9N, R21E Section 27 City of Mequon	Private	10	Moderate-quality mesic woodlot supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum latifolium</i>), a State- designated special concern species
54	Gengler's Woods	T9N, R21E Section 33 City of Mequon	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	4	Small beech-maple woods on grounds of Mequon Nature Preserve supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
55	Stauss Woods	T9N, R21E Section 33 City of Mequon	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	8	Small, but relatively good quality complex of beech-maple woods and lowland hardwoods on grounds of Mequon Nature Preserve supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
56	Union Pacific Right-of-Way	T9N, R22E Section 5 City of Mequon	Private	1	Small portion of railway right-of-way supporting a population of the State-designated threatened forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>)
57	Eastbrook Road Woods	T9N, R22E Section 19 City of Mequon	Private	9	Small mesic woodlot supporting a good population of the State- designated threatened forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>)
58	Pecard Sedge Meadow	T9N, R22E Section 19 City of Mequon	Private	16	Moderate-quality sedge meadow and shallow marsh supporting a population of the State-designated threatened cream gentian (<i>Gentiana alba</i>)
59	Bike Path Island	T10N, R21E Section 13 Town of Grafton	Bureau of Land Management	1	Island in Milwaukee River supports sweet Indian plantain (<i>Hasteola suaveolens</i>), a State-designated special concern species
60	Woodland Meadows Woods	T10N, R21E Section 17 Town of Cedarburg	Private	40	Moderate-quality mesic and wet-mesic forested woodlot supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum</i> <i>latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
61	Cedarburg Woods—West	T10N, R21E Section 22 Town of Cedarburg	Private	4	Small mesic woodlot Supporting populations of goldenseal (<i>Hydrastis canadensis</i>) and great waterleaf (<i>Hydrophyllum appendiculatum</i>), State-designated special concern species
62	Port Washington Clay Banks	T10N, R22E Sections 3, 10 City of Port Washington	Private	35	Semi-wooded upland clay banks above Lake Michigan provide critical bird species habitat for the short-eared owl (<i>Asio flammeus</i>), a State-designated special concern species
63	Cedar-Sauk Upland Woods	T11N, R21E Section 33 Town of Saukville	Private	44	Mesic woodlot being disturbed by residential development supporting a population of American gromwell (<i>Lithospermum</i> <i>latifolium</i>), a State-designated special concern species
64	Port Washington Beach and Dunes	T11N, R22E Sections 1, 11 Town of Port Washington	Private	29	A stretch of beach and dunes containing several critical plant species restricted in Wisconsin to the Lake Michigan shore containing populations of State-designated threatened sand- reed grass (<i>Calamovilfa longifolia</i>) and thick-spike wheat grass (<i>Ellytrigia dasystachya</i>) and a population of sea rocket (Cakile edentula), a State-designated special concern species
65	Sauk Creek Nature Preserve	T11N, R22E Section 29 Town of Port Washington	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust	13	Woodland bordering Sauk Creek containing a population of the State-designated threatened forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>)
66	Heinen Woods	T12N, R21E Section 26 Town of Fredonia	Private	32	Small population of State-designated threatened forked aster (<i>Aster furcatus</i>) within a woodlot of moderate quality
67	Harrington Beach Old Fields	T12N, R22E Section 24 Town of Belgium	Department of Natural Resources	395	Large artificial grassland area that provides nesting habitat for grassland breeding birds including the upland sandpiper (<i>Bartramia longicauda</i>), a State designated special concern species
Total	17 sites			729	

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and SEWRPC.

CRITICAL AQUATIC HABITAT AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1994

STREAMS

Number on Map 12	Stream	Size (stream miles)	Rank ^a	Description and Comments
68	Milwaukee River main stem upstream from STH 33	11.2 miles	AQ-1 (RSH)	Important reservoir for critical fish species, including the striped shiner, an endangered fish species, and three threatened fish species
69	Milwaukee River downstream from STH 33 to STH 57 (includes Mole Creek)	9.9 miles	AQ-1 (RSH)	Important reservoir for the striped shiner; good overall fish population and diversity
70	Riveredge Creek	2.9 miles	AQ-1 (RSH)	A slow, cold, spring-fed stream, with excellent water quality; contains a very diverse invertebrate assemblage; a designated State Natural Area
71	Cedar Creek downstream from STH 60	6.7 miles	AQ-2 (RSH)	Good fish population and diversity, including three critical fish species; good assemblage of mussel species
72	Milwaukee River downstream from STH 33 to main stem	4.4 miles [°]	AQ-2 (RSH)	Excellent Biotic Index Rating, ^d critical fish species present; good assemblage of mussel species
73	Milwaukee River downstream from STH 57 to CTH C	4.5 miles	AQ-2 (RSH)	Critical fish species present, including the striped shiner; Biotic Index Rating ^d of Good
74	North Branch, Milwaukee River	0.8 miles ^c	AQ-2 (RSH)	Good overall fish population and diversity, including critical fish species; Biotic Index Rating ^e of Good to Excellent
75	Pigeon Creek	4.4 miles	AQ-2 (RSH)	Good overall fish population and diversity, including critical fish species; critical plant species adjacent to and within the channel
76	North Branch, Menomonee River upstream from STH 145	1.1 miles [°]	AQ-3	Bisects identified Natural Areas
77	Fish Creek	1.2 miles ^c	AQ-3	Bisects Fairy Chasm State Natural Area
78	Cedar Creek downstream from Little Cedar Creek inflow to CTH M	1.9 miles [°]	AQ-3	Good fish population and diversity; bisects Jackson Swamp, an identified Natural Area
79	Cedar Creek downstream from CTH M to STH 60	8.4 miles ^c	AQ-3	Good fish population and diversity; good mussel species assemblage
80	Milwaukee River downstream from CTH C to Mequon Road	7.4 miles	AQ-3 (RSH)	Good fish population and diversity and mussel species richness
81	Milwaukee River downstream from Mequon Road to Brown Deer Road	2.5 miles ^c	AQ-3 (RSH)	Biotic Index Rating ^d of Good; critical fish species present
	Total - 14 stream reaches	67.3 miles		

Table 20 (continued)

LAKES

Number		Size	_	_
on Map 12	Lake	(acreage)	Rank ^a	Description ^D and Comments
82	Long Lake	34 acres	AQ-1 (RSH)	A shallow seepage lake with an undeveloped shoreline and wilderness character within the Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area; a variety of plant communities surrounds the Lake; critical herptile habitat
83	Mud Lake	245 acres	AQ-1 (RSH)	A shallow, undeveloped seepage lake within the Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area; a variety of plant communities surrounds the lake
84	Big Bienborn Lake (Horn Lake)	12 acres	AQ-2 (RSH)	A seepage lake adjacent to the Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area
85	Watts Lake	7 acres	AQ-2	A deep spring lake within the Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area; an undeveloped shoreline
86	Quarry Lake	19 acres	AQ-3	An abandoned limestone quarry which is an identified Geological Area site adjacent to an identified Natural Area, Harrington Beach Lacustrine Forest
87	Huiras Lake	26 acres	AQ-3	An undeveloped seepage lake encompassed by an identified Natural Area, Huiras Lake Woods and Bog
88	Spring Lake	50 acres ^c	AQ-3	A seepage lake with adjacent wetlands important for breeding and feeding habitat for wildlife
89	Unnamed lake	13 acres	AQ-3 (RSH)	A seepage lake with suitable habitat for Blanding's turtle, a threatened species
	Total - 8 lakes	406 acres		

^aAQ-1 identifies Aquatic Area sites of statewide or greater significance.

AQ-2 identifies Aquatic Area sites of countywide or regional significance.

AQ-3 identifies Aquatic Area sites of local significance.

RSH, or Rare Species Habitat, identifies those aquatic areas which support rare, endangered, threatened, or "special concern" species officially designated by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

^b"Seepage lakes" are lakes which have no inlet or outlet and whose main source of water is direct precipitation and runoff supplemented by groundwater. "Spring lakes" are lakes which have no inlet but do have an outlet and whose main source of water is groundwater flowing directly into the basin and from the immediate drainage area.

^cLake or stream is located partially within Ozaukee County. Number refers to acreage or stream miles located within the County.

^dBased upon the Hilsenhoff Biotic Index (HBI) discussed in Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Technical Bulletin No. 132, Using a Biotic Index to Evaluate Water Quality in Streams, 1982.

^eBased upon the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) discussed in U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, General Technical Report NC-149, Using the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI) to Measure Environmental Quality in Warmwater Streams of Wisconsin, April 1992.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources and SEWRPC.

corridors" by SEWRPC.¹² Primary environmental corridors include a wide variety of the most important natural resources and are at least 400 acres in size, two miles long, and 200 feet wide. Secondary environmental corridors serve to link primary environmental corridors, or encompass areas containing concentrations of natural resources between 100 and 400 acres in size. Where secondary environmental corridors serve to link primary corridors, no minimum area or length criteria apply. Secondary environmental corridors that do not connect primary corridors must be at least 100 acres in size and one mile long. An isolated concentration of natural resource features,

¹²A detailed description of the process of refining the delineation of environmental corridors in Southeastern Wisconsin is presented in SEWRPC Technical Record, Vol. 4, No. 2 (March 1981), pp. 1-21.

SIGNIFICANT GEOLOGIC SITES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2009

Number on Map 12	Site Name	Classification Code ^a	Site Area (acres)	Location	Ownership	Description
90	Thiensville Roadcut and Quarry	GA-1	9	T9N, R21E, Section 10 City of Mequon	Ozaukee County and private	Road cut and small old quarry provide only sizable exposure of the Devonian Thiensville Formation anywhere
91	Ozaukee Buried Forest	GA-1	32	T9N, R21E, Section 17 City of Mequon	Private	Old water-filled sand quarry contains remnants of ancient forest
92	Milwaukee River- Grafton Outcrops and Lime Kiln Park	GA-1	57	T10N, R21E, Section 24 Village of Grafton	Ozaukee County and private	Undisturbed, 40-foot-high rock outcrops along the Milwaukee River, containing the best and most extensive exposures of Silurian Racine Dolomite in the Region. Historically used for scientific research
93	Cedar Creek- Anschuetz Quarries	GA-1	5	T10N, R21E, Section 26 Town of Cedarburg	Private	Outcrops and abandoned quarries along Cedar Creek that were main supply of stone for area buildings
94	Phyllocarid Quarry	GA-1	4	T12N, R21E, Section 29 Town of Fredonia	Private	Small, partially water-filled quarry in Upper Silurian Waubakee Dolomite. Only site in Wisconsin where Silurian phylloc arid fossils have been found
95	Virmond Park Clay Banks	GA-2	10	T9N, R22E, Section 28 City of Mequon	Ozaukee County	Clay banks along Lake Michigan shoreline
96	Groth Quarry	GA-2	7	T10N, R21E, Section 35 City of Cedarburg	City of Cedarburg	One of the more important geological sites in the area because of its prominence in the fossil reef studies of eminent geologists. Contains unique reef fossil biota
97	Druecker's Lime Kiln	GA-2	1	T11N, R22E, Section 9 Town of Port Washington	Private	Nineteenth-century patented lime kiln, possibly only remaining example
98	Sauk Creek	GA-2	3	T11N, R22E, Section 29 Town of Port Washington	Private	Unquarried riverbank and low falls exhibiting natural outcrops of Silurian Racine Dolomite
99	Harrington Beach State Park Quarry	GA-2	25	T12N, R23E, Section 19 Town of Belgium	Department of Natural Resources	Large, water-filled quarry and restored pot kiln, and extensive exposures of Devonian rock containing abundant, highly diverse marine fossils
100	Little Menonomee River Reef District	GA-2	1	T9N, R21E, Sections 19, 20, 30 City of Mequon	Private	Siluian Racine Dolomite reef rock exposures. Has considerable importance in scientific research. Contains a wide variety of reef features
101	Riveredge Bluff	GA-3	1	T11N, R21E, Section 6 Town of Saukville	Riveredge Nature Center	Rock bluff of massive Racine Dolomite on south bank of Milwaukee River
102	Saukville Reef	GA-3	3	T11N, R21E, Section 26 Town of Saukville	Private	Small quarries exposing Racine Dolomite reef
103	Waubeka Quarry	GA-3	2	T12N, R21E, Section 29 Town of Fredonia	Private	Small, abandoned quarry exhibiting an uncommonly exposed type section
104	Fredonia Quarries	GA-3	6	T12N, R21E, Section 34 Town of Fredonia	Private	Two small, undisturbed mid-19th- century quarries and several outcrops of Racine Dolomite
105	Belgium Abandoned Shoreline	GA-3	108	T12N, R22E, Section 36 Town of Belgium	Private	Gravel and sand beaches and wind-cut cliffs and terraces indicating higher ancient lake levels
Total	16 sites		274			

^aGA-1 identifies Geological Area sites of statewide or greater significance; GA-2 identifies Geological Area sites of countywide or regional significance; and GA-3 identifies Geological Area sites of local significance.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, and SEWRPC.

encompassing at least five acres and 200 feet wide, but not large enough to meet the size or length criteria for primary or secondary environmental corridors, is referred to as an isolated natural resource area. Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in the County in 2000 are shown on Map 13. At that time, such areas encompassed about 45 square miles or about 19 percent of the County as indicated in Table 22.

The preservation of environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in essentially natural, open uses can assist in flood-flow attenuation, water pollution abatement, noise pollution abatement, and maintenance of air quality. Corridor preservation is important to the movement of wildlife and for the movement and dispersal of seeds for a variety of plant species. In addition, because of the many interacting relationships between living organisms and their environment, the destruction and deterioration of any one element of the natural

Table 22

EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS AND ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2000^a

Local Government	Primary Environmental Corridors (acres) ^b	Secondary Environmental Corridors (acres) ^b	Isolated Natural Resource Areas (acres) ^b
City of Mequon	2,776	1,258	847
Town of Belgium	917	1,228	410
Town of Cedarburg	2,278	793	576
Town of Fredonia	4,584	173	378
Town of Grafton	2,046	180	295
Town of Port Washington	418	652	149
Town of Saukville	6,313	306	603
Other Cities and Villages	1,177	269	311
Ozaukee County	20,509	4,859	3,569

^aInventory conducted in 2000; based on 2010 civil division boundaries.

^bIncludes associated surface water areas.

Source: SEWRPC.

resource base may lead to a chain reaction of deterioration and destruction. For example, the destruction of woodland cover may result in soil erosion and stream siltation, more rapid stormwater runoff and attendant increased flood flows and stages, as well as destruction of wildlife habitat. Although the effects of any single environmental change may not be overwhelming, the cumulative effects will eventually create serious environmental and developmental problems. These problems include flooding, water pollution, deterioration and destruction of wildlife habitat, loss of groundwater recharge, as well as a decline in the scenic beauty of the County. The importance of maintaining the integrity of the remaining environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas thus becomes apparent.

As shown on Map 13, the primary environmental corridors in the County are located along the Milwaukee River and major streams, along Lake Michigan, around several lakes, and in large wetland areas. In 2000, about 32 square miles, comprising about 14 percent of the County, were encompassed within primary environmental corridors. Secondary environmental corridors are located chiefly along the smaller perennial streams and intermittent streams in the County. About eight square miles, comprising about 3 percent of the County, were encompassed within secondary environmental corridors in 2000. Isolated natural resource areas within the County include a geographically well-distributed variety of isolated wetlands, woodlands, and wildlife habitat. These areas encompassed about six square miles, or 2 percent of the County, in 2000. Table 22 sets forth the amount of land encompassed by primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in each participating local government.

Park and Open Space Sites

A comprehensive region wide inventory of park and open space sites was conducted in 1973 under the initial regional park and open space planning program conducted by SEWRPC. The inventory is updated periodically, and was updated in 2010 as part of a new Ozaukee County park and open space plan.

The 2010 inventory identified all park and open space sites owned by a public agency, including Federal, State, County, and local units of government and school districts. The inventory also included privately owned outdoor recreation sites such as golf courses, campgrounds, boating access sites, hunting clubs, group camps, and special use outdoor recreation sites. Also identified in the inventory were lands held in conservation easements, including those held by private organizations such as the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT).

ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS AND ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2000



Park and Open Space Sites Owned by Ozaukee County

Park and open space sites owned by Ozaukee County in 2010 are shown on Map 14 and listed in Table 23. In 2010 the County owned 15 park and open space sites encompassing 1,268 acres, or about 1 percent of the County. The County park system includes the following nine sites: 1) Mee-Kwon County Park, 2) Virmond County Park, 3) Covered Bridge County Park, 4) Lion's Den Gorge Nature Preserve, 5) Hawthorne Hills County Park, 6) Tendick Nature Preserve, 7) Ehlers County Park, 8) Harborview County Park, and 9) Waubedonia County Park. Six sites owned by the County but not part of the County park system include: 1) Ozaukee County Fairgrounds, 2) Guenther Farmstead Property, 3) Ozaukee County Trail Park Property, 4) Bee Keeper Bog Property, 5) Pinnacle Property, and 6) Shady Lane Property.

Map 14 also shows Ozaukee County project boundaries which reflect areas that are recommended to be acquired by Ozaukee County to not only preserve natural areas and critical species habitat sites, but also provide valuable buffer areas adjacent to such natural areas and habitat sites. The lands recommended for acquisition by Ozaukee County within the identified project areas encompass 1,894 acres.

Park and Open Space Sites Owned by the State of Wisconsin

Park and open space sites in Ozaukee County that are owned by the State of Wisconsin in 2010 are shown on Map 14 and listed in Table 24. In 2010, there were 12 State-owned park and open space sites encompassing 3,184 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. Eleven of the 12 sites, encompassing 2,913 acres, were owned by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), and one site, encompassing 271 acres, was owned by the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

WDNR has acquired large areas of park and open space lands in the County for a variety of resource protection and recreational purposes. Sites acquired for natural resource preservation and limited recreational purposes include the Cedarburg Habitat Preservation Area, Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area, and a number of scattered sites, including four sites within the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Project Area. Another WDNR owned site, Harrington Beach State Park, is a wildlife refuge and has more intensive recreational activities such as swimming, camping, picnicking, and trail facilities. Map 14 also reflects project boundaries approved by the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board for additional acquisitions associated with State park, wildlife, and heritage areas. Lands within approved project boundaries have been identified by the Board as appropriate additions to adjacent parks, forests, natural areas, or wildlife areas and are intended to be acquired by the WDNR on a "willing seller-willing buyer" basis for recreational or open space purposes as funding permits.

The WDNR established the 19,487 acre North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area in 2002. This site lies within the Milwaukee River Basin and is located in portions of northwestern Ozaukee County, northeastern Washington County, and southwestern Sheboygan County. The project site encompasses river and stream corridors, large wetland complexes, agricultural lands, and three minor lakes. Wetlands and agricultural lands comprise 16,549 acres of the heritage area and river corridors comprise an additional 2,938 acres. A total of 8,449 acres of the heritage area lie within the County. The WDNR anticipates using a variety of real estate tools, including fee simple acquisition, easements, and purchase of development rights to protect natural features and agricultural lands with the project area. The North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area project boundary is shown on Map 14. Three parcels had been acquired in the County as of 2010. The parcels total 333 acres in size and are reference numbers 22, 24, and 25 on Map 14.

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) owns and operates a field station that encompasses a portion of the Cedarburg Bog. Located in the Town of Saukville, the UWM Cedarburg Bog Field Station site encompasses about 271 acres.

Park and Open Space Sites Owned by the Federal Government

Map 14 and Table 24 identify six open space sites in the County owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which encompass 695 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County. Five of the open space sites were purchased for the primary purpose of preserving and improving breeding habitat for waterfowl in Wisconsin. Project boundaries for potential acquisition associated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service sites are also shown on Map 14.

Park and Open Space Sites Owned by Local Governments, School Districts, or Other Public Districts

In addition to County-, State-, and Federally-owned park and open space sites, there were 162 park and open space sites owned by local governments, schools districts, or other public districts in the County in 2010. Those sites encompassed 2,259 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. Local governments owned 131 of the park and open space sites, public school districts owned 22 sites, and other public districts owned nine sites. Map A-1 and Table A-1 in Appendix A of the Ozaukee County park and open space plan adopted in 2011 sets forth park and open space sites owned by local governments, school districts, and other public districts in the County in 2010. The acreage attributed to school district sites includes only those portions of the site used for recreational (outdoor) or open space purposes.

The nine sites included in Table A-1 and shown on Map A-1 as owned by other public districts are sites owned by the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD). These sites were purchased by the MMSD with assistance from The Conservation Fund under its "Greenseams" program. The program is intended to permanently protect key lands within the MMSD greenway planning area,¹³ which includes essentially the City of Mequon, the Village of Thiensville, and a portion of the Village of Bayside in Ozaukee County as well as areas of other adjacent counties in the Region, for long term benefits for floodplain management. Where applicable, the properties can be used for hiking, bird watching, and other passive recreation, but are intended to remain largely undeveloped and be restored to natural conditions. In 2010, the nine sites owned by the MMSD in Ozaukee County encompassed 363 acres.

Private and Public Interest Resource-Oriented Park and Open Space Sites

Table A-2 and Map A-2 in Appendix A of the County park and open space plan identify privately-owned resource-oriented recreation sites. There were 74 of these sites in 2010 encompassing 3,397 acres, or almost 2 percent of the County, as depicted on Map A-2. Examples of privately-owned recreation sites include hunting clubs, stables, golf courses, boat access sites, campgrounds, an ice skating facility, swimming beaches, subdivision parks, a game farm, and recreation areas associated with private schools. The ice skating facility is the Ozaukee Ice Center. This facility was formerly owned by Ozaukee County, but the ownership was turned over to the Ozaukee Youth Hockey Association in 2009. Under the agreement, the facility remains available to citizens of the County for public skating.

An additional 15 sites, encompassing 1,375 acres or about 1 percent of the County, are owned by private organizations for natural resource protection purposes. Those sites are listed on Table 13 and shown on Map 17 in Chapter III of the County park and open space plan. The 15 open space area sites owned for resource preservation purposes encompass 1,375 acres, or about 1 percent of the total area of the County. Those sites include 12 Ozaukee Washington Land Trust sites, two sites owned by The Nature Conservancy, and Riveredge Nature Center.

Conservation Easements

Many privately-owned open space and environmentally sensitive sites in Ozaukee County are protected under conservation easements. These easements are typically voluntary contracts between a private landowner and a land trust or government body that limit, or in some cases prohibit, future development of the parcel. The property owner sells or donates a conservation easement for the property to a land trust or government agency, but retains ownership. The owner is not prohibited from selling the property, but future owners must abide by the terms of the conservation easement. Conservation easements typically do not include any provision for public access. Those easements, shown on Map 15 and listed in Table 25, encompassed 1,954 acres in Ozaukee County in 2010. All of the conservation easements identified on the Table and Map provide for the permanent protection of resources on private land.

¹³The planning area is identified in SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 152, A Greenway Connection Plan for the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, December 2002. The planning area consists mostly of Milwaukee County, an eastern portion of Waukesha County, a southeastern portion of Washington County, and a southern portion of Ozaukee County.



EXISTING COUNTY, STATE, AND FEDERAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE SITES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

Source: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

EXISTING COUNTY OWNED PARK AND OPEN SPACE SITES: 2010

Number on Map 14	Site Name	Location	Size
1	Mee-Kwon County Park	TON R21E Sections 10, 11: City of Meguon	244
2	Virmond County Park	TON R2TE, Section 28: City of Mequon	63
2	Covered Bridge County Park	T10N R21E Section 10: Town of Cedarburg	12
3	Lion's Den Gorge Nature Preserve	T10N R22E Sections10, 15, 16: Town of Grafton	74
4	Howtherpe Hills County Derk ^b	T10N, R22E, Sections 10, 15, 10, 10will of Granon	296
5		TITIN, RZTE, Section 33, Town of Saukville	200
0		TTTN, R2TE, Section 14; Town of Saukville	125
7	Ehlers County Park	T11N, R21E, Sections 13, 14, 23, 24; Town of Saukville	10
8	Harborview County Park	T11N, R22E, Section 28; City of Port Washington	1
9	Waubedonia County Park	T12N, R21E, Sections 27, 34; Town of Fredonia	45
	Total - 9 sites		860
	Other County Properties – Not Considered Part of the County Park System		
10	Ozaukee County Fairgrounds	T10N, R21E, Sections 22, 27; City of Cedarburg	18
11	Guenther Farmstead Property	T11N, R21E, Sections 16, 17; Town of Saukville	213
12	Ozaukee County Trail Property	T11N, R22E, Section 4; Town of Port Washington	36
13	Bee Keeper Bog Property	T12N, R21E, Section 5; Town of Fredonia	41
14	Pinnacle Property	T12N, R21E, Section 32; Town of Fredonia	39
15	Shady Lane Property	T12N, R21E, Section 34; Town of Fredonia	61
Total	6 sites		408

^aIndicates location given in U.S. Public Land Survey Township, Range, and Section.

^bIncludes Hawthorne Hills Golf Course, Pioneer Village, and H.H. Peters Youth Camp.

Source: SEWRPC.

Table 24

EXISTING STATE AND FEDERAL PARK AND OPEN SPACE SITES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

Number on Map 14	Site Name	Location ^a	Size (acres)
	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) Sites		
16	WDNR Site	T9N, R21E, Section 22; City of Mequon	6
17	WDNR Site	T9N, R22E, Section 7; City of Mequon	30
18	Cedarburg Habitat Preservation	T10N, R21E, Section 20; Town of Cedarburg	19
19	WDNR Site	T10N, R22E, Section 8; Town of Grafton	33
20	WDNR Site	T11N, R21E, Section 31; Town of Saukville	80
21	Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area	T11N, R21E, Sections 20, 21, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33;	
		Town of Saukville	1,616
22	WDNR Site-North Branch Milwaukee River Project	T12N, R21E, Section 5; Town of Fredonia	240
23	WDNR Site-Scattered Wetland	T12N, R21E, Section 7; Town of Fredonia	81
24	WDNR Site-North Branch Milwaukee River Project	T12N, R21E, Section 9; Town of Fredonia	73
25	WDNR Site-North Branch Milwaukee River Project	T12N, R21E, Section 9; Town of Fredonia	20
26	Harrington Beach State Park	T12N, R22E, Section 24; T12N, R23E,	
		Section 19; Town of Belgium	715
	Subtotal – 11 sites		2,913
	University of Wisconsin Site		
27	UWM Cedarburg Bog Field Station	T11N, R21E, Sections 29, 30; Town of Saukville	271
	Subtotal- 1 site		271
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sites (USFWS)		
28	USFWS-Ulao Waterfowl Production Area	T10N, R22E, Section 9; Town of Grafton	44
29	USFWS-Blue Wing Waterfowl Production Area	T10N, R22E, Section 16; Town of Grafton	55
30	USFWS Land	T11N, R21E, Section 13; Town of Saukville	41
31	USFWS-Cedar Grove Waterfowl Production Area	T12N, R22E, Section 2; Town of Belgium	115
32	USFWS-Armin O. Schwengel Waterfowl		
	Production Area	T12N, R22E, Sections 8, 9; Town of Belgium	282
33	USFWS-Belgium Waterfowl Protection Area	T12N, R22E, Section 10; Town of Belgium	158
	Subtotal – 6 sites		695
	Total – 18 sites		3,879

^aIndicates location given in U.S. Public Land Survey Township, Range, and Section.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.



Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, and SEWRPC.

LANDS UNDER CONSERVATION EASEMENTS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

Number on Map 15	Holder of Easement	Location	Size (acres)
1	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Brickman)	T9N, R21E, Section 1; City of Mequon	15
2	MMSD	T9N, R21E, Section 4; City of Mequon	4
3	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Pigeon Creek)	T9N, R21E, Section 9; City of Mequon	1
4	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Pigeon Creek)	T9N, R21E, Section 9; City of Mequon	3
5	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Kursel)	T9N, R21E, Section 9; City of Mequon	40
6	MMSD (Huntington Park Subdivision)	T9N, R21E, Section 32; City of Mequon	98
7	WDNR	T10N, R21E, Section 8; Town of Cedarburg	3
8	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Uihlein)	T10N, R21E, Section 25; Town of Grafton	9
9	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Watts/Cudahy)	T10N, R21E, Section 25; Town of Grafton	175
10	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Parsons)	T10N, R21E, Section 31; Town of Cedarburg	153
11	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Cudahy)	T10N, R21E, Section 36; Town of Grafton	43
12	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Kaul)	T10N, R22E, Section 8; Town of Grafton	56
13	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Abbott)	T10N, R22E, Section 28; Town of Grafton	26
14	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Meissner)	T10N, R22E, Section 28; Town of Grafton	16
15	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Sandhill)	T11N, R21E, Section 4; Town of Saukville	121
16	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 7; Town of Saukville	1
17	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 7; Town of Saukville	5
18	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 14; Town of Saukville	7
19	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Sieckman)	T11N, R21E, Section 18; Town of Saukville	111
20	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Lynn)	T11N, R21E, Section 20; Town of Saukville	36
21	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 22; Town of Saukville	10
22	WDNR (Lake Hills West)	T11N, R21E, Section 25; Town of Saukville	26
23	WDNR (Cole)	T11N, R21E, Section 27; Town of Saukville	5
24	WDNR (Bell)	T11N, R21E, Section 27; Town of Saukville	2
25	WDNR (Bell)	T11N, R21E, Section 27; Town of Saukville	6
26	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 30; Town of Saukville	21
27	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 33; Town of Saukville	1
28	WDNR	T11N, R21E, Section 34; Town of Saukville	8
29	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Fairchild)	T11N, R21E, Section 36; Town of Saukville	12
30	WDNR (Aloha Auto)	T11N, R22E, Section 32; City of Port Washington	1
31	WDNR (Mueller)	T12N, R21E, Section 4; Town of Fredonia	214
32	WDNR (Luedtke)	T12N, R21E, Section 4; Town of Fredonia	120
33	WDNR (Winter)	T12N, R21E, Section 5; Town of Fredonia	23
34	WDNR (Huiras)	T12N, R21E, Section 5; Town of Fredonia	261
35	WDNR (Grabinger)	T12N, R21E, Section 6; Town of Fredonia	76
36	WDNR (Stemper)	T12N, R21E, Section 17; Town of Fredonia	201
37	Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (Lord)	T12N, R21E, Section 19; Town of Fredonia	24
38	WDNR	T12N, R21E, Section 27; Town of Fredonia	6
39	WDNR	T12N, R21E, Section 28; Town of Fredonia	11
40	WDNR	T12N, R21E, Section 29; Town of Fredonia	2
41	WDNR	T12N, R21E, Section 30; Town of Fredonia	1
Total	41 sites		1,954

NOTE: All of the conservation easements listed above provide permanent protection of resources on private land.

^aIndicates location given in U.S. Public Land Survey Township, Range, and Section.

Source: Ozaukee Washington Land Trust, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD), and SEWRPC.

Environmentally Sensitive Lands and Potential Natural Limitations to Building Site Development

The comprehensive planning law (Section 66.1001 of the *Statutes*) requires environmentally sensitive lands in the County to be identified and mapped as part of the County comprehensive planning process. Several natural resource features located in the County were identified as environmentally sensitive lands including: primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, natural areas, critical species habitat sites, critical aquatic habitat sites, surface water, wetlands, woodlands, significant geological sites, high and very high groundwater recharge areas, and Hines Emerald Dragonfly habitat. These features are shown on Map 16 and on Map 94 in Chapter VIII of the County comprehensive plan.¹⁴ Preservation of these resources has also been identified as vital to the character, bio-diversity, quality of life, and economy of the County. One of the comprehensive planning programs is to incorporate the lands identified on Map 16 into the County land use plan map, shown later in this Chapter on Map 24, reflects this recommendation where possible.

Section 66.1001 of the *Statutes* also requires that natural limitations to building site development in the County be identified and mapped as part of the County comprehensive planning process. Several natural resource features located in the County were identified that limit building site development under the natural resources inventoried in this Chapter. These natural resources, shown on Map 17, include: 100-year floodplains, high and very high groundwater recharge areas, hydric soils, Lake Michigan bluffs, surface water, wetlands, and woodlands. The characteristics of these natural resource features are important to land use, transportation, and utilities and community facilities planning. These conditions affect the construction costs of urban development, and may limit the location of buildings, pavements, utilities, and private onsite wastewater treatment systems. In some cases, particularly in wetlands and floodplains, State regulations and County, City, Village, or Town ordinances will also affect site development. One of the comprehensive planning programs is to incorporate the lands identified on Map 17 into the County 2035 land use plan map. The adopted County land use plan map reflects this recommendation where possible.

Climate

Its midcontinental location gives Ozaukee County a continental climate that spans four seasons. Summers generally occur during the months of June, July, and August. They are relatively warm, with occasional periods of hot, humid weather and sporadic periods of cool weather. Lake Michigan often has a cooling effect on the County during the summer. Winters are cold and generally occur during the months of December, January, and February. Winter weather conditions can also be experienced during the months of November and March in some years. Autumn and spring are transitional weather periods in the County when widely varying temperatures and long periods of precipitation are common. The median growing season, the number of frost free growing days between the last freeze in the spring and the first freeze in the fall, is about 170 days, but and can range from 150 to 192 days.

Precipitation in the County can occur in the form of rain, sleet, hail, and snow and ranges from gentle showers to destructive thunderstorms. The more pronounced weather events, such as severe thunderstorms and tornadoes, can cause major property and crop damage, inundation of poorly drained areas, and lake and stream flooding. Table 56 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan sets forth the temperature and precipitation characteristics of the County.

Cultural Resources

Historic Sites

Historic sites in Ozaukee County often have important recreational, educational, and cultural value. A number of inventories and surveys of potentially significant historic sites have been conducted by various units and agencies of government in Ozaukee County since the completion of the regional park and open space plan in 1977. The results of these inventories and surveys, on file at such agencies as The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, indicate that there are more than 500 historic sites in Ozaukee County.

¹⁴Map 16 does not reflect the updated natural areas and critical species habitat site boundaries described in this Chapter.



Source: Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, and SEWRPC.

69

14,000 Feet

POTENTIAL NATURAL LIMITATIONS TO BUILDING SITE DEVELOPMENT IN OZAUKEE COUNTY



14.000 Feet

Source: Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, T.B. Edil, D.M. Mickelson, J.A. Chapman, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and SEWRPC. 70

National and State Registers of Historic Places

In 2010 there were 33 historic places and districts in the County listed on the National and State Registers of Historic Places, as shown in Map 22 and in Table 15 in Chapter III of the County park and open space plan. Of the 33 historic places and districts listed on the National and State Registers, 27 are historic buildings or structures, five are historic districts, and one is a shipwreck. Sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places may be eligible for a 25 percent Federal tax credit. Information regarding the procedure for nominating a site to the National and State Registers of Historic Places is available on the State Historical Society website at www.wisconsinhistory.org/hp/register/.

Local Landmarks

In addition to those historic sites and districts nominated to the National and State Registers of Historic Places, there are 99 sites in the County that had been designated as local landmarks by local governments as of 2005. Local landmarks are shown on Map 43 and listed in Table 58 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan. A local government is authorized to designate local landmarks after a landmarks commission or historic preservation commission has been established by local ordinance. Local governments in the County that have established landmark or historic preservation commissions and designated local landmarks as of 2005 include the City of Cedarburg, City of Mequon, Village of Grafton, Village of Thiensville, and Town of Cedarburg. It should be noted that the Town of Cedarburg and Village of Grafton have designated local landmarks but have not provided documentation to SEWRPC for inclusion on Map 43 and Table 58.

State Historical Markers

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin also administers a historical marker program. Interested parties can apply for a historical marker with the State Historical Society's Division of Historic Preservation. The applicant must be able to pay for the marker, maintain the marker, and have permission from the owners of the land where the marker is to be erected. The Division of Historic Preservation will consider applications for markers that describe any one of the following aspects of Wisconsin's history: history, architecture, culture, archaeology, ethnic associations, geology, natural history, or legends. As shown on Map 44 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan, there were 12 historical markers in the County as of 2006. The title and location of each marker is set forth in Table 59 of that Chapter.

Additional Historic Sites

The Ozaukee County comprehensive plan also identified and described several historical sites in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan that contribute to the heritage and economy of Ozaukee County. Many of these sites have not been designated as National Register sites, State Register sites, local landmarks, State historical markers, or State heritage trails. Some of these sites include about 20 shipwrecks located in Lake Michigan off the Ozaukee County shoreline, the Judge Eghart House built in 1872 in the City of Port Washington, the Luxembourg American Cultural Center in the Village of Belgium, and an octagon shaped barn built approximately 100 years ago in the Town of Grafton.

As part of a Wisconsin Centennial Celebration, which was celebrated as part of a Wisconsin State Fair event, the Century Farm and Home Award program originated in 1948 to honor owners of farms or homes (in whole or part) that have been in continuous family ownership (blood relative of the original owner or a legally adopted child of a descendant) for 100 years with commemorative signs. As indicated in Table 26, 104 Century Farms were honored in Ozaukee County between 1952 and 2010. The earliest farm awarded was settled in 1820. In 1998, the program was expanded to include the Sesquicentennial Farm and Home Award program which was established as a partnership between DATCP and the Wisconsin State Fair to honor those farms that have been in one family for 150 years. Between 1998 and 2010, 15 Sesquicentennial Farms were honored in Ozaukee County, which are also identified in Table 26. The earliest farm awarded was settled in 1839.

Archaeological Resources

Preservation of archaeological resources is also important in preserving the cultural heritage of the County. Similar to historic sites and districts, significant prehistoric and historic archaeological sites provide the County and each of its communities with a sense of community heritage and identity and can provide for economic

CENTURY AND SESQUICENTENNIAL FARMS HONORED WITHIN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1952-2010

CENTURY FARMS (100 YEARS)

Name of Owners	Location	Year Settled	Year of Award
John Grotlueschen	Town of Saukville	^a	^a
Walter Ahlers	Town of Grafton	1842	1952
Edward Behrens	Town of Cedarburg	1851	1952
Milton and Roland Clausing	City of Meguon	1846	1952
Anna Egerer	Town of Saukville	1848	1952
Herbert Nero	City of Meguon	1846	1952
Arnold and Roland Nieman	Town of Cedarburg	1852	1952
Irwin Staus	City of Meguon	1842	1952
Emil Gonwa	Town of Belgium	1847	1953
	City of Meguon	1850	1953
	Town of Fredonia	1853	1953
Arthur Poggenburg	Town of Cedarburg	1848	1953
Ray Blank	Town of Grafton	1854	1954
Walter and Donald Bloecher	Town of Saukville	1850	1954
Harold and Dorothy Hartmann	Town of Eredonia	1854	1954
Marie Kubefuss	City of Cedarburg	1854	1954
Edward Lueders	Town of Cedarburg	1854	1054
Henry and Minni Krier	Town of Eredonia	1854	1955
Morris and John McCarthy	Town of Saukville	1855	1955
Mike Detesch	Town of Eredonia	1855	1955
Martin Wienking	Town of Codarburg	1954	1955
	City of Meguon	1846	1955
Edwin Borthol	City of Mequon	1920	1950
Edward Bocher		1848	1959
Edgar Bruss	City of Moguon	1954	1959
Eugal Bluss		1004	1959
Adelf Debberfubl	Village of Thioppyille	a 1032	1959
Adoli Dobberiuli			1959
Erederick Deberruhl	Town of Cedarburg	1044	1959
Please Departual	Town of Cedarburg	1049	1959
Lohn Bodlinger	Town of Soularillo	1049 a	1959
Boymond Bonnicko		1940	1959
Fator Spubl		1042	1959
	City of Moguop	1040	1959
Ella Stelli	City of Mequon	1000	1959
Endory Voland		1043	1959
		1020	1959
Pehert Poll		1000	1960
Robert Bell	Town of Polgium	1950	1903
Floo Knuth		1000	1963
Coorgo Pontz		1003	1904
Weldemar Luft		1965	1903
		1000	1965
Villiam Majone		1000	1965
	Town of Port Weshington	1960	1967
Anibiose Lansei		1009	1969
		1040	1970
John Jacoby	City of Moguop	1040	1970
	Town of Dort Machineton	1044	1970
		1000	1970
Diver and Evengeling Lied		6001	19/1
		1040	1972
Fiank Jacoby	Town of Beigium	1867	19/3
Einer and Genrose Kiug		1842	19/3
	TOWIT OF FREGORIA	10/2	19/3

Table 26 (continued)

CENTURY FARMS (100 YEARS)

Name of Owners	Location	Year Settled	Year of Award
Carl Sachse	City of Meguon	1863	1973
John Kasten	Town of Cedarburg	1845	1974
Alex Klas	Town of Fredonia	1872	1974
Theophil Laubenstein	Town of Grafton	1874	1974
Richard Schommer	Town of Belgium	1846	1975
Joseph and Caroline Bohlen	Town of Saukville	1846	1976
Kenneth Berger	Town of Fredonia	1844	1977
Edmund Bienlein	Village of Grafton	1861	1977
Alvin Schueller	Town of Belgium	1868	1977
Alvin Wieskerchen	Town of Fredonia	1878	1979
Garv and Ellen Uselding	Town of Belgium	1872	1980
Harvey Thill	Town of Belgium	1879	1981
Lerov Wollner	Town of Saukville	1878	1981
Erwin Sievers	Town of Grafton	1857	1983
Kenneth Schueller	Town of Belgium	1883	1984
Robert Berger	Town of Fredonia	1846	1986
Richard and Ethel Depies	Town of Fredonia	1886	1986
Gordon Lorge	Town of Belgium	1886	1986
Richard Musbach	Town of Grafton	1867	1986
Eugene and Ethel Pierron	Town of Belgium	1880	1986
Alovsius J. Weyker, Jr.	Town of Belgium	1857	1986
Edward and Elvira Paulus	Town of Belgium	1888	1988
Marvin and Eileen Hofffman	Town of Saukville	1848	1989
Louis Hovener	Town of Grafton	1873	1989
Henry and Germain Leider	Town of Belgium	1868	1990
Arnold and Carol Depies	Town of Fredonia	1892	1993
Lerov Hass	Town of Fredonia	1883	1994
Herbert and Helen Kassens	Town of Grafton	1880	1994
George Large	Town of Belgium	1845	1994
Paul and Jennifer Thill	Town of Fredonia	1893	1994
Erhard, Barbara, Joseph, and Jason Job	Town of Saukville	1896	1996
Richard and Judith Mowry	Town of Fredonia	1848	1997
Gerald and Mary Biever	Town of Port Washington	1849	1999
Allen M. and Pamela J. Poull	Town of Belgium	1899	1999
John and Linda Risch	Town of Belgium	1847	2000
Mildred G. and Donald W. Bloecher	Town of Saukville	1891	2001
Jane M. and James A. Kultgen	Town of Port Washington	1901	2001
Doris Maechtle	Town of Port Washington	1901	2001
Diane, Heather, and Don Hamm	Town of Saukville	1852	2002
Tamara Koop	Town of Fredonia	1899	2003
Clarice and Frank Bucholtz	Town of Grafton	1904	2004
William J. Ciriacks	Town of Saukville	1885	2004
William J. Karrels	Town of Port Washington	1854	2004
Schroeter	Town of Grafton	1904	2004
Bonnie S. and Raymond J. Lapinski	Town of Belgium	1855	2005
Dorothy and Harold Schoessow	City of Meguon	1879	2007
Joyce and Robert Dries	Town of Saukville	1872	2009
Evelvn and Richard Rathke	Town of Fredonia	1852	2009
Seideman	Town of Fredonia	1907	2009
Cathy, Mike, Andy, and Dan Pohl	Town of Belgium	1851	2010
Total – 104 Farms			

Table 26 (continued)

Name of Owners	Location	Year Settled	Year of Award
Pipkorn	City of Mequon	1844	1998
Gerhard Schoessow	City of Mequon	1839	1998
Melvin W. Stauss	City of Mequon	1842	1998
Richard S. and Judith A. Mowry and Joann E. Walek	Town of Fredonia	1848	1998
Gerald and Mary Biever	Town of Port Washington	1849	1999
Carl, Alfred, and Mark Dobberfuhl and Eunice Szpiszar and Lois Roller	City of Mequon	1844	1999
Edna Prahl	City of Mequon	1844	2000
John and Linda Risch	Town of Belgium	1847	2000
Mildred G. and Donald W. Bloecher	Town of Saukville	1850	2001
Diane, Heather and Don Hamm	Town of Saukville	1852	2002
William J. Karrels	Town of Port Washington	1854	2004
Bonnie S. and Raymond J. Lapinski	Town of Belgium	1855	2005
Evelyn and Richard Rathke	Town of Fredonia	1852	2009
Mildred Jacoby	Town of Belgium	1848	2010
Cathy, Mike, Andy and Dan Pohl	Town of Belgium	1851	2010
Total – 15 Farms			

SESQUICENTENNIAL FARMS (150)

^aData not available.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection; Wisconsin State Fair; and SEWRPC.

opportunities through tourism if properly identified and preserved. Archaeological sites found in the County can fall under two categories, prehistoric sites and historic sites. Prehistoric sites are defined as those sites which date from before written history. Historic sites are sites established after history began to be recorded in written form (the State Historical Society defines this date as A.D. 1650).

As of 2005, there were 393 known prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in the County listed in the State Historical Society's Archaeological Sites Inventory, including prehistoric and historic camp sites, villages, and farmsteads; marked and unmarked burial sites; and Native American mounds. No archaeological sites in the County are listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places.

The State Historical Society also identifies and catalogs burial sites, including sufficient contiguous land necessary to protect the burial site from disturbance, throughout Wisconsin. There are six such cataloged burial sites located in Ozaukee County: Immanuel Lutheran Heritage Cemetery, Lakefield Cemetery, Union Cemetery, Katherina Cemetery, St. Finbars Cemetery, Sizer Cemetery, and Woodworth Pioneer Cemetery. The location of these sites is shown on Map 46 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan. About 40 additional cemeteries are inventoried in Chapter IV of that plan. In addition, a circular Native American mound and a group of oblong embankments are located in Section 22 in the Town of Saukville.¹⁵

The field notes and plat maps of the U.S. Public Land Survey of Wisconsin, completed between 1834 and 1836 for Ozaukee County, are also valuable sources for identifying the location of significant Native American sites and trails. Survey records show there were additional Native American mounds and several Native American sugar camps, villages, and trails located in the County. These features are shown on Map 47 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan.

¹⁵*This Indian mound group is referenced in* Antiquities of Wisconsin as Surveyed and Described, *Smithsonian Institute, Washington D.C., 1855.*

An archaeological site distribution study of Ozaukee County is available through the UW-Milwaukee Archaeology Department.

Local Historical Societies and Museums

There are several local historical societies affiliated with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in Ozaukee County. These include the Ozaukee County Historical Society, Cedarburg Cultural Center, Mequon Historical Society, Port Washington Historical Society, and Saukville Area Historical Society. Each historical society contains a varying number of facilities housing items of historical or archaeological significance, historical records and information, educational facilities, or gallery and performance facilities, which are summarized on Table 62 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan.

Cultural Venues, Events, and Organizations

Cultural performances, events, and organizations that showcase the arts and the heritage of Ozaukee County greatly contribute to the quality of life and economy of the County. There are several venues at which cultural performances are regularly held. Many of these venues are not historic themselves, but serve as a cultural resource because they facilitate culturally significant performances and exhibits. They are listed in Table 63 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan. Cultural venues in the County include multi-faceted facilities such as the Cedarburg Cultural Center, which is a blend of performing arts center, art gallery, educational facility, museum, and community gathering place, the historic Rivoli Theatre, which continues to show movies in downtown Cedarburg due to the efforts of the Cedarburg Landmark Preservation Society, Inc., American Legion Posts, and attractions such as museums and restored historic buildings. Tables 64 and 65 in Chapter III of the County comprehensive plan lists, respectively, a wide range of cultural events, from art shows to music series, that took place in Ozaukee County during 2006 and 2007 and the supporting cultural organizations that help promote these venues and events, including the Luxembourg American Cultural Society and the Lions and Kiwanis Clubs.

PART 3: EXISTING AND HISTORICAL POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

Information on the size, characteristics, and distribution of the resident population, household, and employment levels in the County is needed to prepare projections that will anticipate changes in these factors over time, which is essential for the preparation of a comprehensive plan including the farmland preservation plan component. Many of the planning recommendations are directly related to existing and probable future population levels in the County and local units of government. This section provides information on existing and historical population, household, and employment levels. Projections for these levels for the year 2035, which were considered during plan preparation, are presented in the next Chapter.

Population Trends

Population growth in Ozaukee County from 1860 to 2010 is indicated in Table 27 and Figure 2. In addition, the 1990-2010 historical and current population of each city, village, and town in Ozaukee County is set forth in Table 28. Ozaukee County experienced a population decline during the period between 1860 and 1890. With the exception of the decade between 1910 and 1920, the County experienced relatively modest growth between 1890 and 1940 as the County population increased from 14,943 to 18,985 residents. Since then, the County population has grown steadily—increasing by about 4,400 persons during the 1940s, 15,100 persons during the 1950s, 16,000 persons during the 1960s, 12,500 persons during the 1970s, 5,900 persons during the 1980s, 9,500 during the 1990s, and 5,100 persons during the 2000s. The population of the County stood at 86,395 persons in 2010.

As indicated in Table 27, in percentage terms, the population of Ozaukee County has increased more rapidly than the Southeastern Wisconsin Region and the State in each decade since 1930s, except for the 2000 to 2010 period when growth in the State was faster than in the County. Between 1970 and 2010, the population of Ozaukee County increased by 59 percent, compared to increases of 15 percent and 29 percent for the Region and State, respectively.

HISTORIC RESIDENT POPULATION LEVELS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY, SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN, AND WISCONSIN: 1850-2010

	Ozaukee County			Sout	theastern Wisco	onsin		Wisconsin	
		Chang	e from		Change from			Chang	e from
		Preceding	g Census		Precedin	g Census		Precedin	g Census
Year	Population	Absolute	Percent	Population	Absolute	Percent	Population	Absolute	Percent
1850	^a			113,389			305,391		
1860	15,682			190,409	77,020	67.9	775,881	470,490	154.1
1870	15,564	-118	-0.8	223,546	33,137	17.4	1,054,670	278,789	35.9
1880	15,461	-103	-0.7	277,119	53,573	24.0	1,315,497	260,827	24.7
1890	14,943	-518	-3.4	386,774	109,655	39.6	1,693,330	377,833	28.7
1900	16,363	1,420	9.5	501,808	115,034	29.7	2,069,042	375,712	22.2
1910	17,123	760	4.6	631,161	129,353	25.8	2,333,860	264,818	12.8
1920	16,355	-768	-4.6	783,681	152,520	24.2	2,632,067	298,207	12.8
1930	17,394	1,039	6.5	1,006,118	222,437	28.4	2,939,006	306,939	11.7
1940	18,985	1,591	9.1	1,067,699	61,581	6.1	3,137,587	198,581	6.8
1950	23,361	4,376	23.0	1,240,618	172,919	16.2	3,434,575	296,988	9.5
1960	38,441	15,080	64.6	1,573,614	332,996	26.8	3,951,777	517,202	15.1
1970	54,461	16,020	41.7	1,756,083	182,469	11.6	4,417,821	466,044	11.8
1980	66,981	12,520	23.0	1,764,796	8,713	0.5	4,705,642	287,821	6.5
1990	72,831	5,850	8.7	1,810,364	45,568	2.6	4,891,769	186,127	4.0
2000	82,317	9,486	13.0	1,931,165	120,801	6.7	5,363,675	471,906	9.6
2010	86,395	4,078	5.0	2,019,970	88,805	4.6	5,686,986	323,311	6.0

^aIn 1853, seven Towns (Belgium, Cedarburg, Fredonia, Grafton, Mequon, Port Washington, and Saukville) and the Village of Port Washington, then in Washington County and which contained a resident population of 8,281 in 1850, were detached from the remainder of Washington County to form Ozaukee County.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Figure 2



RESIDENT POPULATION LEVELS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1860-2010

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

		Popu		Change 1	980-2010	
Community	1980	1990	2000 ^a	2010	Number	Percent
Cities						
Cedarburg	9,005	10,086	11,102	11,412	2,407	26.7
Mequon	16,193	18,885	22,643	23,132	6,939	42.9
Port Washington	8,612	9,338	10,467	11,250	2,638	30.6
Villages						
Bayside ^b	112	108	103	89	-23	-20.5
Belgium	892	928	1,678	2,245	1,353	151.7
Fredonia	1,437	1,558	1,934	2,160	723	50.3
Grafton	8,381	9,340	10,464	11,459	3,078	36.7
Newburg ^c	95	105	92	97	2	2.1
Saukville	3,494	3,695	4,068	4,451	957	27.4
Thiensville	3,341	3,301	3,254	3,235	-106	-3.2
Towns						
Belgium	1,424	1,405	1,513	1,415	-9	-0.1
Cedarburg	5,244	5,143	5,550	5,760	516	9.8
Fredonia	2,144	2,043	2,083	2,172	28	1.3
Grafton	3,588	3,745	3,980	4,053	465	13.0
Port Washington	1,436	1,480	1,631	1,643	207	14.4
Saukville	1,583	1,671	1,755	1,822	239	15.1
Ozaukee County	66,981	72,831	82,317	86,395	19,414	29.0

POPULATION TRENDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 1980-2010

^aReflects U.S. Bureau of the Census approved adjustments to the original 2000 Census population counts, including: an increase of 152 in the Village of Grafton, a decrease of 152 in the Town of Grafton, an increase of 194 in the City of Cedarburg, a decrease of 194 in the Town of Cedarburg, an increase of 820 in the City of Mequon, and a decrease of 820 in the Town of Fredonia.

^bOzaukee County portion only. Total population for the Village of Bayside, portions within both Milwaukee and Ozaukee Counties, was 4,724 in 1980, 4,789 in 1990, 4,518 in 2000, and 4,389 in 2010.

^cOzaukee County portion only. Total population for the Village of Newburg, portions within both Ozaukee and Washington Counties, was 783 in 1980, 958 in 1990, 1,119 in 2000, and 1,254 in 2010.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

As indicated in Table 28, the City of Mequon is the most populous community in the County, with 23,132 residents, or about 27 percent of the County's population, in 2010. The next most populous communities are the City of Cedarburg with 11,412 residents in 2010, the City of Port Washington with 11,250 residents in 2010, and the Village of Grafton with 11,459 residents in 2010, each accounting for about 13 percent of the County's population.

Age Distribution

The age distribution of the population in the context of supporting the agricultural industry may be expected to influence the continuation of farming by future generations. It will also have important implications for planning and the formation of public policies in the areas of health, education, housing, transportation, and economic development. The age distribution of the population in the County and Region in 1980 through 2010 is set forth in Table 29. Between 1980 and 2010, there were significant increases in the number of adults aged 45 to 64 and those 65 and over in Ozaukee County. Conversely, the population of those less than 45 years old has decreased. This trend is somewhat similar to that of the Region as a whole, which experienced increases in the number of adults aged 25 to 44. The median age of Ozaukee County residents was nearly 43 in 2010 compared to 37 for the Region. Based on Census of Agriculture data from the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, the average age of principal operators of farms in Ozaukee County increased from about 52 in 1987 to about 58 in 2007.

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION OF OZAUKEE COUNTY AND SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 1980-2010

	1980		19	90	20	00	20	10	Change 1	980-2010
Age Group	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent						
Under 5	4,771	7.1	5,334	7.3	5,069	6.2	4,548	5.3	-223	-4.7
5-17	16,174	24.1	14,408	19.8	16,862	20.5	15,824	18.3	-350	-2.2
18-24	7,495	11.2	6,031	8.3	5,624	6.8	6,420	7.4	-1,075	-14.3
25-44	19,351	28.9	23,531	32.3	23,049	28.0	19,111	22.1	-240	-12.4
45-64	13,528	20.2	15,450	21.2	21,356	25.9	27,284	31.6	13,756	101.7
65 and Older	5,662	8.5	8,077	11.1	10,357	12.6	13,208	15.3	7,546	133.3
All Ages	66,981	100.0	72,831	100.0	82,317	100.0	86,395	100.0	19,414	29.0

OZAUKEE COUNTY

SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN

	198	1980 ^ª 1990		200	0 ^b	201	0 Change 1980-2		80-2010	
Age Group	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent
Under 5	128,085	7.3	138,286	7.7	132,390	6.8	133,503	6.6	5,418	4.2
5-17	375,653	21.3	339,722	18.8	377,706	19.5	364,772	18.1	-10,881	-2.9
18-24	234,264	13.3	181,211	10.0	179,500	9.3	194,877	9.6	-39,387	-16.8
25-44	482,615	27.3	590,955	32.6	581,351	30.1	527,802	26.1	45,187	9.4
45-64	349,008	19.8	333,818	18.4	420,937	21.8	545,009	27.0	196,001	56.2
65 and Older	195,294	11.0	226,372	12.5	241,024	12.5	254,007	12.6	58,713	30.1
All Ages	1,764,919	100.0	1,810,364	100.0	1,932,908	100.0	2,019,970	100.0	255,051	14.4

^aThe 1980 regional population of 1,764,919 includes 123 persons who were subtracted from this number after the conduct of the 1980 census but were not allocated to the various age group categories.

^bThe 2000 regional population of 1,932,908 includes 1,743 persons who were subtracted from this number after the conduct of the 2000 census but were not allocated to the various age group categories.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

In 2010, children less than five years old numbered 4,548 or about 5 percent of the County population, while children between the ages five and 19 numbered 18,010, or 21 percent of the County population. The size of the less than five years old age cohort and the five to 19 year old age cohort is important for planning future educational facilities and establishing work force training programs.

Adults ages 20 through 64 numbered 50,629, or about 59 percent of the total County population, in 2010. The size of this age cohort correlates directly to the size of the workforce residing in Ozaukee County. It will be important to retain and expand existing businesses and attract new businesses to the County, including those in the agricultural industry, to meet the employment needs of the 20 to 64 year old age cohort in an effort to maintain a stable and healthy economy in the County.

Persons age 65 and older in Ozaukee County numbered 13,208, or nearly 15 percent of the total population of the County in 2010. There will likely be an increased demand for specialized housing units, transportation, and health care services for the elderly as the elderly population increases in size over the next three decades.

		Ozaukee County		Southeastern Wisconsin			
	Number of Change from Previou		revious Census	Number of	Change from Previous Census		
Year	Households	Number	Percent	Households	Number	Percent	
1970	14,753			536,486			
1980	21,763	7,010	47.5	627,955	91,469	17.0	
1990	25,707	3,944	18.1	676,107	48,152	7.7	
2000	30,857	5,150	20.0	749,039	72,932	10.8	
2010	34,228	3,371	10.9	800,087	51,048	6.8	

NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 1970-2010

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census and SEWRPC.

Table 31

NUMBER OF JOBS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY AND SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN: 1970-2010

		Ozaukee County		Southeastern Wisconsin			
	Number Change from Previous Time Period		Number	Change from Previous Time Period			
Year	of Jobs	Number	Percent	of Jobs	Number	Percent	
1970	21,543			794,887			
1980	28,450	6,907	32.1	953,282	158,395	19.9	
1990	35,421	6,971	24.5	1,063,515	110,233	11.6	
2000	50,720	15,299	43.2	1,216,719	153,204	14.4	
2010	53,700	2,980	5.9	1,184,700	-32,019	-2.6	

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC.

Households

Trends in the number of households in the County and the Region are shown on Table 30. Both the County and Region experienced significant gains in the number of new households over the time period between 1970 and 2010. The rate of increase in the number of households has exceeded the rate of population increase in both cases. Between 1970 and 2010, the rate of increase in the number of households was 132 percent in the County and 49 percent in the Region, compared to a population increase of 59 percent in the County and 15 percent in the Region. The number of households has increased at a faster rate than the population as the number of persons per household has decreased.

The number of households is of particular importance in land use and public facility planning, because it influences the demand for converting rural land to urban use to accommodate additional residential development. It should be noted that Section 91.10(1)(c)7 of the *Statutes* indicates that county farmland preservation plans must include policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions, as provided in Chapter VI of this document, to increase housing density in areas that are not identified as a farmland preservation area. The number of households in an area is also an important component in creating demand for transportation and other facilities and services.

Employment

Trends in job growth in the County and Region are set forth in Table 31. The jobs are enumerated at their location and the data therefore reflect the number of jobs within the County and Region, including both full- and part-time jobs. An increase in the number of jobs may be expected to attract additional residents to the County, thus influencing population growth.

As indicated in Table 31 as well as Figure 4 in Chapter III, employment growth was significant in the County between 1970 and 2010, with the number of jobs increasing from about 21,543 to 53,700. The 149 percent rate of increase in the number of jobs in the County exceeded the rate of increase in the Region during the same period, which experienced an increase of about 389,813 jobs, or about 49 percent. The Region experienced a loss of jobs between 2000 and 2010, with job losses occurring in Milwaukee and Racine Counties. The remaining five counties, including Ozaukee County, experienced job growth during this period, but at a slower rate than in the years 1970 to 2000. Table 32 shows the number of jobs within each community in Ozaukee County in 2000 (the most current local data available), with most jobs located in urban centers, such as cities and villages.

Farm Employment

Farm employment has accounted for a small share of all jobs, about 1 percent in 2009, in Ozaukee County. Table 33 indicates the level of farm employment in Ozaukee County from 1970 through 2009. Even though such employment accounts for only a small share of all jobs, it should be noted that the farm employment group as shown in Table 33 includes sole proprietors, partners, or hired laborers directly engaged in the production of agricultural

Table 32

NUMBER OF JOBS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY COMMUNITIES: 2000

Community	Number Jobs	Percent of Total
Cities		
Cedarburg	7,110	14.0
Mequon	16,071	31.7
Port Washington	7,083	14.0
Villages		
Belgium	776	1.5
Fredonia	1,067	2.1
Grafton	8,849	17.5
Saukville	3,304	6.5
Thiensville	2,062	4.1
Towns		
Belgium	423	0.8
Cedarburg	1,462	2.9
Fredonia	544	1.1
Grafton	835	1.7
Port Washington	607	1.2
Saukville	454	0.9
Ozaukee County ^a	50,647	100.0

^aDoes not include the portion of the Village of Newburg located in Ozaukee County.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC.

commodities, either livestock or crops, and excludes employment in some agricultural-related enterprises such as food processing plants, farm equipment and supply sales and services, and agricultural research and development laboratories. The number of jobs on farms has declined between 1970 and 2009 in the County and the Region, and in the State from 1980 to 2009. The 59 percent rate of decrease for the County during this period is more than the decrease for the Region and State of 56 percent and 37 percent, respectively.

As noted earlier in this Chapter, farming was the principal occupation of 45 percent of the farm operators in the County, while it was not the primary occupation for the other 55 percent of the farms in 2007. Also as indicated earlier, about 231 farms, or about 45 percent of farms, in the County had sales of agricultural products that accumulated less than \$2,500 in 2007, while 99 farms, or about 19 percent, had sales of \$100,000 or more in 2007.

PART 4: EXISTING LAND USES, UTILITIES, AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

This part of the Chapter presents an inventory of land uses and identifies existing transportation infrastructure, utilities, and community facilities to support urban and rural land uses. An understanding of the amount, type, and spatial distribution of urban, agricultural, and other rural land uses, including environmentally sensitive lands, as well as the historic conversion of rural lands to urban use, is essential to the preparation of a farmland preservation plan.

Historical and Existing Land Uses

This section presents a description of the historical urban development and existing land uses in the County. The Regional Planning Commission utilizes an urban growth analysis and a land use inventory to monitor urban growth and development in the Region. The urban growth analysis delineates concentrations of urban

	Ozaukee County				stern Wisconsi	n Region		Wisconsin		
	Change from Number Preceding Yea		e from ng Year	Number	Chang Precedi	le from ng Year	Number	Change from Preceding Year		
Year	of Jobs	Number	Percent	of Jobs	Number	Percent	of Jobs	Number	Percent	
1970	1,483			11,956			148,414			
1980	1,006	-477	-32.2	10,023	-1,933	-16.2	150,849	2,435	1.6	
1990	711	-295	-29.3	7,172	-2,851	-28.4	114,701	-36,148	-24.0	
2000	698	-13	-1.8	5,947	-1,225	-17.1	101,442	-13,259	-11.6	
2009	609	-89	-12.7	5,232	-715	-12.0	93,001	-8,441	-8.3	

FARM EMPLOYMENT IN OZAUKEE COUNTY, SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION, AND WISCONSIN: 1970 - 2009

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC.

development and depicts the urbanization of the Region over the past 150 years. The Commission land use inventory places all land and water areas in the Region into one of 66 land use categories, providing a basis for analyzing specific urban and non-urban land uses. Both the urban growth analysis and the land use inventory for the Region have been updated to the year 2000 under the continuing regional planning program. Changes in land uses between 2000 and 2007 were also identified and mapped as part of the Ozaukee County comprehensive planning process.

Historical Urban Growth

The historical urban development of Ozaukee County from 1850 to 2000 is shown on Map 18. Small portions of the Port Washington, Cedarburg, Grafton, and Thiensville areas were developed prior to 1850. In 1900, urban development was still largely confined to the Port Washington, Cedarburg, Grafton, and Thiensville areas with additional development in the now incorporated areas of Saukville, Fredonia, Belgium, and Newburg. The period from 1900 to 1950 saw expansion around these areas of urban development. The pace of urban development accelerated after 1950. The period from 1950 to 2000 has seen significant urban growth in the southern portion of Ozaukee County in the Village of Grafton, City of Cedarburg, and the City of Mequon in an outward expansion of the Milwaukee metropolitan area. Moderate development in and around the City of Port Washington and the other established urban centers in the northern portion of Ozaukee County has also occurred during this period. In addition, there has been a proliferation of scattered urban enclaves in many portions of Ozaukee County removed from historic urban centers, particularly since 1963. Providing urban services and facilities to scattered, low density urban and sub-urban density development in outlying areas can be inefficient and costly.

Despite significant urbanization, large tracts of agricultural and other open space and environmentally sensitive lands remain intact and relatively free of encroachment by urban development, particularly in the northern half of the County. This situation has important implications for farmland preservation planning and implementation in the County. Ozaukee County has the opportunity to continue to plan for widespread preservation of agricultural and other open space and environmentally sensitive lands.

Urban Service Areas

Urban service areas are identified in the regional land use plan based on the sanitary sewer service areas delineated in the regional water quality management plan. Urban service areas are currently served, or have the capacity to be served, by a public sanitary sewer system and public wastewater treatment plant. These services allow for relatively dense residential, commercial, and industrial uses, which characterize urban areas. Urban service areas are also generally served by a municipal water utility or, in some cases, a private water supply system, local parks, local schools, and shopping areas. Urban service areas in Ozaukee County include: the City of Mequon/Village of Thiensville, City of Cedarburg, Village of Grafton, Village of Saukville, City of Port Washington, Village of Newburg, Village of Fredonia, and Village of Belgium. Urban service areas in Ozaukee County are shown on Map 19.





PLANNED SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREAS AND EXISTING AREAS SERVED BY SEWER IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

LAND USES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2007

Land Use Category ^a	Acres	Percent of Subtotal (Urban or Nonurban)	Percent of Total
Urban		,	
Residential			
Single-Family ^b	20,575	52.9	13.7
Two-Family	461	1.2	0.3
Multi-Family	782	2.0	0.5
Mobile Homes	12	^c	c
Subtotal	21,830	56.1	14.5
Commercial	1,099	2.8	0.7
Industrial	1,457	3.8	1.0
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities			
Arterial Street Rights-of-Way	3,957	10.2	2.6
Nonarterial Street Rights-of-Way	5,272	13.5	3.5
Railroad Rights-of-Way	452	1.2	0.3
Communications, Utilities, and Other Transportation	398	1.0	0.3
Subtotal	10,079	25.9	6.7
Governmental and Institutional ^d	1,277	3.3	0.8
Recreational ^e	3,168	8.1	2.1
Urban Subtotal	38,910	100.0	25.8
Nonurban			
Natural Resource Areas			
Woodlands	7,123	6.4	4.7
Wetlands	16,718	15.0	11.1
Surface Water	2,146	1.9	1.4
Subtotal	25,987	23.3	17.2
Agricultural	78,025	69.9	51.8
Landfill	118	0.1	0.1
Nonmetallic Mining Sites	675	0.6	0.5
Open Lands ^f	6,879	6.1	4.6
Nonurban Subtotal	111,684	100.0	74.2
Total ^f	150,594		100.0

^aIncludes parking and lands under development in associated use.

^bIncludes farm residences. Other farm buildings are included in the agricultural land use category.

^cLess than 0.05 percent.

^dIncludes public and private schools, government offices, police and fire stations, libraries, cemeteries, religious institutions, hospitals, nursing homes, and similar facilities.

^eIncludes only lands which are intensively used for recreational purposes.

¹Open lands includes lands in rural areas that are not being farmed and other lands that have not been developed, including residual lands or outlots attendant to existing urban development, such as restricted open space within conservation subdivisions, that are not expected to be developed.

Source: SEWRPC.

Existing Land Uses

Land uses in Ozaukee County in 2007 are shown on Map 20, and quantitatively summarized in Table 34. The 2000 SEWRPC land use inventory, an update of major urban development between 2000 and 2007, and 2007 civil division and cadastral boundaries formed the basis of the 2007 generalized land use inventory update. Wetland, woodland, and surface water were from the 2000 inventory and were only adjusted if development occurred within such areas. However, wetland data from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources update of the Wisconsin Wetlands Inventory in 2005 and surface water data from 2005 orthophotos are provided on Map 10 and Table 16 in Part 2 of this Chapter.

Urban Land Uses

Urban land uses consist of residential, commercial, industrial, governmental and institutional, recreational, and transportation, communication, and utility uses. As indicated on Map 20 and in Table 34, urban land uses encompassed about 62.1 square miles, or about 26 percent of Ozaukee County, in 2007.

Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category, encompassing 34.1 square miles, or about 56 percent of all urban land use and about 15 percent of the total area of the County in 2007. Most urban residential homes are located within urban service areas where public sanitary sewer, water supply, health, educational, and fire and police protection services are provided.

Land uses categorized as transportation, communications, and utilities constituted the second largest urban land use category in 2007, encompassing about 15.8 square miles, or about 26 percent of all urban land use and about 7 percent of the total area of the County. Streets and highways occupied about 14.4 square miles, or about 92 percent of the uses in this category. Major arterial highways serving the County include IH 43, which traverses the County in a generally north-south direction, and State Trunk Highways 32, 33, 57, 60, 167, and 181. Other uses in the transportation, communications, and utilities category within the County include railway freight service lines operated by the Union Pacific Railroad, the Wisconsin and Southern Railroad Company, and Canadian National Railway.

Recreational land uses constituted the third largest urban land use category within the County in 2007, encompassing about 5.0 square miles, or about 8 percent of all urban land uses and about 2 percent of the total area of the County. These figures include only those areas that are developed for intensive recreational use, such as golf courses, campgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, playfields, and accessory uses. Areas used for passive recreational purposes, such as hiking and nature study, are generally designated as open lands or woodlands. A description of park and open space sites within the County is presented Part 2 of this Chapter.





Nonurban Land Uses

Nonurban land uses consist of agricultural lands; natural resource areas, including woodlands, wetlands and surface waters; landfill; nonmetallic mining sites; and other open lands. As indicated on Map 20 and Table 34, nonurban land uses encompassed about 174.5 square miles, or about 74 percent of Ozaukee County in 2007.

Agriculture was the largest single land use in Ozaukee County in 2007. It encompassed about 121.9 square miles, or about 70 percent of nonurban land uses and about 51 percent of the total area of the County. Much of the existing agricultural land is outside of the urban service areas in Ozaukee County, most notably in the Towns of Belgium, Fredonia, Port Washington, and Saukville. The western portion of the City of Mequon, generally outside of the sanitary sewer service area, was also in agricultural use. Agricultural lands include all croplands, pasture lands, orchards, nurseries, and nonresidential farm buildings. A more detailed inventory of agricultural land in Ozaukee County is included in Part 1 of this Chapter.

Natural resource areas, consisting of surface water, wetland, and woodland areas, were the second most predominant land use in the County in 2007. These resources combined encompassed about 40.6 square miles, or about 23 percent of nonurban land uses and about 17 percent of the total area of the County in 2007. Natural resource areas are located throughout Ozaukee County, in both rural areas and within established urban service areas. A complete inventory of natural resource areas is included in Part 2 of this Chapter.

Transportation

Much of the existing transportation facilities and services inventory information for Ozaukee County is from the 2035 regional transportation system plan. The regional plan includes five elements: public transit, transportation systems management, travel demand management, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and arterial streets and highways. Inventory information relating to these elements is presented in this section. Information on rail, harbors, and airport services is also provided. Additional detailed information on the existing Ozaukee County transportation system is provided in Chapter IV of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan.

Streets and Highways

The street and highway system serves several important functions, including providing for the movement of through vehicular traffic; access of vehicular traffic to abutting land uses; movement of pedestrian and bicycle traffic; and location for utilities and stormwater drainage facilities. Street and highway system design is based on a functional grouping or classification of streets and highways, based on the primary function served, such as traffic movement or land access. The three functional classifications of streets and highways are: 1) arterial streets; 2) collector streets; and 3) land access streets. The arterial street and highway system is intended to provide a high degree of travel mobility, serving the through movement of traffic between and through urban areas. Arterial streets and highways accounted for 252 miles, or about 28 percent of the mileage of the total street and highway system in 2001 as identified in Map 51 in Chapter IV of the County comprehensive plan. The primary function of land access streets is to provide access to abutting property. Collector streets are intended to serve primarily as connections between the arterial street system and the land access streets. Farmers rely on the street and highway system, including County and Town roads, to receive many of the products they use in farming activities, to transport raw milk from dairy farms for processing and distribution, and to transport crops and other products produced on the farm to processing facilities and/or markets.

Public Transportation

Public transportation is the transportation of people by publicly operated vehicles between trip origins and destinations, and may be divided into service provided for the general public and service provided to special population groups. Examples of special group public transportation include yellow school bus service operated on behalf of area school districts, and fixed-route bus and paratransit van service provided by counties or municipalities for the elderly and disabled. Public transportation services provided to Ozaukee County residents and businesses include:

• Intercity or interregional public transportation, including:

- Scheduled intercity passenger train service serving Ozaukee County is provided by Amtrak over Canadian Pacific Railway trackage, with stops in the Region at the Milwaukee Intermodal Station in downtown Milwaukee, the Milwaukee Airport Rail Station serving General Mitchell International Airport, and at Sturtevant.
- Intercity bus service serving Ozaukee County is provided by five carriers that stop in nearby downtown Milwaukee. None of the carriers make stops within Ozaukee County.
- Cross-lake ferry service is available in nearby cities. Ferry services for passengers and visitor vehicles are available between Milwaukee and Muskegon, Michigan and between Manitowoc and Ludington, Michigan. Both ferry services operate seasonally in the months of May through October of each year.
- Scheduled air carrier service for County residents is provided by a number of air carriers at Milwaukee County's General Mitchell International Airport.
- Urban public transportation, commonly referred to as public transit, which is open to the general public and provides service within and between large urban areas. The fixed-route bus transit system operated by Ozaukee County falls into this category. Map 52 in the County comprehensive plan shows public transit services provided in Ozaukee County in 2006, including the Ozaukee County Express Bus System and connecting shuttle services.
- Rural and small urban community public transportation. The nonfixed-route shared-ride taxi systems currently operated by Ozaukee and Washington Counties fall into this category.
- Other transportation. Additional transportation services are provided for certain elderly and/or disabled residents by the Cedarburg Senior Center, Ozaukee County Aging and Disability Resource Center (OCADRC), and Ozaukee County Veterans Services Department.

Public transit is essential in any metropolitan area to meet the travel needs of persons unable to use personal automobile transportation; to provide an alternative mode of travel, particularly in heavily traveled corridors within and between urban areas and in densely developed urban communities and activity centers; to provide choice in transportation modes as an enhancement of quality of life; and to support and enhance the economy.

Other Transportation Facilities and Services

Rail Freight Services

Map 55 of the County comprehensive plan shows railway freight service provided within Ozaukee County by three railway companies over approximately 54 miles of active mainline railway lines as of December 2005. The Union Pacific Railroad provided freight service over an approximately 25 mile segment of railway in the eastern portion of Ozaukee County. This railway traversed the County from south to north serving the urban service areas of Mequon-Thiensville, City of Port Washington, and Village of Belgium. The Canadian National Railway provided freight service over an approximately 17 mile segment of railway in the central portion of Ozaukee County from the southern boundary of the County to the northern boundary of the Village of Saukville. Between this point and the northern boundary of the County, the approximately 11 mile segment of railway is owned by the State of Wisconsin and operated by the Wisconsin and Southern Railroad Company. The Wisconsin and Southern Railroad Company was acquired by a private Kansas-based operator of short line railroads, Watco Transportation, in 2011. Some farm products or materials in Ozaukee County are transported and received by the railway operated by the Wisconsin and Southern Railroad Company. These products or materials are hauled to or picked up at transfer stations or cooperatives located in Sheboygan County in or near the Villages of Adell and Random Lake.

Ports and Harbors

Water freight and transportation facilities and services are provided to Ozaukee County by the Port of Milwaukee, which is located 12 miles south of Ozaukee County in the City of Milwaukee. There is one small boat harbor located in Ozaukee County, the Port Washington Marina located on Lake Michigan adjacent to downtown Port Washington. The marina is open to the public and is owned and managed by the City of Port Washington.

Airports

There are no public use airports in Ozaukee County; however, air services are available within a reasonable distance. Commercial airline service is provided to residents of Ozaukee County by General Mitchell International Airport in Milwaukee County. Chartered air service and air freight services are provided at the following publicly owned airports in the vicinity of Ozaukee County: West Bend Municipal Airport and Hartford Municipal Airport in Washington County, Lawrence J. Timmerman Field in Milwaukee County, and Sheboygan County Memorial Airport in Sheboygan County. These airports are capable of accommodating most types of general aviation aircraft.

Utilities

Development in Ozaukee County is dependent on public and private utilities that provide residents and businesses with electric power, natural gas, communication, water, sewage disposal, and solid waste management facilities and services. This section inventories utilities in Ozaukee County, with additional detailed information provided in Chapter IV of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan.

Sanitary Sewer Service

Map 19 shows adopted planned sanitary sewer service areas in Ozaukee County, as approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, as of December 2010. About 66 square miles, or 25 percent of the County were within planned sanitary sewer service areas at that time, which included the Villages of Belgium, Fredonia, Grafton, Newburg, and Saukville and the Cities of Cedarburg and Port Washington. The Village of Thiensville and portions of the City of Mequon are located within the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) and wastewater is treated at MMSD treatment plants in Milwaukee County. The map shows existing areas served by sewer and planned sewer service areas that are anticipated to be served by sanitary sewers in the future. Two different hatch patterns on Map 19 indicate areas served by existing sewers in 2000 and additional areas served between 2000 and 2010, to provide an indication of the potential direction future urban development may occur in urbanizing communities. About 30 square miles, or 13 percent of the County, were served by existing public sanitary sewers in 2000, and about 34 square miles, or 14 percent of the County, were served in 2010. An estimated 64,500 residents, or about 78 percent of Ozaukee County residents, were served by public sewer in 2000. An estimated 67,900 residents, or about 79 percent of Ozaukee County residents, were served by public sever supply services, which are described in the water supply section.

Each sewer service area conveys waste to a wastewater treatment plant. Table 46 in Chapter V of the County comprehensive plan summarizes existing conditions and design capacities of public wastewater treatment plants in Ozaukee County.

Map 19 also shows two sanitary sewer service areas which are not currently served by wastewater treatment plants. These areas, Waubeka and Lake Church, fit the urban characteristics used to delineate sanitary sewer service areas in the Regional Water Quality Management Plan and are recommended to be served by existing wastewater treatment plants in the Villages of Fredonia and Belgium, respectively. A refined sewer service area was identified for Waubeka in the Village of Fredonia sewer service area plan prepared in 1984. A refined sewer service area has not yet been identified for the Lake Church area. A study to identify a Lake Church sewer service area would be conducted if requested by the Town of Belgium, within which the Lake Church area is located, and the Village of Belgium, which owns the wastewater treatment plant that would serve the area.

Private Onsite Wastewater Treatment

Ozaukee County regulates private onsite wastewater treatment systems (POWTS) for any development that is not served by sanitary sewer in Ozaukee County. Development in this case applies to residential uses and commercial and industrial uses that have employees. The authority to regulate POWTS comes from the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, Chapter Commerce (Comm) 83, with related information in Chapters Comm 5, 16, 84 through 87, and 91. Chapter IX, "Sanitation and Health", of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances sets forth the regulations for POWTS in incorporated (city and village) and unincorporated (town) areas of the County.
When a public sanitary sewer system becomes available to a parcel, the POWTS must be disconnected and abandoned. Connection to the public sanitary sewer system must occur within 12 months of availability. Local governments make the determination whether public sanitary sewer service is available to a parcel.

Water Supply

Map 57 in Chapter IV and Map 103 in Chapter XI of the County comprehensive plan shows areas of existing development within Ozaukee County served by public water utilities and private water supply systems,¹⁶ and those areas where development depends on private wells. The portions of Ozaukee County served by public water utilities encompassed about 18 square miles, or about 7 percent of the County, in 2005. An estimated 45,400 County residents, or about 55 percent of the County population, were served by public water utilities in 2000. There were seven public water utilities in the County. Five public water utilities supplied groundwater, and one (the City of Port Washington) supplied Lake Michigan water. Lake Michigan water was also supplied to portions of the City of Mequon and Village of Thiensville by local water utility districts, who purchase the water from the Milwaukee Water Works. Private community water supply systems in the County served about three square miles in 2005. These community water supply systems conduminations, apartment or condominium developments, and institutions. An additional 23 square miles, or 9 percent of the County, were not served by a public or private water supply system. These areas typically contained sub-urban density single-family residential developments or agricultural areas, which obtained their water supply from private wells.

Map 21 identifies areas recommended to be served by public water utilities for a plan design year of 2035 and further indicates the recommended water supply (groundwater or Lake Michigan water). This Map was prepared as part of a regional water supply plan prepared by SEWRPC, which is described in Part 5. The Village of Grafton and the Cities of Mequon and Cedarburg hired a consultant in 2011 to prepare a two-year study analyzing the feasibility of the three communities joining together to supply municipal water supply services with Lake Michigan water or from a series of wells near the Lake shoreline in the future.

Stormwater Management Facilities

The dispersal of urban land uses over larger areas in Ozaukee County and the accompanying increase in impervious areas increases stormwater runoff, which must be accommodated by the stream network or by engineered storm sewer systems. Map 59 of the County comprehensive plan shows that about 25 square miles, or about 9 percent of Ozaukee County, were served by curb and gutter stormwater management facilities in 2005. The Cities of Cedarburg and Port Washington and the Villages of Belgium, Fredonia, Grafton, Newburg, and Saukville have curb and gutter storm sewer systems which collect stormwater and runoff. The Towns of Belgium, Cedarburg, Fredonia, Grafton, Port Washington, and Saukville rely on roadside swales and culverts to collect storm water and runoff. These areas encompassed about 188 square miles, or about 72 percent of Ozaukee County. The City of Mequon and Village of Thiensville had a combination of curb and gutter systems and roadside swales and culverts to handle stormwater collection in 2005. Many local governments require the use of detention and retention basins to help control stormwater runoff and meet the water quality goals specified in Chapter NR 151 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, regardless of whether they use curb and gutter or roadside swales to convey stormwater.

Electric Power Service

Most of Ozaukee County is provided with electric power service by We Energies. Electric power service is available on demand throughout the County and does not constitute a constraint on the location or intensity of urban development in Ozaukee County. A We Energies electric power generation facility is located in the City of Port Washington along Lake Michigan, south of downtown. The City of Cedarburg operates a municipal utility, Cedarburg Light and Water, which provides electric power within the City of Cedarburg and a small portion of the Town of Cedarburg adjacent to the City.

¹⁶Private water supply systems typically provide infrastructure to serve multiple residences in a single family residential or multi-family residential development or a large institutional development. Water serving these developments does not come from a municipal source.

Map 21





Natural Gas Service

Ozaukee County is provided with natural gas by We Energies. A major natural gas pipeline has been constructed through the County, which is shown on Map 60 of the County comprehensive plan. The pipeline follows an east to west route entering Ozaukee County in the northwest corner of the Town of Cedarburg and extends to the We Energies power plant in the City of Port Washington.

Telecommunications Service

Although there are many telecommunication service providers, there are only a few basic types of communication services. These are: 1) Voice Transmission Services, including "Plain Old Telephone Service" (POTS); cellular wireless; satellite wireless; packet-based telephone networks (ATM-Frame Relay); and Internet voice services; 2) Data Transmission Services, including the Internet, ATM-Frame Relay, and third generation (3G) cellular wireless networks; 3) Multimedia Services, including video, imaging, streaming video, data, and voice; and 4) Broadcast Services, including AM/FM terrestrial radio, satellite radio and television, terrestrial television, and cable television.

Wireless antennas providing wireless cellphone service were inventoried in 2006 as part of the regional telecommunications plan. Providers with wireless antennas in Ozaukee County included Cingular, Nextel, Sprint, T-Mobile, U.S. Cellular, and Verizon. The location of wireless antennas in the County are shown on Map 61 and listed in Table 75 of the County comprehensive plan.

Solid Waste Management Facilities

All of the municipal solid waste currently collected in Ozaukee County is landfilled in the Glacier Ridge Landfill in Horicon, Dodge County, or the Orchard Ridge Landfill in Menomonee Falls, Waukesha County. The Glacier Ridge Landfill is owned by Veolia Environmental Services. Veolia is contracted to provide solid waste management services to the City of Port Washington and Villages of Grafton and Saukville. In addition, Veolia provides garbage collection service to residents in the Villages of Belgium, Fredonia, and Newburg and the Towns of Grafton, Fredonia, and Saukville. The Orchard Ridge Landfill is owned by Waste Management Inc. Waste Management is contracted to provide solid waste management services to the City of Cedarburg. The Town of Cedarburg and the Village of Thiensville provide municipal garbage collection service. Their solid waste is deposited at a Veolia transfer station. City of Mequon residents may privately hire Veolia, Waste Management, or Ozaukee Disposal for garbage collection services. Arrow Disposal and recycling maintains a solid waste drop off site in the Town of Port Washington for Town residents.

Another method of solid waste disposal in Ozaukee County is recycling. Section 159.09 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, a component of Wisconsin's recycling law, provides for designation of responsible units of government for implementing recycling programs across the State. These units of government may be County governments or municipal governments. The duties of responsible units include: development of a recycling or other program to manage the solid waste generated within its jurisdiction, preparing a report setting forth the manner in which the responsible unit intends to implement its program, and providing information to the WDNR describing the implementation status of the program. As of 2005, each of the 14 local governments in Ozaukee County and the Village of Newburg were "responsible units of government" for implementing a recycling program within its jurisdiction.

Additional solid waste programs administered by Ozaukee County as of 2011 include a countywide used tire collection day. A countywide used tire collection day is held by UW-Extension-Ozaukee County each year at the Ozaukee County Fairgrounds. County residents are able to dispose of used car tires, light truck tires, heavy truck tires, and rear tires for tractors and combines. In 2005, County residents could drop off hazardous waste (HHW) items at the Veolia/Superior Services waste facility located in the City of Port Washington. This program was eliminated in 2006; however, Veolia may still be contacted for HHW disposal information.

There are also 35 former solid waste facilities in Ozaukee County. The sites are located throughout the County and are typically former municipal landfills or fly ash landfills. The location of each site is shown on Map 62 in the County comprehensive plan.

Community Facilities and Services

Development in Ozaukee County is also dependant on various types of community facilities that provide residents and businesses with administrative, educational, fire and police protection, health, and other services. This section inventories community facilities and services in Ozaukee County with additional detailed information provided in Chapter IV of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan.

Health Care Facilities

Map 63 in Chapter IV of the County comprehensive plan shows hospitals and medical centers in Ozaukee County in 2005. There was one hospital in Ozaukee County offering a full range of medical services. This was Columbia-St. Mary's Hospital (Ozaukee Campus) located in the City of Mequon near the intersection of CTH W (Port Washington Road) and Highland Drive. Columbia-St. Mary's had 82 beds in 2005, but plans an expansion of 98 beds in 2006, which would bring the total number of beds to 180. Table 76 in the County comprehensive plan sets forth the location of medical centers in Ozaukee County in 2005, which include medical centers offering multi-specialty facilities and services. In addition, a new Aurora Medical Center with 107 beds opened in the Village of Grafton in 2010 near the intersection of CTH W and STH 60.

Government and Public Institutional Centers

Map 64 in the County comprehensive plan shows the government and institutional centers in Ozaukee County as of 2005. These facilities include the County Administration and Justice Centers, municipal halls, libraries, and U.S. post offices. In 2005 there were 13 municipal halls, five libraries, and six U.S. post offices in Ozaukee County. Table 77 in the County comprehensive plan sets forth the name and location of each government and public institutional center in Ozaukee County.

Police Services

Map 65 in the County comprehensive plan shows the locations of municipal police department facilities and protection service areas in Ozaukee County and the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department facilities located in the Ozaukee County Justice Center. The Ozaukee County Justice Center houses the Ozaukee County Jail in addition to the Sheriff's Department. The Cities of Cedarburg, Mequon, and Port Washington, and the Villages of Grafton, Newburg, Saukville, and Thiensville each have a municipal police department. Table 78 in the County comprehensive plan sets forth the number of full and part time officers employed by each municipal police department and the County Sheriff's Department as of 2005. The Village of Fredonia also has a police department, which is staffed by a part-time Village Marshal who responds to Village Ordinance violations and five part-time police officers in coordination with the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department. The Village of Belgium and the Towns of Belgium, Cedarburg, Fredonia, Grafton, Port Washington, and Saukville are served by the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department. The Village of Belgium does have a part-time Village Marshal who responds to Village Ordinance violations.

Fire Protection Services

Map 66 in the County comprehensive plan shows the locations of local fire departments, all affiliated fire stations, and the fire protection service area of each department in 2005. There were 11 fire departments serving Ozaukee County in 2005, which included the Waubeka, Random Lake, Belgium, Fredonia, Newburg, Saukville, Port Washington, Cedarburg, Grafton, Mequon, and Thiensville fire departments. Table 79 in the County comprehensive plan sets forth the number of full time, paid on-call, and volunteer firefighters in each department and the square miles served by each department.

Emergency Medical Services

Map 67 in the County comprehensive plan identified 13 emergency medical service (EMS) zones served by 10 EMS Departments and two paramedic departments¹⁷ in Ozaukee County in 2005. Table 80 in the County comprehensive plan lists which departments serve each zone.

¹⁷The City of Port Washington and the Village of Thiensville have upgraded their EMS departments to paramedic departments. These Departments will respond to any call in Ozaukee County outside of their service zone upon the request of an EMS department.

Dispatch Centers

There are five dispatch centers in Ozaukee County taking emergency calls 24 hours a day, which are operated by the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department and the Mequon, Cedarburg, Grafton, and Port Washington Police Departments. In addition, there is a dispatch center operated by the Saukville Police Department from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and a dispatch center operated by the Thiensville Police Department from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Emergency calls placed to these dispatch centers outside operating hours are diverted to the Ozaukee County Sheriff's Department. Map 68 in the County comprehensive plan shows the location of each dispatch center.

Public and Private Schools

There were 24 public schools in seven school districts and 15 private schools in Ozaukee County in 2005. In addition to primary and secondary schools, there were three institutions of higher learning in Ozaukee County. These were the Milwaukee Area Technical College Mequon Campus, Concordia University, and Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, all located in the City of Mequon. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) also maintains a field station with research facilities located at the Cedarburg Bog Natural Area in the Town of Saukville. Map 69 in the County comprehensive plan shows the location of public and private schools and colleges and universities in Ozaukee County in 2005, and the boundaries of school districts. Table 81 in the County comprehensive plan includes the location and grades served for primary and secondary schools and the location of colleges and universities in Ozaukee County.

A number of students, including middle and high school students, are homeschooled in Ozaukee County. Ozaukee Homeschoolers Network is a homeschooling support group operating in the County. The support group offers learning resources and legal information about homeschooling. In addition to the support group, the Oscar Grady library in Saukville has set up a special section offering materials specifically for homeschooled students.

PART 5: EXISTING PLANS

The Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County is intended, in part, to review past agricultural/farmland preservation planning efforts and update those plans as necessary to comply with the State farmland preservation planning law enacted in 2009, and to reflect changes that have occurred since the previous County farmland preservation plan was adopted in 1983 for design year 2000. This plan also takes into consideration areawide and local planning recommendations as those plans affect or relate to agricultural and other natural resource preservation in Ozaukee County. Accordingly, an important step in the planning process was a review of the existing framework of areawide and local plans. This part presents a summary of that review.

Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County

Prime agricultural lands in Ozaukee County were identified as part of the previous Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County,¹⁸ which was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board in 1983. The 1983 plan recommendations are shown on Map 22. That plan defines prime agricultural land as: an individual farm must be at least 35 acres in size; at least one-half of the farm must be covered by soils meeting U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) criteria for national prime farmland or farmland of statewide significance (generally Class I, II, or III soils); and the farm must occur in a contiguous farming area at least 100 acres in size. The identification of prime agricultural lands was the basis for delineating the farmland preservation areas shown on Map 22.

As part of the inventory and analysis conducted for the 1983 County farmland preservation plan, Map 23 was prepared which identifies farms between 1965 through 1982 that contained soil and water conservation plans. The map also indicates where certain types of soil and water conservation practices were implemented by farms, such as vegetative cover, water retention, water flow control, crop production, and other practices.

¹⁸Documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 87, A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, May 1983.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY ADOPTED IN 1983



Source: SEWRPC.

Map 23

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION PLANS AND PRACTICES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1965-1982



Source: SEWRPC.

This farmland preservation planning process is intended to update the 1983 Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County in response to changes to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program made by the Wisconsin Legislature in 2009.

Land Use and Comprehensive Plans

Areawide Land Use Plan

A regional land use plan¹⁹ for the year 2035 was adopted by the Regional Planning Commission and endorsed by the Ozaukee County Board in 2006. The regional plan sets forth the fundamental concepts that are recommended to guide the development of the seven-county Southeastern Wisconsin Region. The regional land use plan map as it pertains to Ozaukee County is shown on Map 74 in Chapter V of the County comprehensive plan. The plan embodies the following vision for the Region over the course of the next three decades:

- The development needs of the Region would be met while preserving the best remaining elements of the natural resource base, most of which are located within environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. The most productive farmland would also be preserved for long-term agricultural use and not be converted to either urban development or to other forms of rural development. An exception is prime agricultural land located adjacent to existing urban centers and within planned urban growth/sewer service areas, which is proposed to be converted to urban use to provide for the orderly growth of those urban centers.
- Areas beyond the planned urban service areas and outside environmental corridors are recommended to remain in primarily agricultural or rural density residential use. Prime agricultural land is recommended to be preserved for farming. The plan also encourages the preservation of nonprime farmland for agricultural use. This could be in the form of traditional agricultural use or alternative agricultural uses such as smaller hobby or specialty farms. The regional plan recommends that the development of nonprime farmland in planned rural areas be limited to rural residential development at a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres. Where rural residential development is accommodated, the regional plan encourages the use of conservation subdivision design, with homes grouped together on relatively small lots surrounded by permanently preserved agricultural, recreational, or natural resource areas such as woodlands, wetlands, or prairies sufficient to maintain the maximum recommended density of no more than one home per five acres. The regional plan recommends the county plans further refine and detail the identification of prime agricultural land. Prime agricultural land is identified in the 1983 Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. A Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) analysis of agricultural lands was conducted in 2007 as part of the Ozaukee County comprehensive planning process to help identify farmlands best suited for long-term protection (see Part 1 of this Chapter).
- New urban development would be provided through the infilling and renewal of existing urban areas and through the orderly outward expansion of existing urban areas, resulting in a more compact and efficient urban settlement pattern, one that is readily served by basic urban services and facilities and that maximizes the use of existing urban service and facility systems.
- Residential development and redevelopment would occur in a variety of residential neighborhood types and in mixed use settings—with an emphasis on low, medium, and high residential densities.
- Growth in the economic base of the Region would be accommodated through the development and redevelopment of major economic activity centers as well as community- and neighborhood-level centers.

Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional and Local Comprehensive Plans

Ozaukee County and 14 cities, villages, and towns completed a multi-jurisdictional County comprehensive plan and a comprehensive plan for each participating city, village, and town. All communities in the County, except the City of Cedarburg, participated in the joint planning process. As part of the planning process, the County and

¹⁹Documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 48, A Regional Land Use Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2035, June 2006.

local governments identified existing and future land uses and important natural resources that should be preserved to maintain the high quality of life in Ozaukee County. The desired land use pattern as adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors in May 2009 is reflected on Map 24, and land use acreages are provided in Table 35. The land use plan maps adopted by local communities are shown on Maps 111 through 124²⁰ in Chapter XIII of the County comprehensive plan.

The County and local comprehensive plans were prepared to comply with the requirements of Wisconsin's comprehensive planning law, which took effect in 1999. The law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, requires County and local governments that enforce zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances to have an adopted comprehensive plan by January 1, 2010. The law requires nine plan elements to be included as part of the comprehensive plan, which include an issues and opportunities element; agricultural, natural, and cultural resources element; land use element; housing element; transportation element; utilities and community facilities element; economic development element; intergovernmental cooperation element; and implementation element. The land use element includes the land use plan map for Ozaukee County for the design year 2035, as shown on Map 24. In addition, the law requires environmentally sensitive lands and natural limitations to building site development to be identified and mapped as part of the planning process, which are reflected on Maps 16 and 17, respectively, and described in Part 2 of this Chapter. The law further requires that productive agricultural soils be identified and mapped. A land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) analysis was conducted by the County to meet this requirement and to develop goals and objectives for farmland preservation in Chapter VII of the County comprehensive plan. Map 6 in Part 1 of this Chapter shows the results of the LESA analysis.

Essentially, Ozaukee County and participating local communities envision urban development to continue to occur within mostly planned urban (sanitary) service areas. The County and local communities also desire the preservation of agricultural resources, environmentally sensitive areas, and rural and small town (community) character. Many of the agricultural, natural, and cultural resource goals and objectives identified in Chapter VII, *Agricultural, Natural, and Cultural Resources Element*, of the County comprehensive plan address these desires and are included in Chapter VI of this farmland preservation plan report.

Park and Open Space Plans

Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan

An updated County park and open space plan was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board in June 2011.²¹ The plan has a planning horizon of 2035 and is intended to maintain County eligibility to apply for and receive Federal and State aids in partial support of the acquisition and development of park and opens space sites and facilities. The plan consists of both an open space preservation element and an areawide outdoor recreation element, intended to, respectively, protect areas containing important natural resources and to provide major parks, areawide trails, and resource-oriented recreational facilities. Major parks are defined as publicly owned parks at least 100 acres in size which provide opportunities for such resource-oriented activities as camping, golfing, picnicking, and swimming. Responsibility for providing community parks, neighborhood parks, and local trails is assigned to cities, villages, and towns.

The County park and open space plan recommends that 33,262 acres of environmentally significant open space lands be preserved, and that about 7,489 acres of land be acquired for park and open space preservation purposes, for which the County would be responsible for acquiring about 2,526 acres of that total. The plan recommends that the County develop additional facilities at Hawthorne Hills County Park, Mee-Kwon County Park, Tendick

²⁰The County land use plan map and several local government land use plan maps have been amended since their initial adoption. Contact the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department for amendments to the County comprehensive plan, and the city, town, or village clerk to determine if a particular community has adopted any amendments to its local comprehensive plan.

²¹Documented in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 133, 3rd Edition, A Park and Open Space Plan for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, June 2011.

Map 24

ADOPTED YEAR 2035 OZAUKEE COUNTY LAND USE PLAN MAP: MAY 2009



Table 35

PLANNED LAND USES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035

		Percent of Subtotal	Percent
Land Use Category ^a	Acres	Nonurban)	of Total
Urban			
Sub-urban Density Residential ^b	22,253	37.0	14.8
Medium Density Urban Residential ^c	11,167	18.5	7.4
High Density Urban Residential ^d	1,895	3.1	1.2
General Commercial (retail/service/office)	2,296	3.8	1.5
Industrial	1,740	2.9	1.2
Business/Industrial Park	2,385	4.0	1.6
Mixed Use	2,395	4.0	1.6
Streets and Highways	9,371	15.5	6.2
Transportation and Utilities	704	1.2	0.5
Government and Institutional ^e	1,729	2.9	1.1
Park and Recreational	4,289	7.1	2.9
Urban Subtotal	60,224	100.0	40.0
Nonurban			
Farmland Protection ^f	40,737	45.1	27.0
Mixed Agriculture/Conservation Subdivision ⁹	5,157	5.7	3.4
Rural Residential ^h	12,191	13.5	8.1
Extractive	389	0.4	0.3
Primary Environmental Corridor ⁱ	18,415	20.4	12.2
Secondary Environmental Corridor ⁱ	4,770	5.3	3.2
Isolated Natural Resource Area ⁱ	3,277	3.6	2.2
Other Conservancy Lands to be Preserved ⁱ	3,294	3.6	2.2
Surface Water	2,140	2.4	1.4
Nonurban Subtotal	90,370	100.0	60.0
Total ^k	150,594		100.0
Overlay Categories			
Traditional Neighborhood Development	428		
Map Modernization Floodplain: 2007	18,385		
Wisconsin Wetland Inventory: 2005	19,413		

Note: Planned land use acreages on this table are based on Map 96 in the Ozaukee County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan report published in May 2009. Contact the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department for amendments to Map 96 that have been adopted by the County Board.

^aIncludes parking and lands under development in appropriate category.

^bAverage density of one home per 1 to 4.9 acres.

^cAverage density of one home per 10,000 to 43,559 square feet.

^dAverage density of less than 10,000 square feet per home.

^e Includes public and private schools, government offices, police and fire stations, libraries, cemeteries, religious institutions, hospitals, nursing homes, and similar facilities.

^fMinimum parcel size of 35 acres.

^gAverage density of one home per 3.5 acres.

^hAverage density of one home per 5 to 34.9 acres.

ⁱDoes not include street and highway rights-of-way and associated surface waters.

¹Includes woodlands, wetlands, natural areas, critical species habitat sites, lands owned by nonprofit conservation organizations outside primary and secondary environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, and significant geological sites.

^kTotal acreage is based on 2010 cadastral and civil division boundary data.

Source: SEWRPC.

Nature Park, and six other parks owned by Ozaukee County; develop six new parks to be added to the County park system; develop trails within the Milwaukee River and Little Menomonee River Corridors; and continue to maintain existing County parks and the Ozaukee Interurban Trail.

City, Village, and Town Park and Open Space Plans

Park and open space plans prepared by local units of government are set forth in Table 88 in Chapter V of the County comprehensive plan. The plans identify needed recreational facilities and delineate natural areas and other open spaces to be preserved within their respective community. Each plan was intended to further establish or maintain eligibility for Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and Wisconsin Stewardship Fund grant programs administered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. Recommendations from existing city, village, and town park and open space plans have been incorporated into the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan and comprehensive plans for participating local governments.

Regional Natural Areas Plan

The Ozaukee County park and open space plan incorporates the recommendations of the regional natural areas plan.²² The regional natural areas plan as it pertains to Ozaukee County is depicted in Map 12 in Part 2 of this Chapter. The natural areas plan identifies the most significant remaining natural areas, critical species habitats, aquatic habitats, geological sites, and archaeological sites in the Region, and recommends means for their protection and management. The plan identifies potential sites to be placed in public or private protective ownership, and other sites to be protected, insofar as it is possible, through zoning and other regulatory means without protective ownership. It also recommends that a detailed management plan be prepared and implemented for each site placed under protective ownership. Part 2 describes the inventory of natural areas, critical species habitat sites, aquatic habitat sites, and significant geological areas in Ozaukee County, as shown in Map 12.

Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Leopold Wetland Management District

In 2008, the Leopold Wetland Management District (WMD), administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, prepared a Comprehensive Conservation Plan²³ for managing habitat, wildlife, and public use in the District. Established in 1993, the Leopold WMD manages more than 12,000 acres of Waterfowl Production Areas in 17 southeastern Wisconsin counties including Ozaukee County, covering some of the most important waterfowl areas of Wisconsin. The plan outlines how the District will fulfill its legal purpose and contribute to the National Wildlife Refuge System's wildlife, habitat, and public use goals, objectives, and strategies for the next 15 years. The plan is a guide for strategic planning and prioritizing programs. Affected communities were involved in the planning process.

Wisconsin Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan

Since 1965, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources has developed and maintained the Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). This plan examines various recreation trends, assesses current and future recreational needs within the State, and sets forth appropriate recommendations to meet those needs. The SCORP plan is updated every five years, the current plan is for the period 2011-2016. The SCORP should be used as a reference source as the adopted Ozaukee County park and open space plan is implemented.

²²Documented in SEWRPC Planning Report No. 42, A Natural Areas and Critical Species Habitat Protection and Management Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin, September 1997. The plan was updated and amended in 2010.

²³U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Leopold Wetland Management District, Comprehensive Conservation Plan, 2008.

Conservation and Greenway Connection Plans

The Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD), with the assistance of SEWRPC, prepared a "greenway connection plan"²⁴ as a companion to a "Conservation Plan"²⁵ prepared by the Conservation Fund staff, a National nonprofit conservation organization. The Conservation Plan identifies land parcels which are recommended to be protected for multiple purposes including flood reduction, stormwater management, wildlife habitat, water quality, and recreational benefits. The Conservation Plan identified 165 sites for protection through public acquisition or conservation easements throughout the Menomonee River, Root River, and Oak Creek watersheds within the District's planning area. The planning area includes the City of Mequon, the Village of Thiensville, and a portion of the Village of Bayside in Ozaukee County. The greenway connection plan identified in the Conservation Plan. In addition, it envisions that the planning process would synthesize the results of the other related open space planning efforts undertaken in the MMSD area, resulting in a comprehensive District-wide greenway connection plan having flood mitigation benefits as well as a wide range of other environmental benefits. In 2010, nine sites in Ozaukee County were owned by MMSD, which were purchased under its "Greenseams" program with assistance from the Conservation Fund, as indicated in Part 2 of this Chapter.

North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area Plan

The WDNR North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area was established in 2002. A feasibility study for the North Branch Area sets forth goals for creating grasslands and restoring wetlands, while maintaining the viability of farming in the area. The study notes that all townships in the North Branch study area are identified as critical habitat within the Southeast Focus Area of the Upper Mississippi River and Great Lakes Region Joint Venture of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan (1992). As such, the area has been selected to receive grants through the North American Wetland Conservation Act because of the potential for, and value to wildlife of, restoring grasslands and wetlands and because some of the highest waterfowl breeding densities come from this area of the State." The project site consists of about 19,487 acres that lie within the Milwaukee River Basin and is located in portions of northwestern Ozaukee County, northeastern Washington County, and southwestern Sheboygan County. The project site encompasses river and stream corridors, large wetland complexes, agricultural lands, and three minor lakes. The portion of the project site within Ozaukee County is shown on Map 14 and described in detail in Part 2 of this Chapter.

Water Quality and Supply Plans

Water Quality Management Plan

In 1979, the Regional Planning Commission adopted an areawide water quality management plan²⁶ for Southeastern Wisconsin as a guide to achieving clean and wholesome surface waters within the seven-county Region. The plan has five elements: a land use element; a point source pollution abatement element; a nonpoint source pollution abatement element; a sludge management element; and a water quality monitoring element.

The point source pollution abatement element of the regional water quality management plan is of particular importance to land use planning. That plan element recommends major sewage conveyance and treatment

²⁴Documented in SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 152, A Greenway Connection Plan for the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District, December 2002.

²⁵The Conservation Fund; Applied Ecological Service, Inc.; Heart Lake Conservation Associates; Velasco & Associates; and K. Singh & Associates, Conservation Plan, technical report submitted to MMSD, October 31, 2001.

²⁶Documented in the three-volume SEWRPC Planning Report No. 30, A Regional Water Quality Management Plan for Southeastern Wisconsin: 2000, as amended. The plan was updated in 2007 for the Greater Milwaukee Watersheds.

facilities and identifies planned sanitary sewer service areas for each of the sewerage systems in Southeastern Wisconsin. Under Wisconsin law, major sewerage system improvements and all sewer service extensions must be in conformance with the plan.

Part 4 of this Chapter shows public sanitary sewer service areas in Ozaukee County on Map 19 and provides additional information regarding existing areas provided with sewer service and sewerage facilities as well as areas planned to be served.

Water Quality Management Plan Update

The Commission worked with the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District (MMSD) to update the regional water quality management plan in 2007 for the "Greater Milwaukee Watersheds." The area involved included all of the Kinnickinnic River, Menomonee River, Milwaukee River, Root River, and Oak Creek watersheds; the Milwaukee Harbor estuary; and the adjacent nearshore areas draining to Lake Michigan. All of Ozaukee County is included in the plan update except the Sauk Creek, Sucker Creek, and Sheboygan River watersheds and two small portions of the Lake Michigan direct drainage area located in the northeast portion of Ozaukee County.

This interagency effort used the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's recommended watershed approach to update the Regional Water Quality Management Plan and to develop the MMSD's 2020 Facilities Plan for the study area, called the Greater Milwaukee Watersheds. The plan recommends the control of both point and nonpoint pollution sources, and provides the basis for decisions on community, industrial, and private waste disposal systems.

Regional Water Supply Plan

The Commission completed a regional water supply study for the Southeastern Wisconsin Region in 2010. The plan, together with groundwater inventories and a ground water simulation model, formed the SEWRPC regional water supply management program. The preparation of these three elements included interagency partnerships with the U.S. Geological Survey, the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, and many of the area's water supply utilities. Map 21 in Part 4 shows areas recommended to be served by public water utilities and the source of water supply for the year 2035 based on the recommendations of the regional water supply plan.

The regional water supply plan includes the following major components:

- Water supply service areas and forecast demand for water use.
- Recommendations for water conservation efforts to reduce water demand.
- Evaluation of alternative sources of supply, recommended sources of supply for each service area, and recommendations for development of the basic infrastructure required to deliver that supply.
- Identification of groundwater recharge areas to be protected from incompatible development.
- Specification of new institutional structures necessary to carry out plan recommendations.
- Identification of constraints to development levels in subareas of the Region that emanate from water supply sustainability concerns.

Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan

The Wisconsin legislature established through Act 27 in 1997 and Act 9 in 1999 the land and water resource management (LWRM) planning program as Chapter 92 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. This program is the primary Statewide vehicle for implementing conservation practices included in the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) administrative rules in Chapter ATCP 50 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. Under this program, counties are required to develop land and water resource management plans for the purpose of conserving soil and water resources. Only counties with DATCP-approved land and water resource management plans are eligible to receive annual funding through the soil and water resource management grant program.

The Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan, originally written in 1996, has since been updated. The most recent *Ozaukee County Land & Water Resource Management Plan 2011-2015* was adopted by resolution by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors on March 2, 2011. The plan identifies a set of priority issues and establishes a work plan related to County land and water resources, including nonpoint pollution reduction and control, habitat protection and restoration, public recreation and access, protection of natural systems, preservation and protection of farmland and other working lands, protection of Lake Michigan and associated resources, wildlife management, and public safety.

PART 6: EXISTING REGULATIONS

Good community development depends not only on quality planning at all levels of government, but on practical implementation measures as well. Land use and development regulations affect the extent of agricultural and natural resources preserved and the type of uses allowed, as well as the detailed design and site layout of proposed developments. The following presents a summary of land use regulations adopted by Ozaukee County²⁷ and zoning, subdivision, and official mapping regulations adopted by local governments that participated in the development of this plan. County and local planning objectives identified by Ozaukee County and local officials are often reflected in locally adopted land use control ordinances.

Section 66.1001(3) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires the adoption or amendment of zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances by local and county governments to be consistent with local and county comprehensive plans, respectively, as of January 1, 2010. Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* further requires that, if a county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. This updated Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County was prepared as part of, and as an amendment to, the adopted Ozaukee County comprehensive plan.

Zoning

A zoning ordinance is a public law that regulates and restricts the use of property in the public interest. The primary function of zoning should be to implement an adopted master or comprehensive plan and plan elements or components thereof, including land use and farmland preservation plans. A zoning ordinance divides a community into districts for the purpose of regulating the use of land and structures, including identifying areas to be preserved; the height, size, shape, and placement of structures; and the density of housing. A zoning ordinance typically consists of two parts: a text setting forth regulations that apply to each of the various zoning districts, together with related procedural and administrative requirements; and a map delineating the boundaries of zoning districts.

County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinances

Under the Section 59.692 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, counties are responsible for zoning shoreland areas within unincorporated areas. Shoreland areas are defined in the *Statutes* as lands within the following distance from the ordinary high-water mark of navigable waters: 1,000 feet from a lake, pond, or flowage; and 300 feet from a river or stream or to the landward side of the floodplain, whichever distance is greater.

The Ozaukee County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance includes restrictions on uses in wetlands located in the shorelands, and limits the types of uses that can occur in the 100-year recurrence interval flood hazard area to prevent damage to structures and property and to protect the floodwater conveyance and storage capacity of floodplains. The ordinance also includes restrictions on the removal of vegetation and other activities in the shoreland area, and requires that most structures be set back a minimum of 75 feet from navigable waters. Minimum requirements for uses in unincorporated shoreland areas are set forth in Chapter NR 115 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. Minimum floodplain requirements are set forth in Chapter NR 116. Map 25 depicts shoreland areas in unincorporated areas regulated under the County Ordinance in 2010. Floodplains and shoreland-wetlands are also shown.

²⁷Ozaukee County also exercises zoning authority over County-owned lands in unincorporated areas, in accordance with an ordinance adopted by the County Board on May 1, 2013.

Map 25

SHORELAND AND FLOODPLAIN ZONING IN UNINCORPORATED AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010



County regulations continue to apply in shoreland areas annexed by cities and villages after May 7, 1982, unless the city or village adopts shoreland regulations that are at least as restrictive as those included in the County ordinance. Where County regulations continue in effect, the city or village is responsible for enforcing the regulations. Cities and villages are also required to regulate wetlands of five acres or larger within shoreland areas, including those that were in the city or village prior to 1982, under Chapter NR 117 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*; and to enforce the minimum floodplain standards set forth in Chapter NR 116 within all floodplain areas of the city or village.

Local Zoning Ordinances

Each city, town, and village in Ozaukee County has adopted a zoning ordinance. Zoning district maps and regulations for each participating local government are presented in Appendix D.

Map 26 depicts generalized basic zoning in Ozaukee County for participating local governments based on zoning in effect in 2010. To prepare this Map, local basic zoning districts of participating local governments, as shown in Appendix D on Maps D-1 through D-7, were converted to a uniform classification system and mapped. The composite map reflects general basic zoning districts and notes that local zoning district maps, Maps D-1 through D-7, should be referred to for additional details and overlay zoning districts.

Extraterritorial Zoning Regulations

The *Wisconsin Statutes* authorize cities and villages to adopt extraterritorial zoning regulations for adjacent unincorporated areas, in cooperation with the adjacent town, within three miles of a city of the first, second, or third class; and within 1.5 miles of a city of the fourth class or villages. The City of Mequon is the only municipality in Ozaukee County which has adopted an extraterritorial zoning ordinance. The ordinance applies to an approximately 1,528-acre area in the Town of Grafton, adjacent to the northeast portion of the City. The Mequon extraterritorial zoning regulations were approved by the joint City-Town zoning committee in October, 2004. Several other communities have initiated extraterritorial zoning processes within the past 10 years, but all have now expired without adoption of extraterritorial zoning regulations, including processes initiated by both the Village of Newburg and the Village of Saukville affecting portions of the Town of Saukville in 2005; the City of Cedarburg over portions of the Town of Cedarburg in 2006; and the Village of Cedar Grove in Sheboygan County over portions of the Town of Belgium in 2007. Appendix M in the County comprehensive plan includes a summary of the process set forth in the *Statutes* for enacting an extraterritorial zoning ordinance.

Land Division Regulations

A land division ordinance is a public law that regulates the division of land into smaller parcels. Land division ordinances provide for appropriate public oversight of the creation of new parcels and help ensure that new development is appropriately located; lot size minimums specified in zoning ordinances are observed; arterial street rights-of-way are appropriately dedicated or reserved; access to arterial streets and highways is limited in order to preserve the traffic-carrying capacity and safety of such facilities; adequate land for parks, drainageways, and other open spaces is appropriately located and preserved; street, block, and lot layouts are appropriate; and adequate public improvements are provided. Land division ordinances can be enacted by cities, villages, towns, and counties, with the latter's approval authority applying only to unincorporated (town) areas and limited objecting authority applying within cities and villages. Thus, within towns, it is possible for both counties and towns to have concurrent jurisdiction over land divisions. Cities and villages also have "extraterritorial" plat approval jurisdiction over subdivisions proposed in town areas near their corporate boundaries.

Chapter 236 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* sets forth general requirements governing the subdivision of land, including, among others, surveying and monumenting requirements, necessary approvals, recording procedures, and requirements for amending or changing subdivision maps. The *Statutes* also grant authority to county and local governments to review subdivision maps, commonly referred to as plats, with respect to local plans and ordinances. Section 236.45 authorizes county and local governments to adopt their own land division ordinances, which may be more restrictive than State requirements.

Map 26

GENERALIZED EXISTING BASIC ZONING FOR PARTICIPATING COMMUNITIES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010



Source: Local Governments and SEWRPC.

Table 36

SCOPE OF COUNTY AND LOCAL SUBDIVISION ORDINANCES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2010

	-	-	
Governmental Unit	Governing Body Has Adopted a Subdivision Control Ordinance	Ordinance Applies to Divisions of Land Other than Subdivisions as Defined in State Statutes ^a	Scope of Ordinance if Different from Statutory Scope
Ozaukee County	Yes	Yes	Ordinance applies in unincorporated shoreland areas only: any land division resulting in three or more parcels. The County also has approving authority over all subdivisions in towns and objecting authority over all subdivisions in cities and villages under Chapter 236 of the <i>Wisconsin Statutes</i>
Cities			
Cedarburg	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in a parcel less than 35 acres
Mequon	Yes	Yes	All land divisions; condominiums
Port Washington	Yes	Yes	All land divisions; condominiums
Villages			
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in a parcel less than 10 acres
Fredonia	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in a parcel of four acres or less; condominiums
Grafton	Yes	Yes	All land divisions
Saukville	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in five or more parcels of 1.5 acres or less, or other land division resulting in a parcel less than 10 acres
Thiensville	Yes	Yes	All land divisions
Towns			
Belgium	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in a parcel less than 35 acres
Cedarburg	Yes	Yes	All land divisions
Fredonia	Yes	Yes	All land divisions
Grafton	Yes	Yes	All land divisions
Port Washington	Yes	Yes	All land divisions; condominiums
Saukville	Yes	Yes	Any land division resulting in a parcel less than 35 acres; condominiums

^aUnder Chapter 236 of the Wisconsin Statutes, a subdivision is defined as the division of a lot, parcel or tract of land where the act of division creates five or more parcels or building sites of 1.5 acres each or less in area; or where five or more parcels or building sites of 1.5 acres each or less in area are created by successive divisions within a period of five years.

Source: SEWRPC.

The Ozaukee County shoreland and floodplain zoning ordinance includes land division regulations for areas located in the shoreland. Ozaukee County also has authority under Section 236.10 of the *Statutes* to review and approve all subdivisions located in unincorporated portions of the County. All cities, towns, and villages in the County have adopted a land division ordinance. Under Chapter 236, local governments are required to review and take action on plats for subdivisions. Subdivisions are defined in the *Statutes* as "a division of a lot, parcel, or tract of land by the owner thereof or the owner's agent for purpose of sale or of building development, where the act of division creates five or more parcels or building sites of 1.5 acres each or less in area are created by successive divisions within a period of five years." Local subdivision ordinances may be broader in scope and require review and approval of land divisions in addition to those meeting the statutory definition of a "subdivision," including review of land division screating condominiums or fewer than five lots. Table 36 provides a summary of the scope of land division ordinances adopted by local governments in Ozaukee County.

Extraterritorial Platting Authority

Under Section 236.10 of the Statutes, a city or village may review, and approve or reject, subdivision plats located within its extraterritorial area if it has adopted a subdivision ordinance or an official map. Section 236.02 of the Statutes defines the extraterritorial plat review jurisdiction as the unincorporated area within three miles of the corporate limits of a city of the first, second, or third class, or within 1.5 miles of the corporate limits of a city of the fourth class or a village. In accordance with Section 66.0105 of the *Statutes*, in situations where the extraterritorial plat approval jurisdiction of two or more cities or villages would otherwise overlap, the extraterritorial jurisdiction between the municipalities is divided on a line, all points of which are equidistant from the boundaries of each municipality concerned, so that no more than one city or village exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction over any unincorporated area. All cities and villages in the County and two villages outside of the County to the north have extraterritorial plat authority as depicted in Map 82 of the County comprehensive plan. The extraterritorial area changes whenever a city or village annexes land, unless the city or village has established a permanent extraterritorial area through a resolution of the common council or village board or through an agreement with a neighboring city or village. A municipality may also waive its right to approve plats within any portion of its extraterritorial area by adopting a resolution that describes or maps the area in which it will review plats, as provided in Section 236.10(5) of the Statutes. The resolution must be recorded with the County register of deeds.

Official Mapping Ordinances

Section 62.23(6) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* allows the Common Council of any City to establish an official map for the precise identification of right-of-way lines and boundaries of streets, highways, waterways,²⁸ and parkways and the location and extent of railroad rights-of-way, public transit facilities, parks, and playgrounds. An official map is intended to be used as a precise planning tool for implementing master and comprehensive plans and for insuring the availability of land for the above features.

Section 61.35 of the *Statutes* grants the authority provided to cities under Section 62.23 to develop an official map to villages. Similarly, Section 60.10(2)(c) authorizes towns to engage in the same planning activities as a village, including preparation of an official map, provided the town board has adopted village powers and created a town plan commission. All of the towns in Ozaukee County have adopted village powers and created a town plan commission. The clerk of any city, village, or town in the County that adopts an official map must record a certificate showing that the city, village, or town has established an official map with the Ozaukee County register of deeds.

One of the basic purposes of the official map is to prohibit the construction of structures and their associated improvements on land that has been designated for future public use. Local government subdivision ordinances can also require land shown on the official map to be dedicated for street, park, or other public use at the time land is subdivided. The official map is a plan implementation device that operates on a communitywide basis in advance of land development and can thereby effectively assure the integrated development of the street and highway system. Unlike subdivision control, which operates on a plat-by-plat basis, the official map can operate over the entire community in advance of development proposals. The official map is a useful device to achieve public acceptance of long-range plans in that it serves legal notice of the government's intention well in advance of any actual improvements. Table 92 in Chapter V of the County comprehensive plan lists those communities in Ozaukee County that have adopted an official map.

Nonmetallic Mining Reclamation

The Ozaukee County nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance was established to ensure the effective reclamation of nonmetallic mining sites in Ozaukee County. The ordinance adopts the uniform Statewide standards for nonmetallic mining required by Section 295.12(1)(a) of the *Statutes* and Chapter NR 135 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. The requirements of the ordinance apply to all operators of nonmetallic mining sites within Ozaukee County operating or commencing operation after August 1, 2001, except for nonmetallic

²⁸Waterways may be placed on the map only if included within a comprehensive surface water drainage plan.

mining sites located in a city, village, or town that has adopted a local mining reclamation ordinance pursuant to Section 295.14 of the *Statutes* and Section NR 135.32(2) of the *Administrative Code*. All reclamation plans must meet the standards set forth by the Ozaukee County nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance including those addressing: surface water and wetland protection, groundwater protection, topsoil management, final grading and slopes, topsoil redistribution for reclamation, and revegetation and site stabilization, and also set forth criteria for assessing completion of successful site reclamation, intermittent mining, and maintenance.

A number of communities require nonmetallic mining restoration plans for nonmetallic mining sites through local zoning ordinances. Communities with zoning ordinances that require restoration plans include: the Town of Cedarburg, Town of Fredonia, Village of Fredonia, Town of Grafton, City of Port Washington, and Town of Port Washington. Local zoning requirements are in addition to State nonmetallic mining site reclamation requirements. All nonmetallic mining operations must comply with Chapter NR 135 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* as enforced by Ozaukee County unless the municipality has adopted a nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance that complies with Chapter NR 135. The Town of Saukville adopted a nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance in 2010 that meets the State requirements.

Erosion Control and Stormwater Management

Stormwater management and construction site erosion control ordinances act to protect water quality and protect and promote health, safety, and general welfare by minimizing the amount of sediment and other pollutants carried to lakes, streams, and wetlands by stormwater and runoff discharged from construction sites or land disturbing activities. Table 90 in Chapter V of the County comprehensive plan sets forth local governments in Ozaukee County that have adopted a construction site erosion control ordinance and a stormwater management ordinance or plan. In many cases, the local construction site erosion control ordinance includes stormwater management regulations.

Sections 62.234 and 61.354 of the *Statutes* grant authority to cities and villages, respectively, to adopt ordinances for the prevention of erosion from construction sites and the management of stormwater runoff from lands within their jurisdiction. Under Section 60.627 of the *Statutes*, towns may adopt village powers and subsequently utilize the authority conferred on villages to adopt their own erosion control and stormwater management ordinances. Chapter NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*, which is intended to reduce the discharge of pollutants carried by stormwater, requires county and local governments in urbanized areas, which are identified based on population and density, to obtain a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) Stormwater Discharge Permit. The code requires that the designated county or local government meet State standards to control pollution that enters a municipal storm sewer system and develop a storm sewer system map, a public information and education program, a stormwater and erosion control ordinance, an illicit discharge detection program, and a plan to reduce suspended solids. An annual report on progress in meeting the requirements must be submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR).

Chapter NR 151 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* requires that municipalities with a WPDES permit reduce the amount of total suspended solids in stormwater runoff by 20 percent by 2008 and by 40 percent by 2013, with respect to stormwater runoff from areas of existing development with no controls as of October 2004. The following communities have received a WPDES Stormwater Discharge Permit under Phase I stormwater regulations: the Village and Town of Grafton (joint application); the City of Mequon and Village of Thiensville (joint application); the Village of Bayside (joint application with other Milwaukee County communities); and the City of Cedarburg. The Village of Saukville, Town of Saukville, and Town of Cedarburg must also obtain Phase I WPDES permits. Ozaukee County must obtain a permit for County facilities in any local government required to obtain a permit.

Phase II of NR 216 requires municipalities outside urbanized areas with a population greater than 10,000 and a density over 1,000 persons per square mile to obtain a WPDES Stormwater Discharge Permit. As a result of Phase II requirements, the City of Port Washington will be required to obtain a permit. The WDNR has notified Ozaukee County through a notice of intent (NOI) that the County will need to prepare a stormwater management plan. The Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted a Construction Site Erosion Control and Post-Construction Storm Water Management Ordinance in 2009.

In addition, regardless of whether a municipality is required to have a stormwater discharge permit under Chapter NR 216, Chapter NR 151 requires that all construction sites that have one acre or more of land disturbance must achieve an 80 percent reduction in the amount of sediment that runs off the site. With certain limited exceptions, those sites required to have construction erosion control permits must also have post-development stormwater management practices to reduce the total suspended solids (sediment) that would otherwise run off the site by 80 percent for new development, 40 percent for redevelopment, and 40 percent for infill development occurring prior to October 1, 2012. After October 1, 2012, infill development will be required to achieve an 80 percent reduction. If it can be demonstrated that the solids reduction standard cannot be met for a specific site, total suspended solids must be controlled to the maximum extent practicable.

Under the requirements of Chapter NR 151, beginning March 10, 2008, incorporated municipalities with average population densities of 1,000 people or more per square mile that are not required to obtain municipal stormwater discharge permits must implement public information and education programs relative to specific aspects of nonpoint source pollution control; municipal programs for management of leaf and grass clippings; and site specific programs for application of lawn and garden fertilizers on municipally-owned properties with over five acres of pervious surface. This requirement applies to virtually all cities and villages.

SUMMARY

This Chapter contains six parts of inventory and analysis data that are relevant to and may affect agricultural preservation in some manner. The planning recommendations set forth in Chapters V and VI are directly related to this data. Key findings include:

Part 1: Soils and Agricultural Resources

- There are five soil associations in Ozaukee County: the Kewanee-Manawa association, Ozaukee-Mequon association, Hochheim-Sisson-Casco association, Houghton-Adrian association, and the Casco-Fabius association.
- Soils that are saturated with water or that have a water table at or near the surface, also known as hydric soils, pose significant limitations for most types of development. About 30 percent of the County, or 44,698 acres, are covered by hydric soils.
- The U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has created a land evaluation and site assessment (LESA) system for identifying areas to be preserved for farmland. LESA is a numeric system for rating potential farmland preservation areas by evaluating soil quality (LE or land evaluation) and geographic variables (SA or site assessment). To develop the LE rating, the NRCS rated each soil type in Ozaukee County and placed the soil ratings into groups ranging from the best to the worst suited for cropland. The best group is assigned a value of 100 and all other groups are assigned lower values. In addition to soil type, the land evaluation component considers slope, the agricultural capability class, and soil productivity. There are 79,859 acres of land covered by soils with values ranging between 90 and 100, or about 53 percent of the County, including 14,795 acres of land covered by soils ranging between 95 and 100, or about 10 percent of the County.
- An Ozaukee County LESA analysis was conducted using SEWRPC and County Geographic Information System (GIS) data to analyze and assign each agricultural parcel in the County a LESA score between 0 and 10, with 10 being the best possible score. The County comprehensive plan recommends that parcels in the highest scoring categories, 9.0 to 10.0 and 8 to 8.9, be given the highest priority for farmland protection resources. Parcels in the next highest scoring categories, 7.0 to 7.9 and 6.4 to 6.9, should be given the next highest priority for farmland protection resources. Six parcels, with 401 acres in agricultural use, are in the highest scoring category (9.0 to 10.0). There are 164 parcels, with 10,450 acres in agricultural use, in the 8.0 to 8.9 category and 807 parcels, with 28,217 acres in agricultural use, in the 7.0 to 7.9 category.

- About 8 percent of the County, or 11,318 acres, have been identified as having highly erodible soils, and about 26 percent, or 38,497 acres, have been identified as having potentially highly erodible soils.
- There are two known active drainage districts in Ozaukee County, both located in the Town and Village of Belgium, and include the Belgium-Holland Drainage District No. 1 and Belgium-Holland Drainage District No. 2. The two districts encompassed an area of 4,078 acres in Ozaukee County in 2006.
- Lands used for agriculture were identified in the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan for Ozaukee County and include all croplands, pasture lands, orchards, nurseries, and associated farm buildings and farmhouses. In 2007, agricultural lands occupied 77,601 acres, or about 121 square miles, representing about 52 percent of the County.
- Dairy farming was the predominant source of agricultural revenue in the County in 2007, accounting for about 56 percent of total agricultural sales revenue. The second and third predominant sources of agricultural revenue were grain crops and horticulture products, respectively, each accounting for about 14 percent of agricultural revenue.
- The value of production is an estimated total monetary value of the agricultural commodity produced and harvested in which portions are sold and/or retained for personal use, which often differs from the market value generated from the sale of the product. Corn for grain had the highest production value in the County in 2010, which accounted for about 53 percent of total crop production value; followed by soybeans, which accounted for about 29 percent of the total production value.
- Ozaukee County farms produce a varied array of agricultural products including many varieties of crops and livestock. Among the most prominent of these agricultural products are corn, forage (hay, grass silage, and greenchop), soybeans, small grains, and dairy products.
- Based on the 2007 Census of Agriculture conducted by the USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service, Ozaukee County farms produced agricultural products with a market value of \$59,056,000, consisting of about \$20,898,000, or about 35 percent, in crops and about \$38,159,000, or about 65 percent, in livestock, poultry, and associated products. The average farm in the County produced agricultural products with a market value of about \$115,120, a 60 percent increase from the 2002 level of \$71,901.
- Farming in the County was the principal occupation (50 percent or more of work time spent on farming or ranching) of the farm operator on 231 farms, or about 45 percent, and was not the primary occupation of the farm operator on 282 farms, or about 55 percent. Of the total 612 farm laborers hired on 138 farms in Ozaukee County, 257 laborers, or about 42 percent, worked 150 days or more, while 355 laborers, or about 58 percent, worked less than 150 days in 2007.
- There were 513 farms in Ozaukee County in 2007. The average farm size in the County was 138 acres in 2007, while the median farm size was 56 acres. This compares to 194 acres and 95 acres, respectively, for farms in the State. Of the 513 farms in Ozaukee County in 2007, 448 farms were between 10 acres and 499 acres in size; 35 farms were less than 10 acres in size; and 30 farms were 500 acres or greater in size.
- In 2006, there were 348 Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) contracts in towns in Ozaukee County and three FPP agreements in the City of Mequon, encompassing a total 21,881 acres of farmland. In 2005, there were 80 CRP contracts and five CREP contracts in Ozaukee County. CRP lands encompassed about 5,892 acres and CREP lands encompassed about 120 acres. There were four WRP agreements encompassing about 40 acres in Ozaukee County.
- Agricultural infrastructure and services supporting farming operations help sustain a viable agricultural industry in Ozaukee County. Supporting infrastructure and services that exist in the County include processors, cooperatives, agricultural by-products, farm veterinary service, public farmers' markets, suppliers, and other related services.

• Agricultural diversification is an important mechanism to help retain the future economic viability of farming. In addition to traditional farming activities, specialty or niche farming exist in the County, including raising unique animals, aquaculture, orchards, horticulture, rotation and organic farming, farmer's market produce, and community-supported agriculture (CSA) operations.

Part 2: Other Related Natural and Cultural Resources

- Bedrock formations underlying the County consist of the Milwaukee Formation and Niagara Dolomite. The Milwaukee Formation includes shale and shale limestone and dolomite in the bottom third. It is approximately 130 feet thick and is found in a 23,276-acre area, or about 36 square miles, in the eastern portion of the County along Lake Michigan. Niagara Dolomite is approximately 100 feet thick and is found in a 135,520-acre area, or almost 212 square miles, in the central and western portions of the County.
- Nonmetallic mineral resources include, but are not limited to, gravel, crushed stone, building (dimension) stone, peat, and clay. Nonmetallic mines in Southeastern Wisconsin provide sand, gravel, and crushed limestone or dolomite for structural concrete and road building; peat for gardening and horticulture; and dimension stone for use in buildings, landscaping, and monuments. Areas in Ozaukee County with bedrock near the surface to economically quarry stone total about 17,863 acres, or about 12 percent of the County.
- The major watersheds in the County include the Milwaukee River, Sauk Creek, Menomonee River, Sheboygan River, and Sucker Creek watersheds. The majority of the County is located in the Milwaukee River watershed which covers 151 square miles, or 64 percent of the County. All five watersheds drain directly into Lake Michigan, which is part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River drainage system.
- Surface waters covered an area of 2,704 acres, or about 2 percent, of the County in 2005, including three major inland lakes, 546 minor lakes and ponds, and approximately 94 miles of perennial streams. There are also about 25 miles of Lake Michigan shoreline along the eastern edge of the County. In 2007, there were approximately 29 square miles of floodplain in the County, and in 2005, there were approximately 30 square miles of wetlands in the County.
- Recharge of the aquifers underlying Ozaukee County is derived largely by precipitation. Areas of groundwater recharge are based upon the rate of annual groundwater recharge from precipitation in the County. About 5 percent of the County is rated "very high" for recharge potential, and about 19 percent is rated "high" for recharge potential. About one-half of the County (about 58 percent) is classified as having "moderate" recharge potential.
- Woodlands encompassed 11 square miles, or about 5 percent of the County, in 2007. The Managed Forest Law (MFL) program is an incentive program intended to encourage sustainable forestry on private woodlands in Wisconsin with a primary focus on timber production. In 2005, there were 58 participants enrolled in the MFL program within the County.
- Natural areas are tracts of land or water so little modified by human activity, or sufficiently recovered from the effects of such activity, that they contain intact native plant and animal communities believed to be representative of the landscape before European settlement. Fifty natural areas lying wholly or partially in Ozaukee County have been identified. These sites encompass 7,657 acres, or about 5 percent of the County.
- Critical species habitat sites consist of areas outside natural areas which are important for their ability to support rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species. Seventeen sites supporting rare or threatened plant and animal species have been identified in Ozaukee County. These sites encompass an area of 729 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County. There are also 22 aquatic sites supporting threatened or rare fish, herptile, or mussel species in the County, including about 63 stream miles and 406 lake acres.
- A total of 16 sites of geological importance, including one glacial feature and 15 bedrock geology sites, were identified in the County in 2009 as part of the regional natural areas study. Together, these sites encompass about 274 acres in Ozaukee County.

- Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas include the best remaining woodlands, wetlands, plant and wildlife habitat areas, and other natural resources and have truly immeasurable environmental and recreational value. Environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas are identified by SEWRPC and classified depending on their size. Primary environmental corridors are at least 400 acres in area, two miles in length, and 200 feet in width. Secondary environmental corridors are between 100 and 400 acres in size and at least one mile in length, except where secondary corridors serve to link primary environmental corridors, in which case no minimum area or length criteria apply. Isolated natural resource areas are between five and 100 acres in size and at least 200 feet in width.
- The primary environmental corridors in Ozaukee County are located along the Milwaukee River and major streams, along Lake Michigan, around several lakes, and in large wetland areas. In 2000, about 32 square miles, comprising about 14 percent of the County, were encompassed within primary environmental corridors. Secondary environmental corridors are located chiefly along the smaller perennial streams and intermittent streams in the County. About eight square miles, comprising about 3 percent of the County, were encompassed within secondary environmental corridors in 2000. Isolated natural resource areas within the County include a geographically well-distributed variety of isolated wetlands, woodlands, and wildlife habitat. These areas encompassed about six square miles, or about 2 percent of the County, in 2000.
- In 2010, Ozaukee County owned 15 park and open space sites encompassing 1,268 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County. Additional lands recommended to be acquired by Ozaukee County for the preservation of natural areas, critical species habitat sites, and other open spaces encompass 1,894 acres.
- In 2010, there were 12 State-owned park and open space sites encompassing 3,184 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. Of these 12 sites, 11 sites, encompassing 2,913 acres, were owned by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) and one site, encompassing 271 acres, was owned by the University of Wisconsin Milwaukee. In addition to State-owned park and open space sites, the WDNR established the 19,487-acre North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area in 2002. A total of 8,449 acres of the heritage area lie within the County, and the WDNR anticipates using a variety of real estate tools, including fee simple acquisition, easements, and purchase of development rights to protect natural features and agricultural lands within the project area. There were also six open space sites owned by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2010, which encompassed 695 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County.
- In addition to County-, State-, and Federally-owned park and open space sites, there were 162 park and open space sites owned by local governments and public schools in Ozaukee County in 2010. Those sites encompassed 2,259 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. Local governments owned 131 of the park and open space sites, public schools owned 22 of the sites, and other public districts owned nine sites.
- Privately owned park and open space sites located in each participating local government have also been inventoried. In 2010, there were 74 such sites encompassing 3,397 acres, or about 2 percent of the County. These sites include privately-owned hunting clubs, stables, golf courses, boat access sites, campgrounds, an ice skating facility, swimming beaches, subdivision parks, a game farm, and recreation areas associated with private schools. An additional 15 sites, encompassing 1,375 acres, are owned by private organizations for resource preservation purposes.
- Conservation easements are typically voluntary contracts between a private landowner and a land trust or government body that limit, or in some cases prohibit, future development of the parcel. In 2010, there were 1,954 acres encompassed within conservation easements in Ozaukee County.
- Several natural resource features located in the County were identified as environmentally sensitive, including primary environmental corridors, secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, natural areas, critical species habitat sites, critical aquatic habitat sites, surface water, wetlands, woodlands, significant geological sites, high and very high groundwater recharge areas, and Hines Emerald Dragonfly habitat. Preservation of these resources has been identified as vital to the character, bio-diversity, quality of life, and economy of the County.

- There were 33 historic places and districts in the County listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the State Register of Historical Places as of 2010. Of the 33 historic places and districts listed on the National and State Registers, 27 are historic buildings or structures, five are historic districts, and one is a shipwreck. In addition to historic sites and districts listed on the National and State Registers of Historic Places, there are 99 sites in Ozaukee County which have been designated as local landmarks by local governments.
- The Century Farm and Home Award program originated in 1948 to honor owners of farms or homes that have been in continuous family ownership for 100 years. Between 1952 and 2010, 104 Century Farms were honored in Ozaukee County. In 1998, the program was expanded to include the Sesquicentennial Farm and Home Award program. Between 1998 and 2010, 15 Sesquicentennial Farms were honored in Ozaukee County.
- As of 2005, there were 393 known prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in Ozaukee County listed in the State Historical Society's Archaeological Sites Inventory, including prehistoric and historic camp sites, villages, and farmsteads; marked and unmarked burial sites; and Native American mounds. No archaeological sites in Ozaukee County are listed on the National or State Registers of Historic Places.
- There are several local historical societies affiliated with the State Historical Society of Wisconsin in the County. These include Ozaukee County Historical Society, Cedarburg Cultural Center, Mequon Historical Society, Port Washington Historical Society, and Saukville Area Historical Society.

Part 3: Existing and Historical Population, Household, and Employment Characteristics

- Ozaukee County has historically experienced an increase in population since 1890. The County experienced relatively modest growth between 1890 and 1940 as the County population increased from 14,943 to 18,985 residents. Between 1940 and 1980, the County experienced a rapid rate of increase in population from 18,985 to 66,981 residents, followed by a more modest population gain between 1980 and 2000 from 66,981 to 82,317 residents. In 2010, the population of the County stood at 86,395 persons.
- In 2010, there were 34,228 households in Ozaukee County, an increase of 11 percent from 2000. Between 1970 and 2010, the rate of increase in the number of households was 132 percent in the County and 49 percent in the Southeastern Wisconsin Region. The number of households is of particular importance in land use and public facility planning, because it influences the demand for converting rural land to urban use to accommodate additional residential development.
- Employment growth was significant in the County between 1970 and 2010, with the number of jobs increasing from about 21,543 to 53,700, an increase of 149 percent. The rate of increase in the number of jobs in the County exceeded the rate of increase in the Region during the same period, which experienced an increase of about 389,813 jobs, or about 49 percent. In 2009, farm employment accounted for about 1 percent of all jobs in Ozaukee County. The number of jobs on farms has declined between 1970 and 2009 in the County and the Region. The County experienced a 59 percent rate of decrease during this period, while the Region experienced a 56 percent decrease.

Part 4: Existing Land Uses, Utilities, and Community Facilities

- The Regional Planning Commission utilizes land use inventories and an urban growth analysis to monitor urban growth and development in the Region. The urban growth analysis delineates the outer limits of concentrations of urban development and depicts the urbanization of the Region over the past 150 years. The Commission land use inventory is a more detailed inventory that places all land and water areas in the Region into one of 66 land use categories, providing a basis for analyzing specific urban and nonurban land uses. The inventory results, as they apply to the County, are summarized in Part 3.
- Urban service areas are identified in the regional land use plan based on the sanitary sewer service areas delineated in the regional water quality management plan. Urban service areas are also generally served by a

municipal water utility or, in some cases, a private water supply system, local parks, local schools, and shopping areas. Urban service areas in Ozaukee County include the City of Mequon/Village of Thiensville, City of Cedarburg, Village of Grafton, Village of Saukville, City of Port Washington, Village of Newburg, Village of Fredonia, and Village of Belgium.

- Urban land uses consist of residential; commercial; industrial; governmental and institutional; and transportation, communication, and utility uses. Urban land uses encompassed about 62 square miles, or about 26 percent of the County, in 2007. Residential land comprised the largest urban land use category in the County, about 34 square miles, or about 56 percent of all urban land and about 15 percent of the total County. Land used for transportation, utilities, and communications facilities encompassed about 16 square miles, or about 26 percent of all urban land and about 7 percent of the total County, which includes 14 square miles of streets and highways. Recreational land encompassed about five square miles, or about 8 percent of all urban land and about 2 percent of the total County.
- Nonurban land uses consist of agricultural lands; natural resource areas, including surface woodlands, wetlands and surface waters; landfills; nonmetallic mining sites; and other open lands. Nonurban land uses encompassed about 175 square miles, or about 74 percent of the County in 2007. Agricultural land was the predominant land use in the County in 2007 as it encompassed about 122 square miles, or about 70 percent of nonurban land uses and about 51 percent of the total County. Natural resource areas consisting of surface water, wetlands, and woodlands combined to encompass about 41 square miles, or about 23 percent of nonurban land uses and about 17 percent of the total County.
- The 2035 regional transportation plan includes five elements: public transit, transportation systems management, travel demand management, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and arterial streets and highways. Transportation facilities in Ozaukee County related to each of these elements are summarized in Part 4. Information on rail, harbors, and airport services is also included.

Part 5: Existing Plans

An important step in the planning process is a review of the existing framework of areawide and local plans. Southeastern Wisconsin, Ozaukee County, and Ozaukee County's local governments have a rich history of planning. Numerous plans have been developed at the regional, county, and local level. Plans developed at the regional level that impact this farmland preservation plan include a land use plan, natural areas plan, water quality management plan, and water supply plan. Plans developed at the County level that impact this farmland preservation plan include a the County level that impact this farmland preservation plan, a 1983 farmland preservation plan, a land and water resource management plan, and a County park and open space plan. In addition, each community in the County has adopted a comprehensive plan and eight communities in the County have developed park and open space plans. Additional State and district plans influencing Ozaukee County and the development of this plan include the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area Plan, the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Leopold Wetland Management District, the Wisconsin Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, and the Conservation and Greenway Connection Plan.

Part 6: Existing Regulations

Section 66.1001(3) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires the adoption or amendment of zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances by local and county governments to be consistent with local and county comprehensive plans, respectively, as of January 1, 2010. Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* further requires that, if a county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. To assist in meeting this requirement, all local zoning, subdivision, and official mapping ordinances as well as the County shoreland and floodplain zoning ordinance have been inventoried and summarized in this Chapter. Chapter VII of this report identifies modifications to existing ordinances needed to implement the farmland preservation plan.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter III

TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Section 91.10(1)(b) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires County farmland preservation plans to identify, describe, and document trends, plans, or needs related to population and economic growth, housing, transportation, utilities, communications, business development, community facilities and services, energy, waste management, municipal expansion, and environmental preservation. While the previous Chapter includes much of the required information, this Chapter identifies additional trends and projections that may affect existing and future farmland preservation. The Ozaukee County comprehensive plan, as described and referenced in Chapter II, also contains information pertaining to the above requirement, including present conditions and future needs related to land uses, housing, transportation, utilities, and community facilities and services.

This farmland preservation plan is a multifaceted plan which identifies the quantity and spatial distribution of agricultural land that should be maintained in agricultural use, areas of environmental significance which should be maintained in essentially natural open uses, and areas which are anticipated to be converted to urban use. The preparation of this plan further requires information regarding anticipated future population, household, and employment levels to help determine the amount and location of areas which may be required for urban development. Accordingly, this Chapter provides information on existing and probable future population, household, and employment levels in Ozaukee County, which provide an important basis for the development of a farmland preservation plan for Ozaukee County.

POPULATION, HOUSEHOLD, AND EMPLOYMENT TRENDS AND PROJECTIONS

Sound planning for the preservation of agricultural lands requires an understanding of the demographic and economic base of the County. Increasing population and employment levels typically result in the conversion of agricultural and other open lands to urban uses. Farmland preservation efforts should consider the factors that lead to urban development or affect land uses since farmland loss is affected by the demand placed on land for nonagricultural purposes. The need for prompt action to preserve the best remaining natural resources while at the same time allowing for the efficient and economical development of urban areas necessitated by increased population and economic activity levels thus become apparent.

Chapter II describes existing demographic and economic characteristics as well as the historical population, household, and employment trends that have occurred in Ozaukee County. This section discusses the projections of future population, household, and employment levels that were essential to properly design the adopted comprehensive plan for Ozaukee County. The future demand for land, housing, transportation facilities and services, and utilities and other supporting community facilities depends directly on future population, household,

Table 37

SELECTED POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLD PROJECTIONS FOR COMMUNITIES IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035

		Total Po	pulation		Total Households				
	Actual	Projected	2010 to 2035 Change		Actual	Proiected	2010 to 2035 Change		
Community	2010	2035	Number	Percent	2010	2035	Number	Percent	
Cities									
Cedarburg	11,412	15,600 ^ª	4,188	36.7	4,691	6,542	1,851	39.5	
Mequon	23,132	29,480 ^b	6,348	27.4	8,598	10,818	2,220	25.8	
Port Washington	11,250	14,500	3,250	28.9	4,704	5,983	1,279	27.2	
Villages									
Belgium	2,245	4,000	1,755	78.2	817	1,492	675	82.6	
Fredonia	2,160	3,600	1,440	66.7	827	1,395	568	68.7	
Grafton	11,459	16,323	4,864	42.4	4,863	6,819	1,956	40.2	
Saukville	4,451	9,000	4,549	102.2	1,766	3,714	1,948	110.3	
Thiensville	3,235	3,500	265	8.2	1,532	1,626	94	6.1	
Towns									
Belgium	1,415	2,023	608	43.0	554	761	207	37.4	
Cedarburg	5,760	6,675	915	15.9	2,055	2,567	512	24.9	
Fredonia	2,172	3,000	828	38.1	807	1,122	315	39.0	
Grafton	4,053	4,894	841	20.8	1,612	2,006	394	24.4	
Port Washington	1,643	2,054	411	25.0	618	826	208	33.7	
Saukville	1,822	1,537	-285	-15.6	704	589	-115	-16.3	
Ozaukee County ^c	86,209 ^c	116,186 [°]	29,977	34.8	34,148 [°]	46,260 ^c	12,112	35.5	

NOTE: This table presents the year 2035 population projections selected by each community. The household projections were derived from the selected population projection and the anticipated household size for each community, along with an allowance for the population living in group quarters.

^aThe City of Cedarburg population projection is based on 1.0 to 1.5 percent annual population growth between 2000 and 2035, as recommended by City staff.

^b The City of Mequon selected a population projection range of 27,264 to 31,695 persons. The 29,480 figure listed above is the mid-point of the range.

^cDoes not include portions of the Villages of Bayside and Newburg in Ozaukee County, which included 89 persons within 35 households and 97 persons within 45 households, respectively, in 2010.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Local Governments, and SEWRPC.

and employment levels. These levels help determine the amount and location of areas which may be needed for urban development. More detailed information on demographic and economic trends and projections are provided in Chapters II, IX, and XII of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan.

Population and Household Projections

The regional land use plan is a systems level plan and as such, it includes generalized boundaries for planned expansions of existing urban service areas. The regional plan proposes urban-density residential, commercial, and industrial uses within planned urban (sewered) service areas to accommodate most new residents, homes, and jobs. The systems level regional plan thus provides an overall regional land use planning framework that relies on refinement and detailing through county and local government planning. The vehicles for refinement and detailing of the regional plan are the County and local comprehensive plans.

Local governments in Ozaukee County developed population and household projections for 2035 to use in local comprehensive plans that refine the systems level projections developed by SEWRPC for the Region and County. These projections were used to plan for land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and other community facilities for each local comprehensive plan through the planning design year of 2035.

Table 37 sets forth the population and household projections selected and adopted by each local government as part of community comprehensive plans for the year 2035. All of the cities and three of the six villages selected population projections consistent with the intermediate population projection growth scenario used to design the





ACTUAL AND PROJECTED POPULATION IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1950-2035

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Local Governments, and SEWRPC.

regional land use plan. The Villages of Belgium and Fredonia selected population projections that fell between the intermediate and high-growth scenarios developed for the regional plan. The Village of Saukville selected a projection that is slightly higher than the high-growth scenario. Each of the Towns, with the exception of Saukville, selected a population projection based on a continuation of the growth rate that occurred in the previous 25 years, which is higher than population growth anticipated under the regional plan. The Town of Saukville selected the population projection set forth in the regional plan. The resultant population projection of 116,186 for the County (not including the Villages of Bayside and Newburg which lie largely in Milwaukee and Washington Counties, respectively) is higher than the intermediate-growth scenario population projection of 102,778 developed under the regional land use plan; however, it is lower than the regional land use plan high-growth scenario population projection of 137,102. Figure 3 displays the actual population levels for Ozaukee County from 1950 to 2010 and the projected level as identified by each Ozaukee County community.

The age distribution of the population in relation to supporting the agricultural industry may be expected to affect the continuation of farming by future generations. As noted in Chapter II, the aging of the large baby-boom generation will likely result in changes to the overall age distribution of the population of the County and the Nation. Changes in the age composition may be expected to have an impact on the available labor force as baby-boomers move into their retirement years to join the 65 and older age group. The aging of the population may also be expected to increase the demand for housing, health care, transportation, and other services for a more elderly population.

Based on the population projection selected by each community in Ozaukee County, the number of households in the County would increase from 34,148 households in 2010 to 46,260 households in 2035, or an increase of about 36 percent, as indicated in Table 37. This information is important in determining the number of housing units that likely will be added to the County and individual city, village, and town housing stock over the planning period. This important statistic also helps determine if various utilities and community facilities will require expansion or whether new facilities will need to be built to meet anticipated demand over the planning period. These issues are examined in greater detail in Chapters IX and XI of the County comprehensive plan.

Employment Projections

Future employment, or job, levels in the County are expected to be strongly influenced by the strength of the regional economy relative to the rest of the State and Nation. The Regional Planning Commission's economic study, *The Economy of Southeastern Wisconsin*, concluded that the regional economy is unlikely to significantly increase or decrease in strength relative to the State or Nation over the projection period of 2000 to 2035.

The Commission used a disaggregate approach to the preparation of regional employment projections. This approach involved the explicit consideration of employment in dominant and subdominant industry groups, along with certain residual groups, and the preparation of projections for those groups. Dominant industries are those which accounted for at least 4 percent of total regional employment in 2000 and subdominant industries are those that accounted for 2 to 3.9 percent. At the regional level, employment projections for industries were developed based on consideration of past industry trends, available indicators of future trends nationally and in the State and Region, and relative industry and sector strength in the Region as compared to the State and Nation. Another variable taken into account was the future available labor force. Population projections indicate a leveling-off in the regional labor force may be expected as much of the baby-boom generation reaches retirement age in the middle of the projection period. The anticipated leveling-off of the labor force is expected to moderate the number of jobs able to be accommodated in the Region and Ozaukee County.

Projections of total employment, or the number of jobs, for Ozaukee County were prepared within the framework of the regional employment projection. Below the county level, future employment levels are essentially planned allocations of county and regional projections for the year 2035. Developed as part of the year 2035 regional land use plan, these allocations were made based upon a consideration of past trends in employment, existing local land use and master plans, and input received from local planning officials as the regional plan was prepared.¹

Figure 4 shows actual and projected employment or jobs in Ozaukee County from 1970 to 2035. In 2010, there were about 53,700 jobs located in the County. A total of 62,135 jobs are projected in the County in 2035. This is a projected increase of 8,435 jobs, or about 16 percent. As with the above population and household projections, the Villages of Bayside and Newburg were not included in the existing and projected employment totals since they lie mostly in Milwaukee and Washington Counties, respectively. Existing and projected employment is set forth in Table 38 for each urban (sewered) service area and unsewered areas in the County. Because the urban service areas include lands adjacent to existing city and village corporate limits, existing employment totals for urban service areas will be greater than those for the corresponding city or village and less in unsewered areas than in the corresponding town.

A description of existing and projected regional employment trends on an industry-by-industry basis is summarized, respectively, in Table 14 of Chapter II and in Table 174 of Chapter XII of County comprehensive plan; however, projected data were not available at the County and local level. Based on that data, the agriculture

¹The total number of jobs envisioned in Ozaukee County under the year 2035 regional plan (62,258) is slightly greater than the trend-based county level projection (61,700) set forth in SEWRPC Technical Report No. 10 (4th Edition), The Economy of Southeastern Wisconsin. The variation from the projection set forth in Technical Report No. 4 is based on the consideration of local plans and input from local planning officials during the preparation of the regional plan. The total of 62,135 jobs reported above does not include the portion of the Newburg urban service area in Ozaukee County.

Figure 4



ACTUAL AND PROJECTED NUMBER OF JOBS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1970-2035

Source: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and SEWRPC.

Table 38

EMPLOYMENT PROJECTION BY SUB-AREA IN OZAUKEE COUNTY UNDER THE REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN: 2035

	Existing: 2000				Projection: 2035	2000 to 2035 Change			
Sub-Area	Sewered	Unsewered	Total	Sewered	Unsewered	Total	Number	Percent	
Urban Service Areas ^a									
Belgium	788	5	793	1,517		1,517	724	91.3	
Cedarburg	7,407	911	8,318	9,000		9,000	682	8.2	
Fredonia	1,072	34	1,106	2,401		2,401	1,295	117.1	
Grafton	8,840	342	9,182	12,359		12,359	3,177	34.6	
Mequon ^b	15,479	22	15,501	17,856		17,856	2,355	15.2	
Port Washington	6,527	967	7,494	8,886		8,886	1,392	18.6	
Saukville	3,303	100	3,403	5,241		5,241	1,838	54.0	
Thiensville	2,062		2,062	2,169		2,169	107	5.2	
Waubeka		116	116	112		112	-4	-3.4	
Lake Church		174	174	150		148	-24	-14.0	
Urban Service Area Subtotal	45,478	2,671	48,153	59,691		59,691	11,538	23.8	
Unsewered Areas ^c									
Belgium		234	234		226	226	-8	-3.4	
Cedarburg		274	274		281	281	7	2.6	
Fredonia		389	389		374	374	-15	-3.9	
Grafton		466	466		459	459	-7	-1.5	
Mequon		570	570		554	554	-16	-2.8	
Port Washington		141	141		144	144	3	2.1	
Saukville		420	420		406	406	-14	-3.3	
Unsewered Area Subtotal		2,494	2,494		2,444	2,444	-50	-2.0	
Ozaukee County Total ^d	45,478	5,165	50,647	59,691	2,444	62,135	11,488	22.6	

^aDoes not include the portion of the Newburg urban service area in Ozaukee County.

^bIncludes the portion of the Village of Bayside in Ozaukee County.

^cAreas located outside planned urban service areas. See Map 4 in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 285, A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035, April 2008, Amended May 2009.

^d The 2035 employment (job) projection is based on the intermediate growth scenario that was used to prepare for the 2035 Regional Land Use Plan, which was considered the most likely projection to be achieved. The high projection for the County is 68,100 jobs and the low projection is 57,200 jobs. The high and low projections are intended to provide an indication of the employment (job) levels that could be achieved under significantly higher and lower, but nevertheless plausible, growth scenarios. The high and low year 2035 County projections are documented in SEWRPC Technical Report No. 10, 4th Edition, The Economy of Southeastern Wisconsin, July 2004.

Source: SEWRPC.

industry sector includes establishments (e.g., farms, orchards, greenhouses, nurseries) primarily engaged in the production of crops, plants, and trees, excluding forestry operations. It also includes establishments (e.g., farms, dairies, feedlots, egg production facilities) primarily engaged in raising livestock for sale or for the sale of livestock products. While the agricultural sector constitutes a small and declining share of the regional economy, it still constitutes a viable economic sector. Wisconsin agriculture is expected to hold a comparative advantage in the dairy and vegetable segments. However, due to continued technological advances in genetics and mechanization, cost pressures from national and global competition, and modern management practices, the employment levels in agriculture may be expected to continue to decline. The continued conversion of farmland to urban uses may also be expected to reduce agricultural employment in the Region. Agricultural employment is expected to decrease by 19 percent, from 5,900 jobs in 2000 to about 4,800 jobs in 2035, in the seven-county region.

LAND USE CONDITIONS AND TRENDS

Section 91.10 of the *Statutes* requires an analysis of past land use trends in addition to the inventory of existing land uses that may or have affected farmland preservation and agricultural development in the County. The following analysis includes trends in land use patterns, land supply, land demand, and land price.

Existing Land Use Conditions

The existing land uses inventoried and described in Chapter II were based on the SEWRPC land use inventory conducted in 2000. This inventory was updated to the year 2007 as part of the County comprehensive planning process to include changes that occurred between 2000 and 2007. As indicated in Map 20 and Table 34 in Chapter II, urban land uses encompassed about 62.1 square miles, or about 26 percent of the County, and nonnurban land uses encompassed about 174.5 square miles, or about 74 percent of the County. Agricultural land uses were the predominate nonurban and overall land use in the County, encompassing 121.9 square miles, or 70 percent of nonurban land and 51 percent of the total County. Residential was the predominate urban land use, encompassing about 34.1 square miles, or 56 percent of urban land uses and 15 percent of the total County. Single-family residential comprised about 95 percent of the residential land. Appendix O of the County comprehensive plan provides a summary of land uses in 2007 for each community participating in the multi-jurisdictional comprehensive planning process.

Land Supply and Demand

The Regional Planning Commission has inventoried existing land uses since 1963. Based on historical data, Map 27 conceptually indicates by general U.S. Public Land Survey quarter-sections the percentage decrease in agricultural uses between 1963 and 2000 due to conversion to other land uses. The amount of land in agricultural use in the County declined by about 22,950 acres, or by about 22 percent, between 1963 and 2000. This represents an average annual loss of about 620 acres of agricultural lands over this period. Most of the loss occurred within and near urban (sanitary sewer) service areas. It should be noted that the year 2000 inventory was referenced to real property boundary information that was not available for prior inventories, therefore this change increases the precision but would not strictly be comparable with data from the 1990 and prior inventories.

Detailed land use trends in Ozaukee County between 1980 and 2007 have been inventoried and are set forth for the County in Table 39 of this Chapter and for each of the participating communities in Appendix P of the County comprehensive plan. Between 1980 and 2007, all urban land uses with the exception of railroad rights-of-way experienced an increase in acreage. Residential land uses experienced an increase of 8,568 acres, which was the largest increase of all land use categories in the County. Single-family residential accounted for 7,842 acres, or about 92 percent of the total residential land increase. The second largest urban land use category increase was transportation, communications, and utilities. These land uses increased by 2,027 acres. Street and highway rights-of-way accounted for almost all of the increases in this category between 1980 and 2007. The third largest increase in urban land use was recreational land uses. Recreational land use increased by 1,388 acres. Industrial land use increased by 802 acres, the fourth largest increase, and commercial land use increased by 505 acres, the fifth largest increase.

Map 27



CHANGE IN AGRICULTURAL LAND USE IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1963-2000

Table 39

LAND USE TRENDS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 1980-2007

	Area (Acres)				Change in Area							
					1980-1990		1990-2000		2000-2007		1980	-2007
						Percent		Percent		Percent		Percent
Land Use Category	1980	1990	2000 ^a	2007	Acres	Change	Acres	Change	Acres	Change	Acres	Change
Urban												
Residential												
Single-Family	12,733	14,318	17,439	20,575	1,585	12.4	3,121	21.8	3,136	18.0	7,842	61.1
Two-Family	212	295	429	461	83	39.2	134	45.4	32	7.5	249	117.5
Multi-Family	308	379	563	782	71	23.1	184	48.5	219	38.9	474	153.9
Mobile Homes	9	12	12	12	3	33.3			0		3	33.3
Subtotal	13,262	15,004	18,443	21,830	1,742	13.1	3,439	22.9	3,387	18.4	8,568	64.6
Commercial	594	793	975	1,099	199	33.5	182	23.0	124	12.7	505	85.0
Industrial	655	813	1,084	1,457	158	24.1	271	33.3	373	34.4	802	122.4
Transportation, Communications, and Utilities												
Arterial Street Rights-of-	0.050			0.057				10.0				o
Way	3,252	3,283	3,884	3,957	31	1.0	601	18.3	73	1.9	705	21.7
Rights-of-Way	3 918	4 161	4 922	5 272	243	62	761	18.3	350	71	1 354	34.6
Railroad Rights-of-Way	547	548	459	452	1	0.2	-89	-16.2	-7	-1.5	-95	-17.4
Communications and Utilities and Other												
Transportation	335	405	419	398	70	20.9	14	3.5	-21	-5.0	63	18.8
Subtotal	8,052	8,397	9,684	10,079	345	4.3	1,287	15.3	395	4.1	2,027	25.2
Governmental and Institutional	1,122	1,213	1,263	1,277	91	8.1	50	4.1	14	1.1	155	13.8
Recreational	1,780	1,866	2,436	3,168	86	4.8	570	30.5	732	30.1	1,388	78.0
Urban Subtotal	25,465	28,086	33,885	38,910	2,621	10.3	5,799	20.6	5,025	14.8	13,445	52.8
Nonurban												
Natural Resource Areas												
Woodlands	6,620	6,993	7,150	7,123	373	5.6	157	2.2	-27	-0.4	503	7.6
Wetlands	15,988	16,334	16,914	16,718	346	2.2	580	3.6	-196	-1.2	730	4.6
Surface Water	1,986	2,063	2,147	2,146	77	3.9	84	4.1	-1	^b	160	8.1
Subtotal	24,594	25,390	26,211	25,987	796	3.2	821	3.2	-224	-0.9	1,393	5.7
Agricultural	93,832	89,410	81,201	78,025	-4,422	-4.7	-8,209	-9.2	-3,176	-3.9	-15,807	-16.9
Landfills	95	164	118	118	69	72.6	-46	-28.0	0		23	24.2
Nonmetallic Mining												
Sites	448	422	536	675	-26	-5.8	114	27.0	139	25.9	227	50.7
Open Lands	6,019	6,988	8,754	6,879	969	16.1	1,766	25.3	-1,875	-21.4	860	14.3
Nonurban Subtotal	124,988	122,374	116,820	111,684	-2,614	-2.1	-5,554	-4.5	-5,136	-4.4	-13,304	-10.6
Total ^c	150,453	150,460	150,705	150,594								

^aAs part of the regional land use inventory for the year 2000, the delineation of existing land use was referenced to real property boundary information not available for prior inventories. This change increases the precision of the land use inventory and makes it more usable to public agencies and private interests throughout the Region. As a result of the change, however, year 2000 land use inventory data are not strictly comparable with data from the prior inventories. At the county level, the most significant effect of the change is to increase the transportation, communication, and utilities category due to the use of actual street and highway rights-of-way as part of the 2000 land use inventory, as opposed to the use of narrower estimated rights-of-way in prior inventories. This treatment of streets and highways generally diminishes the area of adjacent land uses traversed by those streets and highways in the 2000 land use inventory relative to prior inventories.

^bLess than 0.05 percent.

^cThe reported total size of the County changed between 1980 and 2007 due to changes in mapping along the Lake Michigan shoreline and use of more precise cadastral maps.

Source: SEWRPC.

Between 1980 and 2007, nonurban land uses decreased by 13,304 acres, or by about 11 percent, due to a decrease in agricultural land uses. Agricultural land use was the only nonurban land use to experience a decrease in acreage. All other nonurban land uses, including natural resource areas, landfills, nonmetallic mining sites, and open lands, experienced an increase in acreage. The agricultural land use decrease was significant. Agricultural lands decreased by 15,807 acres, or by about 17 percent, between 1980 and 2007.
Table 40

EQUALIZED VALUE BY REAL ESTATE CLASS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2000 AND 2010

	Statement of Equalized Values: 2000			Statement of Equalized Values: 2010			Change in Equalized Values: 2000 to 2010	
Real Estate Class	Land	Improvements	Total	Land	Improvements	Total	Number	Percent
Residential	\$1,605,497,100	\$3,805,573,700	\$5,411,070,800	\$2,755,950,600	\$5,944,176,200	\$8,700,126,800	\$3,289,056,000	60.8
Commercial	211,020,800	681,874,200	892,895,000	399,016,500	1,152,953,800	1,551,970,300	659,075,300	73.9
Manufacturing	33,157,300	219,512,000	252,669,300	46,330,500	194,770,300	241,100,800	-11,568,500	-4.6
Agricultural	31,946,800	N/A	31,946,800	13,288,600	N/A	13,288,600	-18,658,200	-58.4
Undeveloped	10,421,500	N/A	10,421,500	15,807,100	N/A	15,807,100	5,385,600	51.7
Ag Forest ^a	N/A	N/A	N/A	16,420,000	N/A	16,420,000	N/A	N/A
Forest ^a	12,657,800	N/A	12,657,800	7,475,700	N/A	7,475,700	-5,182,100	-40.9
Other	17,670,000	93,187,200	110,857,200	22,695,200	73,462,200	96,157,400	-14,699,800	-13.3
Total	\$1,922,371,300	\$4,800,147,100	\$6,722,518,400	\$3,276,984,200	\$7,365,362,500	\$10,642,346,700	\$3,919,828,300	58.3

^aIn 2005, the Department of Revenue added "Ag Forest" as a new Real Estate Class. As a result, most of the lands classified as "Forest" in 2000 were added to the new "Ag Forest" class in 2010. This resulted in a loss of acreage and a decrease in equalized value in the "Forest" classification in 2010.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Revenue and SEWRPC.

Historical trends and population and job projections indicate a demand for additional land to accommodate urban land uses, especially for single-family residential and the transportation infrastructure that serves it, in Ozaukee County. There is also a decreasing supply of land for agricultural use. These trends pose several challenges to the desire of County residents to preserve productive farmland and rural character while identifying an adequate amount of land to accommodate the projected increase of 12,112 additional households and 8,435 additional jobs expected in the County between 2010 and 2035.

Land Price

Equalized value trends by real estate class in the County in 2000 and 2010 are set forth in Table 40. Residential properties in Ozaukee County experienced the greatest increase in equalized value, which was an increase of almost 61 percent. Commercial properties experienced an increase of about 74 percent and undeveloped lands an increase of about 52 percent. The County experienced an overall increase in equalized value of about 58 percent between 2000 and 2010, which was above the approximately 43 percent increase State-wide over the same period.

Agricultural land, forest land, manufacturing properties, and other lands all experienced a decrease in value between 2000 and 2010. The decrease in the total value of agricultural lands is due to a decrease in the acreage in agricultural land and the implementation of use-value assessments for agricultural land in 2000. Although the equalized value of agricultural land has decreased, the average sale price of agricultural land increased in the County from \$1,618 per acre in 1976 (equivalent to \$5,805 in 2007 dollars)² to \$11,963 in 2007, or an increase of 106 percent when comparing the conversion value in constant 2007 dollars, as indicated in Table 12 in Chapter II. However, the average sales price dropped significantly between 2007 and 2009, to less than the sales price in 1976 when expressed in constant dollars, due to the economic recession.

CHANGES IN NATURE/SCOPE OF AGRICULTURE

Farming operations need to continuously evolve to ensure the economic viability of farming into the future. This section and the proceeding three sections (Agricultural Diversification, Innovations in Agriculture, and Supporting Agriculture) describe general changes in the sales, production, processing, demand/supply, distribution, and enterprises related to agriculture in Ozaukee County. Many of these methods of farming and agricultural-related or support operations already exist in the County and such trends, including new ones presented in these sections, may likely be continued in the future by Ozaukee County farmers as a primary or supplementary business.

²Other data in this Chapter representing dollar value before 2007 were not adjusted to 2007 dollars since such data were more current than 1976.

General Agricultural Market Value Trends

Table 41 sets forth the market value of agricultural products sold in Wisconsin and each county within the Southeastern Wisconsin Region from 1997 to 2007. In Ozaukee County, 513 farms sold \$59,056,000 of agricultural products in 2007, which is about 84 percent more than the 1997 level of about \$32,047,000. This is the highest percent increase in comparison to those of the other six counties in the Region for that time period. Of the seven-county Region, 1,000 farms in Walworth County produced the largest sales revenue from agricultural products sold of \$145,520,000 in 2007. However, Racine County had the highest average market value of agricultural products sold per farm of \$156,324 in 2007. In Ozaukee County, the average market value of agricultural products sold per farm was \$115,120 in 2007, which was an increase of about 53 percent from the 1997 level of about \$75,052. This was the second highest percentage increase in agricultural products sold per farm to the other six counties in the Region.

Table 42 indicates the amount of the total business sales or revenue from agricultural sales from 1997 to 2007 for Ozaukee County, Southeastern Wisconsin, and Wisconsin. Ozaukee County's agricultural sales as a percent contribution to the total business sales revenue of the County increased from 0.6 percent to 1.1 percent between 1997 and 2007, which was higher than the average increase for the Region. Agricultural sales or revenue contributed about 1.9 percent towards the total business sales or revenue of the State in 2007. Even though this may seem like a small percent, it is still an important contribution to the County and State economies.

Agricultural Sector Sales

This section describes changes in sales within agricultural sectors or commodity groups in Ozaukee County and the State of Wisconsin from 2002 to 2007.³ Dairy farming continues to be the predominant agricultural industry in Ozaukee County as dairy sales totaled about \$33.2 million in the County, and increased about 73 percent from 2002 to 2007, which is the same percentage increase of dairy sales in the State. Dairy sales comprised about 56 percent of total agricultural industry in Ozaukee County. Grain sales totaled about \$8.4 million in the County, and increased about 89 percent from 2002 to 2007, compared to an 84 percent increase throughout the State. From 2002 to 2007, grain sales nearly doubled, and had the largest percentage increase of any agricultural product in Ozaukee County, and, during the time period, also surpassed nursery/greenhouses (horticulture) sales as a percent of total agricultural revenue in Ozaukee County. Grain sales comprised about 14 percent of the total agricultural sales in the County. Grain sales comprised about 14 percent of the total agricultural sales in the county. Grain sales comprised about 14 percent of the total agricultural sales in the County. Grain sales comprised about 14 percent of the total agricultural sales in the County.

Horticulture was the third largest agricultural industry in Ozaukee County in 2007, and continues to be a viable source of agricultural income in Ozaukee County. Horticulture sales totaled about \$8.2 million in the County, and increased about 28 percent in Ozaukee County from 2002 to 2007; while the State had a 24 percent increase in horticulture sales. Cattle and calves is the fourth largest agricultural industry in Ozaukee County. Sales totaled about \$4.1 million in the County and increased by about 8 percent from 2002 to 2007. The State had a 22 percent increase in cattle and calf sales in the same five-year period.

Vegetable sales in the County totaled about \$2.0 million in 2007. Vegetable sales increased by about 24 percent between 2002 and 2007 in the State, but decreased slightly in Ozaukee County. Sales in "other" agricultural industries increased about 30 percent in Ozaukee County from 2002 to 2007; while the State had a 52 percent increase in the same five-year period.

Overall, total agricultural sales totaled about \$59.1 million in Ozaukee County in 2007, an increase of about 54 percent from 2002 to 2007. In comparison, total agricultural sales in the State increased by about 59 percent from 2002 to 2007.

³Data is from the USDA-National Agricultural Statistics Service, 2002 and 2007 Census of Agriculture, and Ozaukee County.

Table 41

MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD IN THE SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN REGION AND WISCONSIN: 1997 TO 2007

	1997 ^a			2002			2007		
Area	Number of Farms	Sales (in thousands)	Average Per Farm	Number of Farms	Sales (in thousands)	Average Per Farm	Number of Farms	Sales (in thousands)	Average Per Farm
Southeastern Wisconsin									
Ozaukee County	427	\$ 32,047	\$75,052	533	\$ 38,323	\$71,901	513	\$ 59,056	\$115,120
Kenosha County	388	33,251	85,699	466	34,038	73,043	460	59,726	129,839
Milwaukee County	83	6,820	82,173	78	8,994	115,306	96	9,927	103,411
Racine County	554	78,438	141,584	631	73,164	115,949	652	101,923	156,324
Walworth County	853	93,389	109,484	988	87,500	88,563	1,000	145,520	145,520
Washington County	787	61,445	78,075	844	72,873	86,342	831	107,767	129,684
Waukesha County	630	42,099	66,823	762	35,881	47,087	675	45,243	67,027
Total	3,722	\$ 347,489	\$93,361	4,302	\$ 350,773	\$81,537	4,227	\$ 529,162	\$125,186
Wisconsin	79,541	\$5,794,100	\$72,844	77,131	\$5,623,275	\$72,906	78,463	\$8,967,358	\$114,288

	Number of Farms		Sales (in t	housands)	Average Per Farm		
Area	Number Percent		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Southeastern Wisconsin							
Ozaukee County	86	20.1	\$ 27,009	84.3	40,068	53.4	
Kenosha County	72	18.6	26,475	79.6	44,140	51.5	
Milwaukee County	13	15.7	3,107	45.6	21,238	25.8	
Racine County	98	17.7	23,485	29.9	14,740	10.4	
Walworth County	147	17.2	52,131	55.8	36,036	32.9	
Washington County	44	5.6	46,322	75.4	51,609	66.1	
Waukesha County	45	7.1	3,144	7.5	204	0.3	
Total	505	13.6	\$ 181,673	52.3	31,824	34.1	
Wisconsin	-1,078	-1.4	\$3,173,258	54.8	41,444	56.9	

^aThe 1997 County data was not statistically adjusted to account for nonresponses to the Census survey. All other years for the Counties and all State data have been statistically adjusted, which typically increases the number of farms reported.

Source: USDA Agricultural Statistics Service, Census of Agriculture.

Table 42

VALUE OF SALES/REVENUE OF AGRICULTURAL SECTOR AND ALL BUSINESS SECTORS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY, SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN, AND WISCONSIN: 1997 TO 2007

	1997				2002		2007		
Area	Agricultural Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	All Business Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	Agriculture as Percent of All Business Sales/Revenue	Agricultural Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	All Business Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	Agriculture as Percent of All Business Sales/Revenue	Agricultural Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	All Business Sales/Revenue (in thousands)	Agriculture as Percent of All Business Sales/Revenue
Ozaukee County	\$ 32,047	\$ 5,036,312	0.6	\$ 38,323	\$ 5,261,111	0.7	\$ 59,056	\$ 5,227,380	1.1
Southeastern Wisconsin	. 347,489	107,052,678	0.3	350,773	105,429,716	0.3	529,162	111,355,888	0.5
Wisconsin	\$5,794,100	\$301,478,540	1.9	\$5,623,275	\$355,012,567	1.6	\$8,967,358	\$463,603,173	1.9

Source: USDA Agricultural Statistics Service, Census of Agriculture, and U.S. Bureau of the Census, Economic Census.

Production

Through the increasing use of efficient machinery, science, and other technological innovations, the agriculture sector is expected to increase production and efficiency and thereby improve economic profits. Productivity on farms typically corresponds to enhanced capacity. The number of farms in Ozaukee County declined by 20 from 2002 to 2007, and the acreage of farmlands decreased by about 4,000 acres between 2000 and 2007.

Both the total number of farms and the number of dairy farms decreased in Ozaukee County from 1986 to 2007,⁴ by about 3 percent and 64 percent, respectively. Because of the significant decrease in dairy farms from 1986 to 2007, the number of dairy cows also decreased during this 20-year period by nearly 3,000, or about 26 percent. Despite the decrease in numbers, the average number of milk cows per dairy farm nearly doubled, from 58 to 112, from 1986 to 2007 in Ozaukee County, because dairy cows were placed into larger populations on fewer dairy farms.

Since the number of dairy farms decreased significantly but the total number of farms decreased only slightly between 1986 and 2007 in Ozaukee County, it can be perceived that those former dairy farmers have continued farming operations through alternative methods, such as crop production, livestock raising, or other agricultural practices or enterprises.

Corn and forage crops are still Ozaukee County's largest crop products; however, there were declines of 10 percent and 29 percent, respectively, from 1990 to 2002. Soy crops are the only crop product that increased during this 12-year period in Ozaukee County. Soy crops tripled from 1990 to 2002, or by 203 percent, and, during this period, overtook small grain crops in the total number of acres of crop production in the County.

In 2011, changes in agriculture were also occurring throughout the State of Wisconsin. Within the last 25 years, the total agricultural land base has declined by 14 percent in the State; milk production is stable, but from one-third fewer cows; hog and cattle productions are declining; and corn and soybean production is increasing, but oat production is steadily declining. Favorable agricultural industry trends in the State include green agricultural practices, forestry production, farm woodlots, and cranberry production.

Processing

Many segments of agriculture are continuously undergoing a process of industrialization, including the application of modern industrial manufacturing, production, procurement, distribution, and coordination concepts to food and related agricultural products. This can be attributed to markets being less commodity-driven and more product-oriented, where production is more capital intensive. Agricultural-related processors in Ozaukee County, such as manufacturing or processing dairy products, vegetables, pet food, or agricultural by-products, are listed on Table 14 in Chapter II, and such types of agricultural industries are likely to continue in the future in the County.

Opportunities in agricultural processing include new generation cooperatives as a form of producer ownership of processing ventures. A cooperative is a legally incorporated business arrangement that provides for the control of the business by its membership. A new generation cooperative is a cooperative that uses a system of delivery rights and obligations to encourage business loyalty and provide a form of vertical integration. They are particularly suitable to ventures involved in value-added agricultural processing and marketing. New generation cooperatives are producer-owned, restricted-membership cooperatives formed to process the agricultural products of their members, which enables farmers to combine resources and share risks. The cooperative processing operation is an extension of the farm operation, where farmers are able to retain ownership of their farm product as it proceeds through the processing and distribution chain, thus they receive a larger share of the returns from the food product that results from the processing and marketing of their raw commodity. The cooperative is also able to assess consumer preference and relay the information back to the producer-members, and, in turn, the members can adjust production practices to meet consumer demands. This is a benefit for the cooperatives, because consumers have become increasingly concerned with health issues and food safety, and are demanding more chemical- and hormone-free products.

⁴Data is from the USDA - National Agricultural Statistics Service, Census of Agriculture, and Ozaukee County.

The Coulee Region Organic Produce Pool (CROPP) Cooperative is an example of a large successful cooperative in southwestern Wisconsin that started in 1988. The cooperative started as an organic vegetable cooperative and diversified into an organic dairy program. In 1990, the cooperative developed the Organic Valley label and began marketing its own products. Throughout the years, the cooperative has further diversified its organic products to include eggs, meat, juice, soy beverages, hay, and grains. The cooperative currently has over 1,650 owners. Outpost Natural Foods, a food distribution cooperative, in the City of Milwaukee is an another example of a large cooperative near Ozaukee County. It has over 15,500 owners and offers a variety of organic products.

The changing structure of agriculture has implications. In traditional agriculture, farm production was a distinct stage in the product chain and farmers could concentrate on it exclusively. The movement towards specialized production and much greater integration with input suppliers or processors means farmers are no longer viewed as independent. The emergence of niche markets, as an example, not only creates a need for specialized inputs, both by processors and by farmers, but it also demands that decisions at the farm input, production, and processing levels be coordinated to achieve economies of scale.

Supply and Demand

Population levels and food demand have steadily increased throughout the years, causing farmers to supply agricultural products at a faster rate. Lands used to produce agricultural products have increased to keep up with growing demands for oil crops, fruits, and vegetables, which in turn, is an outcome of dietary diversification and improved living standards. Because of the increasing demand, the effort to adequately supply agricultural products has become a challenge to farmers, and, as a result, has increased food prices for various products. Food prices for basic food commodities have increased sharply over the last decade. Factors that have contributed to the price increase include limited growth in production and rapid growth in demand, a larger demand for biofuels and feedstock, rising energy prices and other increases in agricultural production costs, and adverse weather conditions.

The industrialization and commercialization of agricultural products have provided some relief in product demand and price increases, and have generally changed farm operations and ownership to larger corporations. Technological advances, new farming equipment, and innovative cultivation techniques have allowed commercial farms to decrease labor needs while increasing the overall productivity of the land, and also provides opportunities for higher production capacities, increased access to capital, and better transportation networks that effectively supply consumers in an expanding economy. Research and experimental methods continue to increase agricultural yields and improve practices. Increasing yields mean more food can be grown on fewer acres.

Agriculture product supply is also highly sensitive to climate variability and weather extremes, such as droughts, floods, and severe storms. Climate variability and change also modify the risks of fires, pest, and pathogen outbreak, negatively affecting crop and livestock yields. Management practices, the opportunity to switch management and crop rotation from season to season, and technology can help the agricultural sector cope with and adapt to climatic variability and change.

Distribution

Distribution involves getting a product from the manufacturer to the consumer. The distribution of an agricultural product is often affected by efficiency, product condition, convenience for the consumer, and consistency with a product's image. Agricultural products are the largest user of distribution services in the United States, and it is projected that the demand for such services will continue to increase. An effective distribution system supports rural economies by reducing the prices farmers pay for seed and fertilizer, increasing the value of their crops, and increasing their market access. The economies of rural areas are intertwined, as agriculture thrives, so do supporting communities. Providing effective distribution for rural areas may stimulate the farms and businesses served.

Farmers and consumers have become interested in a new approach to distribution that reduces distance in the food system, known as Community Supported Agriculture, which is described later in this Chapter. This service allows consumers to subscribe to a season of produce at a local farm for a set fee. Products are usually provided weekly by the farmer with pick-ups or deliveries occurring on a designated day and time. Members purchase a portion of

the farm's harvest either by the season or by the week. An advantage of the close consumer-producer relationship is increased freshness of the product because it does not have to be shipped long distances. The close proximity of the farm to the members also helps the environment by reducing pollution caused by transporting the produce. Over a period of time, consumers get to know who is producing their food and what production methods are used.

Enterprises

Technological development and intensifying competition are fundamentally reshaping the agriculture industry from the production of bulk commodities to the production of products to serve specialized markets. The emerging shift from commodity agriculture to product agriculture is having effects in rural areas, especially where large-scale, industrial agriculture remains a significant part of the economy. Efforts to develop and expand new types of and uses for bulk agricultural commodities, alternative agricultural production systems, niche markets, and specialty crops are creating new agricultural enterprises that are improving the economic viability of agriculture.

Even though traditional farming practices are the predominant agricultural business, alternative agricultural innovations are providing farmers with primary or supplementary agricultural opportunities and income. Some examples of enterprises related to agriculture, or alternative agricultural enterprises, include: alternative goods and products, where farmers produce non-traditional crops or raise specialty livestock; alternative marketing, where farmers market their crops (roadside stands and Farmers' Markets) or allow consumers to independently pick or cut the product (U-pick); public events, where farmers organize local fairs or festivals on their property; hospitality services, where farmers provide food and lodging on the farm (Bed and Breakfasts); tourism, where farmers offer tours of the farm while providing opportunities for the consumers to purchase produce; carbon offsets or credits, where farmers can sell carbon offsets by installing methane capture systems over animal waste lagoons; wind power generators, where farmers lease land for power generator activities; biotechnological farming; educational activities, where farmers provide instruction and demonstrate do-it-yourself opportunities; and custom farming, where a farm operator agrees to work on another farmer's land in exchange for a fee.

Although most agricultural enterprises are targeted toward rural areas, some urban agricultural enterprises are thriving. Community gardens are becoming increasingly common in urban areas. Brownfield sites, other vacant lands, and rooftops can become suitable sites, and in some instances community gardens can revitalize low-income communities. Some benefits of urban agricultural enterprises include enhancing food security, enhancing the local environment as it uses organic food production methods, enhancing the local economy, and providing healthy food sources in urban areas.

Urban Agriculture

Urban and peri-urban (perimeter of urban center) agriculture refers to the production, distribution, and marketing of food and other products within a metropolitan area, which includes community and school gardens, backyard and rooftop horticulture, or innovative food production methods. Types of urban agriculture may include the production of fruits and vegetables, institutional and demonstration gardens, edible landscaping, and hobby farming, such as bee, poultry, or other small animal-related agriculture. Urban agriculture also helps meet local food needs while promoting environmental sustainability, health, nutrition, and social interaction; creating opportunities for locally controlled food enterprises and economic development; and enhancing community commitment.

The "Growing Power" program started by Will Allen in 1993, headquartered on Silver Spring Drive in the City of Milwaukee, is one of the premier examples of urban agriculture in the United States. Growing Power is a nonprofit organization and land trust, which provides training, outreach, and technical assistance for people interested in developing sustainable food systems, and is the last remaining farm and greenhouse operation in the City of Milwaukee. Its farmers' cooperative links urban and rural growers in a collaborative marketing effort. Growing Power supports people from diverse backgrounds and neighborhoods by providing equal access to healthy, high-quality, safe, and affordable food. The organization is focused on developing sustainable food production and supporting community growth by establishing local gardens.

The Growing Power program consists of 14 greenhouses, an aquaculture system, an apiary, a kitchen, indoor and outdoor training gardens, an anaerobic digester, a rainwater detainment system, a retail store, and a food distribution facility. The program grows a variety of plants, vegetables, and herbs and raises worms, rabbits, bees, goats, chickens, ducks, turkeys, and fish. Growing Power also uses more than six million pounds of the City of Milwaukee's food waste each year for composting.

The program has numerous collaborative projects and conducts workshops and demonstrations in aquaculture, hydroponics, aquaponics, vermiculture, horticulture, small- and large-scale composting, soil reclamation, and marketing. Growing Power has also established the farm-city market basket program. The program is a community supported agriculture food distribution program designed to connect urban consumers with small-scale, local food systems in the region. The basket program consists of weekly deliveries of boxes of safe, healthy, and affordable produce to neighborhoods throughout the Milwaukee and Chicago urbanized areas.

AGRICULTURAL DIVERSIFICATION

Agricultural diversification is an important mechanism for sustainability and economic growth. Agricultural diversification can be classified as the re-allocation of a farm's productive resources, such as land, capital, farm equipment, and paid labor into new activities. These can be new crops or livestock products, value-added activities, local marketing and sale of products, provision of services to other farmers, and non-farming activities such as restaurants and shops. Because of the sustained and considerable growth of new agricultural enterprises, this trend parallels an increasing divergence between big-scale commercial farms, largely geared to commodity production, and smaller-scale enterprises seeking to improve profit margins by providing specialty products.

This section provides information pertaining to various methods of diversification. Alternative farming enterprises have gained in popularity in Wisconsin and Ozaukee County. Such popularity may continue to provide stability and profitably to farming businesses and industries, and possibly limit urban development in agricultural areas, which would threaten such opportunities.

Organic Farming

Organic farming is a production system of farming that maintains and replenishes soil production and fertility without the use of synthetically-compounded fertilizers, pesticides, growth regulators, and livestock feed additives. Organic farming relies on crop rotation, crop compost and mulch, animal manure, legumes, green manure, off-farm organic wastes, mechanical cultivation, and mineral-bearing rocks to replenish soil nutrients. It also uses aspects of biological pest control to maintain soil productivity and fertility to supply plant nutrients, and to control insects, weeds, and other pests. This farming method is based on minimal use of off-farm inputs and on management practices that restore, maintain, and enhance ecological coordination. The principal goals of organic farming are "zero impact" on the environment and the production of safe and healthy food. Organic livestock, poultry, eggs, and dairy products come from animals that are given no antibiotics or growth hormones. All organic products are processed without artificial ingredients, preservatives, or irradiation to maintain the integrity of the food.

Organic farming is a growing trend in Wisconsin and Ozaukee County. In 2009, Wisconsin ranked second nationally for the total number of organic farms in the United States with 1,155 certified organic farms. Nationally, Wisconsin is currently the top-ranked state for the number of organic livestock, poultry, and dairy farms. Wisconsin also currently ranks second nationally for the number of organic farms raising all plant commodities including grain, fruit, vegetables, berries, hay, and nursery/greenhouse crops and for the number of organic beef farms.

In 2007, there were six organic farming operations in Ozaukee County. Five of the farms produced crops and one farm raised livestock or poultry products. According to DATCP, Ozaukee County contained two certified organic farms in 2011, Behrens Farms and Egg Innovations. Behrens Farms encompasses about 237 acres and is located in the Town of Grafton. The farm is certified to produce organic crops such as alfalfa, grass, soybeans, corn, and vegetables. Egg Innovations is located in the Town of Saukville and is certified to produce organic poultry

products. Ozaukee County also has a number of uncertified organic farms. Regionally, Ozaukee County ranked third, behind Walworth and Washington Counties, for the total number of organic farms by County in 2007. Organic agriculture in Wisconsin continues to grow and thrive, creating a stable and profitable livelihood for farmers and contributing significantly to the State's overall agricultural economy.

Organic Dairy Farming

Organic milk production has been one of the fastest growing sectors of organic agriculture in the United States. Between 2000 and 2005, the number of certified organic milk cows on national farms increased by an annual average of about 25 percent, from 38,000 to more than 86,000.⁵ In 2009, Wisconsin led the nation in the number of organic dairy operations and production.⁶ Farms producing organic milk most often have small dairy operations. Most (88 percent) of Wisconsin's certified organic dairy farms have 100 or fewer dairy cows, and about half of these farms operate with 50 or fewer cows. Wisconsin's organic milk sales were \$57.6 million in 2009.

Certified organic milk production systems rely on ecologically based standards that prohibit the use of antibiotics and hormones in the cows and the use of synthetic chemicals in dairy feed production. Certified organic milk production systems also accommodate the animals' natural nutritional and behavioral requirements, such as ensuring that cows have access to pasture. These requirements add to production costs and increase managerial costs and the risk of shifting to a new way of farming. In 2010, Ozaukee County had one organic dairy farm, the Evergreen Lane Farm, in the Town of Saukville.

Organic milk producers usually transition from conventional dairy operations, which can be a challenging and costly process. During the transition, organic dairies must change their animal husbandry, land and crop management, source new and different inputs, and initiate the certification process. To become a certified organic dairy operation, the pasture and cropland providing feed for organic dairies must be managed organically for a minimum of 36 months. Current standards also require the dairy herd to be fed 100 percent organic feed and to receive organic health care for 12 months before being certified, and forage from grazing is required for all animals over six months of age. Furthermore, detailed production records must be kept for five years after certification for a farm to be in compliance with the regulations.

Challenges in organic milk production identified by producers include sourcing organic inputs, including grains and forages, feed supplements, and replacement heifers; the high costs of production; and maintaining animal health.

Aquaculture

Aquaculture refers to the breeding, raising, and harvesting of plants and animals in all types of water environments, including ponds, rivers, lakes, and the ocean, and can occur in the natural or human-made environment. Aquaculture techniques and technologies include growing, producing, culturing, and farming various types of freshwater and marine species. Aquaculture is typically used to support commercial and recreational marine fisheries or to enhance or reestablish wild stock populations. Aquaculture also includes the production of ornamental fish for aquariums and plant species used in a range of food, pharmaceutical, nutritional, and biotechnology products. Fish harvested from aquaculture operations are commonly produced for food consumption, stocking enhancements, and bait fish, which appeal to different markets.

The most serious threat to profitable fish production is poor water quality and a lack of an acceptable quantity of water. The basic sources of water provision for fishing operations include wells, springs, and surface runoff. The preferred source is a deep well or spring; however, the most common source for most operations is the use of

⁵Data is from a USDA document titled, Characteristics, Costs, and Issues for Organic Dairy Farming, November 2009.

⁶Cited in the document, Organic Agriculture in Wisconsin: 2009 Status Report, prepared by the UW-Madison Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems and DATCP, February 2010.

surface runoff. Surface water makes fish harvesting difficult because the source often is polluted and contains wild fish populations with associated diseases. Water from wells and springs is free of unwanted fish; however, both sources are typically low in oxygen and require aeration. Well water also may be high in iron, carbon dioxide, or nitrogen gas, all of which can be toxic to fish, and must be removed before use.

An aquaculturist must have knowledge of fish nutrition and be able to manipulate natural foods (plankton) along with formulated dry food. The aquaculturist must also recognize how water temperature, water quality, feed quality, feed size, and feeding frequency affect fish eating habits. Types of fish and plants raised and processed include bass, trout, catfish, crayfish, tilapia, watercress, and other aquatic plants.

In 2010, four aquaculture operations existed in Ozaukee County, and are located in the City of Port Washington at Port Washington Aquaponics; Town of Fredonia at Pheasant Creek Farm; Town of Saukville at the Don Bloecher, Jr. property; and Town of Port Washington at the Urban Aquaculture Center.

To operate a fish farm in Wisconsin, an operator needs to register with DATCP, and must renew the registration annually. An operator will also need to contact the Department of Natural Resources for environmental permits as well as obtain permits from the local government and possibly the United States Army Corps of Engineers. A recreational pond used for fish farming does not require a permit.

Aquaponics/Hydroponics

Aquaponics is a sustainable system for producing food that combines hydroponics (growing plants in water) with aquaculture, and is commonly referred to as urban aquaculture. Toxins and waste products that accumulate in the water during aquaculture are filtered out by plants, which in turn use the waste products as nutrients. The cleansed water returns to the aquatic livestock's tank and the system begins again. This type of recirculating aquaculture system reduces or eliminates the need for antibiotics and chemicals to control disease in captive fish populations, and it also reduces water loss and pollution while producing at least two crops simultaneously. An aquaponics system is uniquely suited to urban environments and typically consists of a rearing tank, a solids removal unit, a biofilter, a hydroponics subsystem, and a sump. Neighborhood aquaponics systems may be set up in vacant lots, warehouses, or community areas.

Portfish Ltd, a nonprofit organization located in the City of Port Washington, has a successful aquaponics system. The organization was initiated in 2009 and was formed to raise awareness of issues and concerns regarding current and future food supply and to educate local communities about sustainable and healthy alternatives to food production and supply.

Specialty Crops and Foods

Wisconsin agriculture is known for its diverse products and economic impact. Production and processing of specialty crops in Wisconsin are important to both state and national agricultural and manufacturing industries. In 2010, Wisconsin ranked first nationally for total cheese production, seventh for farm-produced vegetable sales, and eighth for farm-produced fruit and tree nut sales. While a portion of the sales entered fresh markets, a significant amount of Wisconsin farm-produced sales go to processors for freezing, canning, drying, and pickling. As a result, Wisconsin ranks second among states for both harvested acreage and total production of processing vegetables and third for production value. Key processing crops in Wisconsin include potatoes, sweet corn, green beans, green peas, carrots, cucumbers, mint, and onions, with cranberries by far the leading fruit. Other specialty crop processing important to Wisconsin includes maple syrup, mink, Christmas trees, and cherries. Wisconsin is also a world-renowned producer of ginseng. Specialty crop production directly contributed an estimated \$745 million in economic activity and more than 6,100 jobs to Wisconsin's economy in 2010.⁷ Spending from this

⁷Cited in the document, Economic Impact of Specialty Crop Production and Processing in Wisconsin, prepared by UW-Agricultural and Applied Economics and UW-Extension, October 2010.

economic activity generates an additional \$350 million in economic activity and nearly 3,800 jobs. The total impact of Wisconsin specialty crop production is an estimated \$1.1 billion in economic activity and nearly 10,000 jobs statewide.

The Specialty Crop Block Grant program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture aims to increase Wisconsin's competitiveness in the domestic and foreign marketplace. The grant supports projects that develop research, educational tools, promotional strategies, and production techniques to create new markets and foster job creation in Wisconsin's specialty crop industries. Specialty crops are a Federal designation of non-commodity crops and include fruits, vegetables, culinary herbs and spices, medicinal plants, tree nuts, flowers, and nursery plants. Founded in 2006, the program is a Federally funded grant program administered by the State of Wisconsin to provide funds to entities to enhance the competitiveness of Wisconsin specialty crops. The program allocates about \$750,000 to \$950,000 in grants per year.

Specialty cheeses, gourmet foods, novelty products, organics, and health foods are examples of specialty foods that are produced in Wisconsin. Increased consumer demand, industry research, and government funding are supporting a resurgence in artisan and farmstead dairy producers in Wisconsin. "Artisan" implies that a cheese is produced primarily by hand, in small batches, with particular attention paid to the tradition of the cheesemaker's skill, thus using as little mechanization as possible in the production of the cheese. "Farmstead" implies that the cheese must be made with milk from the farmer's own herd or flock on the farm where the animals are raised. Milk used in the production of farmstead cheeses may not be obtained from any outside source. Both artisan and farmstead cheeses may be made from cow, goat, or sheep milk and may include various flavorings.

In 2009, specialty cheese increased to comprise nearly 20 percent of the State's total production, making Wisconsin not only the top producer of cheese in the United States, but also the leading specialty cheese producer.⁸ Cedar Valley Cheese, Inc., located in the Town of Belgium, provides Italian specialty cheese. Other specialty cheese businesses near Ozaukee County are the DCI Cheese Company located in Richfield, Washington County; Level Valley Creamery located in Jackson, Washington County, which is owned by Schreiber Foods (one of the largest cheese manufacturers in the U.S.); and Sartori and Sargento Cheese Companies, both located in Plymouth, Sheboygan County.

Exotic livestock and game-related farming is also a popular business in Wisconsin. Opportunities for profiting from non-conventional eggs, meats, and other animal products have found important niche markets. These farms raise such animals as deer, bison, elk, alpaca, and other exotic animals. Exotic farm animal operations located in Ozaukee County include Lakeview Buffalo Farm (Weyker Buffalo) and D.A. Large (pheasants) in the Town of Belgium; Lakewinds Elk Farm (Kaul Elk) in the Town of Grafton; and Kay's Home Farm (specialized beef) in the Town of Cedarburg. These operations produce and sell meat for consumption, antlers for medicinal or health purposes, and hides and skins.

Orchards

An orchard is an intentional planting of trees or shrubs that is maintained for food production. Orchards are comprised of fruit- or nut-producing trees which are grown for commercial purposes. Orchards are typically designed in a grid pattern, with a grazed or mowed grass or bare soil base that makes maintenance and fruit gathering easy, and are often concentrated near bodies of fresh water, where weather is moderated. Fruit trees are also affected by soil types.

An important growth trend in the business of fruit and nut cultivation is the growth of organic farming. Organic orchards are not treated with pesticides, growth chemicals, or sprays, thus the soil remains untreated and natural.

⁸Cited in the document, Wisconsin Artisan, Specialty, and Farmstead Dairy, prepared by Dairy Business Innovation Center and the Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board, 2009.

Nationally, community orchards have also become a popular agricultural concept in urbanized areas. The orchards are established by local organizations looking to beautify land and grow healthful food within a community. In Wisconsin, a community orchard is located at the Bock Community Forest and Garden in the City of Middleton.

The most extensive orchards nationally are apple and orange orchards. In 2007, there were orchards on 18 farms in Ozaukee County, encompassing 305 acres. Orchards located in Ozaukee County include Appleland in the Town of Belgium, which produces and sells apples; Niemann Orchards in the Town of Cedarburg, which produces and sells apples, cherries, and pears; and R-Apples and Barthel Fruit Farms in the City of Mequon, which produce and sell apples. Barthel Fruit Farm also produces pears, plums, cherries, strawberries, herbs, and perennials.

Horticulture

Horticulture is the creation, production, distribution, and use of fruits, vegetables, ornamentals (landscape nurseries/horticulture), greenhouse, turf (sod farms), and specialty crops, particularly plants used for flavoring and medicine. Horticulture involves five areas of study: floriculture, the production and marketing of floral ornamental and flowering plants; landscape horticulture, the production, marketing, and maintenance of landscape plants; olericulture, the production and marketing of regetables; pomology, the production and marketing of fruits; and postharvest physiology, maintaining quality and preventing decay of horticultural crops.

The horticulture industry in Wisconsin has produced more than \$2.6 billion from sales and services annually. In 1998, Wisconsin had more than 1,100 production nurseries utilizing more than 12,000 acres; 1,250 dealers in nursery stock and herbaceous perennials; 13 million square feet of bedding plants, cut flowers, and floriculture crops grown under glass; and 723 acres of plants grown outdoors. Retail greenhouses and nurseries exceeded \$157 million in sales in 1997. Sixty-two sod growers raised just under 7,000 acres of sod annually at an estimated value of \$14 million.⁹

In 2007, there were 32 farms that strictly raised and harvested horticultural crops in Ozaukee County, a decrease of four from 2002. Horticulture sales provided \$8.2 million, or about 14 percent of agricultural revenue for Ozaukee County, an increase of 4 percent from 2002. In comparison, horticulture sales provided less than 3 percent of agricultural revenue for the State in 2007. The relative importance of the horticultural industry in the County compared to the State could likely be in response to the demand for landscaping material for urban development in the County and the Milwaukee metropolitan area. In 2008, horticultural sales, including the sale of Christmas trees, fruits and vegetables, and greenhouse, nursery, and floriculture products totaled \$10.2 million in Ozaukee County. In 2011, Ozaukee County had 19 licensed nursery growers that provided crops and plants for consumers and businesses and 37 licensed nursery growers were floriculture or landscape nurseries.

Consumers are more aware of and concerned about issues such as food safety, lawn care, pesticide use, and environmental quality. For example, increasing concern of parents and school officials over children's exposure to pesticides in the State's 3,000 Kindergarten through 12th grade schools has increased the demand for school Integrated Pest Management Programs. Consumer demand for information and educational training through the Master Gardener Program, operated through the University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension, continues to increase across the State. In 2010, there were 213 active members in the Ozaukee County Master Gardener Association, with 103 certified for 2011. In 2010, those members volunteered about 6,600 hours for youth and community education and support services relating to proper gardening techniques.

Agri-tourism

Agri-tourism is a farming enterprise at an active farm, ranch, or agricultural facility conducted as a business for the entertainment of visitors, and, in turn, generates supplemental income for the operator. These enterprises are selling more than the agricultural products produced on the farm; they are creating a connection between the

⁹Data from UW-Cooperative Extension document, UW-Extension Trends Analysis Documents, 1999.

consumers and the food supply. The business is focused on direct contact with the consumer on the farmstead. Agri-tourism is a subset of farm-based tourism which includes recreation, camping, hunting and fishing, and education as well as retail, lodging, and entertainment.¹⁰ Examples of agri-tourism may include farm tours for families and school children, day camps, crop or barn art, rural weddings, hay or sleigh rides, bed-and-breakfasts, farm and cannery tours, vineyards, petting farms, corn mazes, geo-caching field mazes, "pick-your-own" farms, community supported agriculture farms, on-farm retail outlets, and farmers' markets.

Agri-tourism is a growing segment of the Wisconsin tourism industry. Each year, tourism contributes \$12 billion dollars to the Wisconsin economy. According to the Wisconsin Agriculture Tourism Association,¹¹ the agri-tourism industry averages an annual growth rate of 30 percent in the State. In 2007, eight farms in Ozaukee County provided agri-tourism services, an increase of four from 2002. Those eight farms produced \$76,000 in sales in 2007.

Value-Added Agriculture

Value-added agriculture is the process of altering the physical state or form of an agricultural product in such a manner that it enhances the economic value of that commodity or product. It allows farmers to benefit by being part of a "specialized" supply chain and affords them the chance to receive a larger share of the consumers' dollar. Usually producer-driven, there is room for both small- and large-scale development within value-added agriculture. Some examples of this process include converting strawberries into jam, processing meat into jerky, and converting milk into cheese products. The value-added sector is highly diverse as it ranges from small organic operations on a few acres to large, specialized operations. In 2004, there were at least 6,700 farms in Wisconsin that could be classified as value-added farms.¹²

Value-added agriculture has grown during the last decade as various food actions have raised awareness and more consumers have requested locally grown products. An increase in the number of farmers' markets and community supported agricultural farms has created a direct connection between producers to consumers. There is a growing trend of consumers demanding healthier and locally grown products. Value-added agriculture can often offer the consumer an agricultural experience or relationship with the producer that normally cannot be obtained elsewhere. Although value-added farms seem to be smaller in size than traditional farms, value-added farms are more manageable and may fill a niche by utilizing smaller vacated farmsteads.

Value-added farmers use several methods to market their products to local consumers, including community supported agriculture, agri-tourism, the internet, home delivery, specialty stores, U-pick stands, farm stands, and farmers' markets. In 2007, 21 farms in Ozaukee County produced and sold value-added commodities.

DATCP is preparing to enhance value-added production to the State's specialty foods, such as specialty meats, livestock, and dairy; promote strong market development efforts to create branded products with a "From Wisconsin" identity; develop high-value industrial crops for neutraceutical (nutritional supplements) and pharmaceutical uses, along with ethanol and fiber crop production; and establish industry-led entrepreneurial agriculture with a State partnership. DATCP's focus is to promote improvement in the economic well-being of farmers and rural communities.

¹⁰*Todd Comen and Dick Foster*, Agricultural Diversification and Agritourism: Critical Success Factors, Interim Report, *Webinar 3, September 2010*. (http://www.uvm.edu/tourismresearch/agtour/publications/Agritourism%20Report.pdf).

¹¹Wisconsin Agriculture Tourism Association is a statewide association representing multiple sectors of the Agritourism industry. (<u>www.visitdairyland.com</u>).

¹²Cited in the document, How Important is Value-Added Agriculture in Wisconsin?, prepared by UW-Cooperative Extension, The Program on Agricultural Technology Studies, Fact Sheet No. 22, January 2005.

DATCP is also working with State, Federal, and private partners to develop the Value Added Dairy Initiative (VADI) to help restore and reinvigorate the dairy sector. The initiative is Federally-funded, and matched by product and service contributions from agencies and organizations within Wisconsin's dairy sector. The initiative is spearheaded by two groups, Grow Wisconsin Dairy Team and the Dairy Business Innovation Center. These two groups help coordinate and focus resources for dairy farmers in modernizing their businesses, help processors streamline the supply chain, and help provide technical assistance to new and emerging specialty dairy businesses. According to the 2009 VADI Report:¹³

- Wisconsin's 2008 milk production increased by 2.5 percent, to 24.7 billion pounds.
- Specialty cheese production set a new record in 2008 as production increased by 4 percent to a total of 419 million pounds. Since the inception of the Value Added Dairy Initiative in 2004, specialty cheese production has increased to almost 20 percent of the State's cheese production. The number of plants and specialty cheese crafters were up from the previous year; 99 of the State's 136 cheese plants now craft at least one type of specialty cheese.
- Reinvestment into all aspects of Wisconsin's dairy industry are occurring as processors and producers across the State have each reinvested nearly \$1 billion to modernize their respective processing operations or dairy farms during the past five years. Projections over the next five years anticipate an additional \$1 billion by each group in planned reinvestments using a variety of VADI methods and tools.
- As of 2009, 43 new processing plants have opened and more than 70 plants have expanded in Wisconsin since the VADI began in 2004.

Equine Industry

The equine industry is highly diversified and supports a wide variety of activities such as breeding, training, care, and riding. The equine industry is typically represented by individual horse ownership; production and use by farm enterprises; agribusinesses which support ownership, production, and use; and tourism and event management businesses. Commercial equine enterprises include breeding farms, training farms, boarding stables, camp and trail-ride businesses, horse sales, and affiliated enterprises.

The Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls conducted a survey in 2007 to estimate the number of households in the State that own at least one horse. The survey was also designed to assess the economic impact horse owners have on the State's economy.¹⁴ The SRC estimates that there are between 299,341 and 351,208 horses in the State and that their total value is between \$998 million and \$1.2 billion. Other key findings from the survey include:

- The equine industry directly generates \$30 million to \$35 million in annual revenues and \$735 million to \$862 million in expenses.
- The total impact of the equine industry in Wisconsin, including indirect and induced impacts, is estimated to be:
 - _ \$1.3 billion to \$1.5 billion in total economic impact per year
 - 33,259 to 37,416 jobs that generate between \$269 and \$303 million in labor income

¹³Data from DATCP, Value Added Dairy Initiative Annual Report 2008-09, Webinar 3, September 2010. (http://datcp.state.wi.us/mktg/business/marketing/val-add/initiative/pdf/VADI_AY5.pdf).

¹⁴David Trechter, Shelly Hadley, Denise Parks, and James Janke, Wisconsin State Horse Council General Population Survey and Horse Owners' Survey Report, (March 2008, Web. 3, September 2010. (http://www.uwrf.edu/SurveyResearchCenter/upload/WisconsinStateHorseCouncil.pdf)

- _ \$351 to \$395 million in total income
- _ \$106 to \$120 million in local, State, and Federal taxes are generated by the equine industry.
- Horses in Wisconsin are used primarily for pleasure/trail riding or showing/competing.
- The issues identified by Wisconsin's horse owners focus primarily on land use concerns. Housing developments that limit horse-back riding (61 percent) and lack of local trails (50 percent) were the most commonly cited issues facing the State's equestrians. Few horse owners said that they faced a lack of local services (e.g. veterinarians, information, farriers) needed for their horses.

Related to the above land use issue, there are various concepts of equestrian-oriented developments, such as the Saddlebrook Park Subdivision in the City of Mequon. In this subdivision, horse facilities are encouraged, and residences are developed around the horse facilities. These types of developments allow horse owners living in the subdivision to share the horse facilities and amenities, such as boarding and training facilities and trails, at a "community/neighborhood center." While the site is primarily an equestrian-related neighborhood, it may also function as an operational, sustainable farm with direct marketing opportunities, such as a farmers' market and recreational facilities, and use renewable energy sources to power on-site facilities and subdivision dwellings.

In 2007, Ozaukee County had 93 farms that totaled 915 horses and ponies, an increase of three farms and 259 horses and ponies from 2002. Of the 93 farms, 16 were exclusively equestrian-oriented farms; the farmers raised horses, ponies, donkeys, mules, and/or burros, a decrease of two farms from 2002.

Other Types of Farming Industries

Apiculture (Bee-Keeping)

Apiculture is the study of honey bees and the practice of maintaining or possessing bees to collect honey or wax, pollinate plants, or produce bees to sell to other beekeepers. The honey bee is the official Wisconsin State insect, primarily because the honey bee plays an important role in agriculture.

In 2010, Wisconsin ranked eighth nationally in honey production. Honey production from producers with five or more colonies totaled 4.35 million pounds in 2010, an increase of 15 percent from 2009. The number of honey producing colonies in the State increased from 63,000 colonies in 2009 to 68,000 colonies in 2010. Wisconsin's 2010 honey crop was valued at \$7.27 million, a 22 percent increase from 2009. The average price for a pound of honey in Wisconsin was \$1.67, an increase of nine cents from 2009. National honey production in 2010 was 176 million pounds, an increase of 20 percent from 2009. In 2007, two bee farms were located in Ozaukee County, a decrease of five from 2002. Both bee farms produce honey.

While honey production is an important component of apiculture industry, crop pollination also makes bees indispensable to agriculture production. Approximately one-third of the food supply, either directly or indirectly, results from insect pollination, and honey bees perform over 80 percent of the pollination. Bees add an estimated \$15 billion to the United States economy each year in increased crop yields.¹⁵

Unfortunately, a sustained decline in the honey bee population over the last decade has farmers and orchard owners concerned that their crops will not be adequately pollinated. The decline is mostly attributed to colony collapse disorder, but other causes include stress, pesticides, pathogens, and parasites. A common strategy for farmers who wish to bolster native bee populations is to increase the natural growth of grasses, shrubs, and trees surrounding their fields. The areas of natural vegetation provide food and shelter for native bees. Pressure from native bees also can make honey bees more efficient and effective when pollinating hybrid seed crops by causing

¹⁵Data from the University of Arkansas–Division of Agriculture, Cooperative Research and Extension, November 2011.

the honey bees to move more frequently between rows of male and female plants. Other strategies to increase bee populations include creating habitats that have a diversity of local, native plants that flower all season while clumping flowers with diverse shapes, colors, and height and constructing human-made nesting spots.

Maple Syrup Farms

Maple syrup is among the oldest natural food products produced in the United States. It is the process of converting maple sap to syrup and requires the removal of water from the raw sap to form the finished product. The sugar maple tree is the traditional species tapped for maple syrup production, because the sap of the sugar maple generally contains a higher level of sugar than the other maples. Maple trees growing in an open setting are capable of producing one-half gallon of syrup in one season, whereas trees growing in a forest setting generally produce about one quart of syrup. Thirty-eight gallons of sap are needed to produce one gallon of syrup.

Wisconsin ranks fourth nationally in the production of maple syrup, and accounts for 6 percent of the maple syrup production in the United States.¹⁶ The United States and Canada are the only countries in the world that produce maple syrup. In 2011, Wisconsin's maple syrup production was 155,000 gallons, an increase of 32 percent from 117,000 gallons in 2010. In 2010, the average price Wisconsin maple syrup producers received was \$39.50 per gallon, \$2.80 more than in 2009. Nationally, maple syrup production in 2011 totaled 2.79 million gallons, an increase of 43 percent from 2010's 1.96 million gallons. In addition to maple syrup, Wisconsin maple syrup producers also produce confections and candies, maple cream, maple butter, and maple sugar. A significant benefit of the maple syrup industry is its renewability, which allows farmers to extract sap from the same trees every year.

In 2007, Ozaukee County had four maple syrup farms that had 925 taps and produced 216 gallons of syrup, an increase of three farms from 2002. The Richard and Susan Knox maple syrup farm, located in the Town of Cedarburg, is a member of the Wisconsin Maple Syrup Producers Association.

Forest Products

Forest production or forest production industry was identified earlier as a favorable agricultural industry trend in Wisconsin. The State ranked first nationally in paper making and has been number one for over 50 years. Total forest products employment in Wisconsin is growing faster than the national average. The sale of forest products could be considered a farm-related source of income. Based on the USDA 2007 Census of Agriculture data, the total sales of forest products (excluding Christmas trees, short rotation woody crops, and maple products) in Wisconsin increased from about \$15,996,000 in 1997 to about \$20,711,000 in 2010, or about 29 percent. Such data for Ozaukee County were not available.

Farms, Land Leases, and Renewable Energy

As energy costs rise, Wisconsin residents and businesses are transitioning to renewable energy as a primary or supplementary energy source. Wisconsin is a national leader in energy conservation and generating electricity from renewable energy sources with programs like time-of-day rates and utility conservation escrows, progressive institutions such as the Wisconsin Energy Conservation Corporation, and as one of 16 states with a renewable portfolio standard.

Wind Power and Cell Towers

Use of wind power is growing as a result of technological improvements and cost reductions and in response to State and Federal laws and incentives. Since 2000, utility-scale wind generation in Wisconsin has grown by over 124 percent.

¹⁶Data from the USDA – National Agriculture Statistics Service, Agricultural Marketing Resource Center, Maple Sugar Profile, October 2011.

Farmers can directly benefit from wind power development, as some of the best wind resources are on farmland. Farmers can lease land to wind developers, use the wind to generate power for their farms, or become wind power producers themselves. The most popular way for farmers to benefit from wind power is to allow developers to install large wind turbines on their land. Large wind turbines typically use less than one-half acre of land, including access roads, so farmers can continue to plant crops and graze livestock right up to the base of the turbines. The royalties are typically around \$2,000 to \$5,000 per year for each turbine, depending on its size, which can help provide a stable supplement to a farmer's income, helping to counteract swings in commodity prices. Farmers are also the largest market for small wind turbines, which can generally generate enough power for one farm, business, or home. In 2011, there were 11 wind farms in the State.

Similar to wind turbines, farmers may lease a portion of their land to allow developers to install cell towers. Since the amount of land leased is small, farmers can continue to cultivate and pasture around the perimeter of a fenced-in area containing the cell tower. The income from the land lease helps supplement the farmer's income.

Solar Power

Solar energy can also be used on farms to supply or supplement energy requirements. Some examples for the use solar energy (solar electric or solar thermal) on farms include providing substantial air and water heating requirements for livestock and dairy operations, especially pig and poultry farms because these animals are typically raised in buildings where it is necessary to carefully control temperature and air quality to maximize the health and growth of the animals; heating greenhouses; providing electricity for fencing, lighting, and water pumping; and drying crops and grains. Most agricultural solar energy systems are off-grid applications, meaning there is no connection to a utility grid and the generated power is used on-site. Solar energy units may be located on buildings or structures or on the ground in an isolated location on the property. Pinehold Gardens, a community supported agriculture program located in the City of Oak Creek, has two solar energy panels to help supplement their energy costs, and has been recognized by Midwest-oriented renewable energy organizations.

The USDA – Rural Development *Renewable Energy Systems and Energy Efficiency Improvement Program* is a Federal program that provides grants and loan guarantees for energy efficiency and renewable energy systems to qualified farms, ranches, and rural businesses. Both solar electric and solar thermal projects are eligible. The grants provide up to 25 percent of the solar energy system cost.

In 2009, there were 46 farms that reported the use of 59 wind turbines and 176 farms that reported the use of solar energy as on-farm energy production systems in Wisconsin. In Ozaukee County, Century Acres Farm, located in the Town of Port Washington, has a solar energy system for on-farm energy production.

Geothermal Energy

Geothermal energy is energy generated by the internal heat of the Earth. Geothermal systems harness the Earth's internal heat to provide heating, cooling, and hot water for a variety of practices. For direct heating or cooling purposes, a geothermal heat pump system extracts this resource and typically consists of a heat pump, a ductwork system, and a heat exchanger, which is a system of pipes buried in the shallow ground near a building. Geothermal heat pumps circulate air, water, or other liquids through pipes buried in a continuous loop next to a building. In heating, the heat pump removes heat from the heat exchanger and pumps it into a structure's indoor air delivery system. In cooling, the process is reversed, and the heat pump moves heat from a structure's indoor air system into the heat exchanger. During the cooling process, the heat removed from a structure's indoor air system can also be used to provide hot water.

For agricultural purposes, irrigation pipes can convey hot water to cold ground, making it possible to grow crops that would otherwise perish; pipe hot water into greenhouses to maintain temperature and humidity levels; provide warm water for fish harvesting; and heat and cool farm dwellings and buildings.

Excellent sources of geothermal energy include areas in or near volcanic or seismic activity, like the western United States, however, geothermal energy is attainable almost anywhere. Areas in Wisconsin and Ozaukee County can utilize the shallow ground, or the upper 10 to 100 feet of the Earth, which maintains a constant

temperature between 50 and 60 degrees Fahrenheit, to develop a geothermal energy system for direct heating and cooling purposes. This ground temperature is warmer than the air above it in the winter and cooler than the air in the summer. The Concordia University Wisconsin-Center for Environmental Stewardship building in the City of Mequon utilizes geothermal heating and cooling and has achieved a LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Platinum rating. This is the highest rating that a building can obtain in this internationally recognized green building certification system. The PieperPower Education Center located in the Mequon Nature Preserve also uses geothermal energy and has applied for LEED certification, but has not yet been rated. In addition, The Providence Place located in the Village of Grafton uses geothermal energy for tempering domestic hot water and for heating and cooling of air for the 40-unit independent senior living facility.

Anaerobic Digestion

Anaerobic digestion is the biological process in which bacteria digest biomass in an oxygen-free environment and produce a gas principally composed of methane and carbon dioxide, or biogas. Anaerobic bacteria naturally exist at the bottom of ponds, swamps, and other moist and airless places. This process is often used for sewage treatment or for managing animal waste; however, almost any organic material can be processed in this manner. Biogas is fed directly into a gas-fired combustion turbine. Combustion of biogas converts the energy stored in the bonds of the methane molecules contained in the biogas into mechanical energy as it spins the turbine. The mechanical energy produced by biogas combustion in an engine spins the turbine that produces a stream of electrons or electricity. Waste heat from these engines can also provide heat or hot water.

Biogas is composed of 65 percent methane which yields about 650 BTU per cubic foot. When designing systems for the anaerobic digestion of manure, these energy estimates can predict the amount of power production per animal. The biogas can be used to generate heat and electricity, compressed into a liquid fuel, or used as an industrial chemical base for creating other products.

In 2009, 19 farms in Wisconsin reported the use of 23 methane digesters.

INNOVATIONS IN AGRICULTURE

Many challenges remain to ensure the food system continues to support the world's growing population in a sustainable way. As increasing demand encourages farmers to expand food production, constraints on land, water, and energy will compel farmers to rely on science and technology for increases in production and on entrepreneurial skills to manage the technology. Because of technological improvements in agricultural production and food processing systems, farmers continue to produce higher-valued products, as well as gain a better perspective on changing consumer preferences.

Developments in science and technology have contributed to better soil, nutrient, water, and pest management, and more efficient methods of harvesting, storing, processing, and transporting farm products to the market. Scientific breakthroughs, such as modern biotechnology, have also occurred in understanding sustainable agricultural systems and improving crop stability, which has led to the development of sustainable crop management techniques and practices.

Because of recent agricultural innovations, producers have been able to increase crop yields, increase flexibility and control, provide environmental sustainability, control new threats, and benefit customers. The following examples of agricultural innovations may provide sustainability to the agricultural industry, while benefitting both farmers and consumers.

Biotechnology

Biotechnology for agricultural uses is an array of methods, including traditional breeding techniques that alter living organisms, or parts of organisms, to develop or modify products; improve plants or animals; or develop microorganisms for specific agricultural uses. For example, some crops can be biotechnologically engineered to tolerate weeds and become resistant to diseases and pests, while some crops can provide consumers with products that are more nutritionally-rich and longer-lasting, reduce natural toxin levels, and produce new medicines. Biotechnology can also be used to conserve natural resources, enable animals to more effectively use nutrients present in feed, decrease nutrient runoff into rivers and lakes, and help meet the increasing food and land demands. Research is constantly conducted to produce hardier crops that will require less fuel, labor, fertilizer, and water, helping to decrease the pressures on land and wildlife habitats.

Biotechnology has helped make other improvements in agriculture by making antibiotic production more efficient through bacterial fermentation and producing new animal vaccines through genetic engineering for diseases such as foot and mouth disease and rabies.

The Federal government developed a Coordinated Framework for the Regulation of Biotechnology in 1986 to provide for the regulatory oversight of organisms derived through genetic engineering. The three principal agencies that provide primary guidance for the experimental testing, approval, and eventual commercial release of these organisms are the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Health and Human Services' Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Products are regulated according to their intended use, with some products being regulated under more than one agency.

Biofuels

Biofuels are liquid, solid, or gaseous fuels produced by the conversion of biomass. Examples of biofuels include bio-ethanol from corn or sugarcane; bio-gas from anaerobic decomposition of wastes; and biodiesel from vegetable oil, animal oil, or other waste oils. The two most common types of biofuels in use today are biodiesel and ethanol. Biofuels accounted for about \$2 billion of the State's economy in 2008.

Biodiesel Production

Biodiesel fuel is an alternative to petroleum that is derived from vegetable oils, animal fats and oils, and other waste oils. Biodiesel can be utilized in pure form or mixed in any combination with petroleum-based diesel fuels and can be used in any diesel engine with little or no engine modifications. In 2004, Wisconsin's first biodiesel refining facility began production in 2004 at two million gallons per year. In 2010, there were four operating, one idle, and two proposed biodiesel facilities with a total production capacity of over 34.1 million gallons annually, a decrease of 23 percent from 2009. There are also 36 known smaller scale production facilities with an annual production capacity of 5.9 million gallons, bringing the total potential production capacity of biodiesel in Wisconsin in 2010 to 40 million gallons, a decrease of 20 percent from 2009.

There are no biodiesel production or retail sites in Ozaukee County. The nearest biodiesel production or retail site is located in the City of Manitowoc in Manitowoc County.

Ethanol Production

Ethanol is a liquid fuel that is produced by the fermentation of plant starches and sugars. Ethanol is an alcohol, the same as in beer and wine, and is commonly made by fermenting any biomass high in carbohydrates through a process similar to brewing. Ethanol is mostly used as an additive to gasoline to increase octane and reduce carbon monoxide and other smog-causing emissions. Some vehicles, called Flexible Fuel Vehicles, are designed to run on E85, an alternative fuel with much higher ethanol content than regular gasoline. In Wisconsin, ethanol is primarily produced from corn, but may also be produced from sorghum, wheat, and sugar cane. Currently, one bushel of field corn will yield approximately 2.7 gallons of pure ethanol fuel.

In 2009, Wisconsin ranked ninth nationally for ethanol production at 545 million gallons of annual capacity, according to the Renewable Fuels Association. In 2010, there were nine large capacity and three small-scale operating ethanol production facilities, as well as one proposed facility in Wisconsin. Ethanol production in Wisconsin decreased 5 percent from 462 million gallons in 2009 to 438 million gallons in 2010. Of the 438 million gallons that were produced in the State, 254.3 million gallons, or about 58 percent, were blended with gasoline in Wisconsin.

Most fuel stations use a gas-ethanol blend called E10, which means it is 10 percent ethanol and 90 percent gas, and is approved for every vehicle manufactured after 1980. Flex fuel vehicles are those vehicles that are approved for gas-ethanol blends of 85 percent ethanol and 15 percent gas, or E85. In 2010, Wisconsin had 131 E85 fueling stations, but none were located in Ozaukee County. The nearest E85 fuel stations are located in the Village of Cedar Grove in Sheboygan County, the City of West Bend in Washington County, and two sites in the City of Milwaukee on Brown Deer Road in Milwaukee County. Other ethanol blended fuels offered in Wisconsin are E20 and E25.

New technological advancements are leading to the production of cellulosic ethanol. Even though it is chemically identical to the ethanol made from corn or soybeans, cellulosic ethanol has a net energy content nearly three times higher, a lower net level of greenhouse gases, and can be made from many different kinds of cellulosic biomass feedstocks such as corn stover (dried stalks and leaves), switchgrass, prairie grasses, and wood materials including tree branches, needles/leaves, and stumps. Such biofuels do not compete with food sources.

SUPPORTING AGRICULTURE

To conserve one of the most basic and precious resources in the State, Wisconsin's productive farmlands, the State, in cooperation with county and local governments, institutions, businesses, and organizations, has been developing and promoting an increasing number of programs that support farmland preservation and local agriculture. These programs include the implementation of various marketing strategies intended to promote locally produced agricultural products through marketing and tourism. The success of these programs depends on the acceptance of local consumers. As consumers adopt lifestyles that embrace locally produced agricultural products, consumers may better understand the importance and community value of locally protected farmland.

Described below are examples of programs or methods that promote local agriculture while acknowledging the need to preserve local farmland. Although these programs will not directly preserve the land, they may help generate awareness of local farmland preservation needs and create a supportive environment for existing agriculture. Funding programs to further support farmlands and related natural and cultural resources are also described in Chapter VII and Appendix E.

Promoting and Marketing Locally Grown Foods

Local food production is increasing across the State, including in urbanized areas, creating viable economic opportunities for Wisconsin citizens. From farmers' markets to community supported agriculture (CSA), from artisan cheeses to specialty meats, Wisconsin's farmers are strengthening agriculture in the State. These progressive farmers are transforming the landscape and culture of agriculture and their influence is affecting how food is grown and how new food systems will be developed. As a result, consumers are rediscovering the products grown in Wisconsin. As Wisconsin residents observe and participate in the expansion of local food production, a resurgence of textures and flavors is evolving to benefit both producers and consumers.

Buying locally grown foods has become increasingly popular and the trend is expected to continue. The range of local agricultural products available has expanded as farmers have responded to the public's interest in relatively unknown foods and/or plant varieties. As consumers' desire to reconnect to locally-grown food affects their buying choices, farmers are presented not only with new opportunities to meet that demand, but also an opportunity to provide background information on their farms, lifestyles, and philosophies. According to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, Wisconsin had 437 farms marketing their products through Community Supported Agriculture, which ranks seventh nationally.

Developing local food systems can be seen as a strategy for sustainable communities and economic development. Local food systems emphasize smaller-scale farms, may employ more sustainable farming methods, and are also viewed as a way to strengthen local economies by supporting family farms and keeping money circulating in the community. The components of a strong local food economy such as farmers' markets, community gardens, and grocery stores and restaurants that feature local foods can be seen as amenities attractive to consumers. Buying locally-grown food is both rewarding and appealing, including enjoying the taste of fresh food, improved health and nutrition, and support for family farms and rural communities.

Another significant reason to buy local is to keep "food miles" to a minimum. "Food miles" refer to the distance a food item travels from the farm to your home. The food miles for items in the grocery store are, on average, 27 times higher than the food miles for goods bought from local sources. The average grocery store's produce travels nearly 1,500 miles between the farm where it was grown and local retail markets. As a result, large amounts of fuel are used to transport foods, releasing carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide, particulate matter, and other pollutants. The refrigeration required to keep fruits, vegetables, dairy products, and meats from spoiling during their long journeys consume additional fuel. In contrast, local and regional food systems produce 17 times fewer pollutants.¹⁷

Buying locally or directly from farmers can also increase a farmer's income. Increasing farm income means more money can be spent locally by the farmer to run their business and home, which help local economies. Another strategy to help support locally-grown community food systems is the development of processing and distribution facilities. This strategy assists in the development of value-added products, and may also create additional employment opportunities for local residents.

Like most successful community development efforts, developing sustainable local food systems requires partnerships. Some common types of collaborative and promotional tools include advertising, sales, promotional programs, public relations, the Internet, and social media networks. The <u>www.greenfarmstand.com</u> website provides information to help link consumers with local food sources including farmers, CSA's, and farmers' markets. The following are examples of collaborative and promotional efforts relevant to Wisconsin programs that serve to promote locally grown foods.

Something Special from Wisconsin

Something Special *from* Wisconsin is a trademarked program administered since 1983 by DATCP. The red and yellow logo provides a quick, reliable way for shoppers to identify Wisconsin products at grocery stores, retail outlets, farmers' markets, and restaurants. The program offers an online searchable directory, a website highlighting the program, and a wholesale catalog for grocers and retailers. Something Special *from* Wisconsin is a membership-based program requiring at least 50 percent of the value of the product or service to be attributable to Wisconsin ingredients, production, or processing. Over 420 companies are currently members. Yearly membership fees are based on gross annual sales from the previous year and range from \$10 to \$200.

Grocers Buy Local

The "Grocers Buy Local" wholesale catalog identifies over 100 Wisconsin suppliers who sell wholesale products. The catalog was made available due to a joint effort by DATCP, the Wisconsin Grocers Association, Thrive, and the UW-Extension Agricultural Innovation Center. The catalog, available in printed form or downloaded at <u>www.somethingspecialwi.com</u>, was developed to help collaborative efforts between Something Special *from* Wisconsin member companies and Wisconsin retailers.

Savor Wisconsin

Launched in 2002, this website is an online promotional tool connecting consumers with Wisconsin companies and products. The site is a free marketing tool for Wisconsin producers, where producers can create and list a company profile and publicize events for free. The site also allows companies to link to their own website, list products sold, and allows visitors to search by company name, product, or location. SavorWisconsin.com features more than 1,850 producers, hundreds of local food retailers and restaurants, a large listing of farmers' markets, and other events throughout the state. More than 50,000 visitors search the website each month. The website is guided by DATCP, the University of Wisconsin-Extension, and the Wisconsin Apple Growers Association.

¹⁷Cited at the Sustainable Table website (<u>www.sustainabletable.org/issues/whybuylocal/</u>), January 2009.

Buy Fresh/Buy Local

The nonprofit Research, Education, Action, and Policy (REAP) Food Group initiated the "Buy Fresh/Buy Local" project in Southern Wisconsin. The project is designed to develop a market for local and sustainably grown foods in restaurants and institutional food service operations, to foster increased purchasing relationships between food service organizations and local producers, and to educate consumers about the value of locally grown food. Because consumers are placing increased importance on locally grown foods, the Buy Fresh/Buy Local label also helps connect consumers to various sources for local foods, such as grocery stores, restaurants, and farmers' markets.

Local Dirt

This national website (<u>www.localdirt.com</u>) connects food producers with consumers. Producers pay a yearly subscription fee to list their products and locations on the database. Individuals, businesses, buying clubs, and distributors can search the website for local products and place orders to be delivered or picked up in person.

Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin Program

The Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin competitive grant program was launched in 2008 to support local food systems by working with farmers and food consumers to develop new markets for Wisconsin food products. The combined efforts of growers, producers, and individuals representing grassroots and nonprofit organizations, industry working groups, the University of Wisconsin, and DATCP resulted in legislation to fund a statewide program.

In accordance with Sections 93.45 and 93.48 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, DATCP may award grants to individuals or organizations to fund projects that are designed to increase the sale of agricultural products grown in Wisconsin that are purchased in close proximity to where they are produced. DATCP administers this program, which is further described in Appendix E.

The Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin program is offered to reduce the marketing, distribution, and processing hurdles that impede the expansion of local food sales. The program can positively impact farmers, communities, consumer nutrition, the environment, and Wisconsin's economy by supporting increased availability and demand for locally grown foods. The program can also strengthen connections between producers, retailers, institutions, and consumers by developing and expanding local food markets for Wisconsin farmers and processors. The grant program is intended to support efforts that increase the sale of Wisconsin-grown or produced food products or expand agricultural tourism in the State.

DATCP estimates that over 1,200 Wisconsin producers benefitted from increased sales resulting from Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin grant funds awarded between 2008 and 2010. During this time, grant recipients generated over \$2.7 million directly in new sales of Wisconsin food products, which equates to \$4.2 million in business sales. The money generated went to Wisconsin farmers, cooperatives, processing facilities, and distribution companies, and to the local suppliers and services these groups depend on.

Community Supported Agriculture

Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) is a social and economic arrangement between residents and farmers who work together to share the responsibility of producing and delivering fresh food. This service allows consumers to subscribe to a season of produce for an annual set fee at a local farm. Products, such as produce, fruits, cheeses, eggs, meats, poultry, flowers, herbs, or preserves are usually provided weekly by the farmer with pick-ups or deliveries occurring on a designated day and time. Members purchase a portion of the farm's harvest either by the season or by the week in return for what the farm is able to successfully grow and harvest, sharing some of the growing risk with the farmer. If a certain crop is not successful, the member will share the burden of the crop failure by receiving fewer or lower quality for that crop for the season. Members are often more actively involved in the growing and distribution process through shared newsletters and recipes, farm visits, farm work-days, advance purchases of products, and picking up their products. Consumers know more about the practices that produce their food and are assured of very fresh products.

CSA usually implements ecologically sound farming practices such as organic or biodynamic growing methods. This type of farming minimizes food waste by producing just the amount of food members need, with minimal unused surplus. Locally-produced foods are not transported long distances, so they typically taste better and consume less fuel. CSA is also recognized for promoting rural-urban connections and allowing urban residents to establish relationships with local farmers and rural land through farms participating in CSA.

Wisconsin is currently ranked first nationally in the number of community supported agriculture farmers per capita. The typical CSA season in Wisconsin runs from the end of May through October. In Ozaukee County, there are three community supported agriculture farms, Rare Earth Farm, Wellspring Farm, and Willoway Farm. Information about each farm is provided in the following paragraphs.

Rare Earth Farm

The Rare Earth Farm located in the Town of Belgium provides an assortment of vegetables and fruits delivered from mid-June to late November. Maple syrup and honey are included with subscriptions. The farm also provides free-range eggs for an additional cost. In addition to Ozaukee County, pick-up sites are established in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Washington, and Waukesha Counties. Some on-farm activities include salsa-making and the fall-harvest festival. Work share programs are also offered on the farm.

Wellspring Farm

This farm is a non-profit education and retreat center in the Town of Saukville. The farm provides an assortment of vegetables, fruits, and herbs. The farm also provides free-range eggs for an additional cost. In addition to Ozaukee County, pick-up sites are established in Milwaukee and Washington Counties. Some on-farm activities include garden education programs and classes, cooking classes, and various festivals. Work share programs are also offered on the farm. Wellspring Farm is open year-round and also serves as a retreat and conference center, a bed and breakfast, and an international hostel for individuals or small groups.

Willoway Farm

Willoway Farm in the Town of Fredonia provides an assortment of vegetables, fruits, flowers, and herbs. The farm also provides free-range eggs for an additional cost. Products are sold in both Ozaukee and Milwaukee Counties.

In addition to the CSA's located in Ozaukee County, community supported agriculture farmers located in adjacent counties also sell, deliver, or provide pick-up sites in Ozaukee County communities.

Farmers' Markets

Farmers' markets are one of the oldest forms of direct marketing by small- and medium-sized farms. A farmers' market is a group of farmers who collaborate to sell their products weekly or daily at a designated time and location. Farmers' markets have become an integral part of the urban-farm relationship and continue to be popular, mostly due to the increasing consumer interest in obtaining fresh products directly from the farm. Farmers' markets allow consumers to have access to locally grown, farm fresh produce, and provide farmers the opportunity to develop a personal relationship with their customers and build consumer loyalty.

Becoming a vendor at a farmers' market typically does not subject a producer to high initial costs, allowing farmers' markets to serve as business incubators by helping prospective and existing farmers develop crucial business skills and a viable business strategy. During this process, farmers have an opportunity to test new products and ideas with minimal risk, as they discover consumers' needs and interests through one-on-one interaction with market visitors. The relatively small size of the average farm providing produce to the local market allows a farmer to adjust production to meet consumer needs and capitalize on new market niches.

Direct marketing of farm products through farmers' markets continues to be an important sales outlet for agricultural producers. In addition to providing whole foods, most farmers' markets are offering bakery, prepared foods, flowers/shrubs, art, and value-added foods, such as jams, jellies, cheeses, and honey, as well as providing

live entertainment. As of 2011, there were 7,175 farmers' markets operating throughout the nation, a 17 percent increase from 2010, which is an indicator of consumer desire for local foods. In 2011, Wisconsin ranked ninth nationally in the number of recorded farmers' markets.

According to the Farm Fresh Atlas of Southeastern Wisconsin, there were five farmers' markets in Ozaukee County in 2010, as noted in Table 14 in Chapter II. Since that time, the number has increased to eight with the addition of the Port Washington Winter Farmers' Market, the Oz Farmers' Market, and the Oz Farmers' Winter Market in 2011. Markets are located in the Cities of Cedarburg and Port Washington, the Villages of Grafton, Saukville, and Thiensville, and the Town of Grafton. A detailed listing of farmers' markets in Ozaukee County and Southeastern Wisconsin can be found at http://www.farmfreshatlas.org/southeast/markets.htm.

Community Gardens

A community garden can be located in urban, suburban, or rural areas and may consist of flowers, fruits, vegetables, herbs, or trees. A community garden can be one community-wide plot, many individual plots or "assigned-allotment" plots, or a series of plots. Community gardens are typically either in-ground plots or raised bed plots. Urban agriculture methods include backyard, roof-top, and balcony gardening; community gardening in vacant lots and parks; street or roadside gardening; and livestock grazing in open space.

Community gardens promote healthy communities and provide food security for low income persons. Community gardens strengthen community bonds, provide food, and create recreational and therapeutic opportunities for a community, as well as promote environmental awareness, and provide community education.

Community gardens are often organized and managed by local residents interested in gardening. When the neighborhood has enough support for the development of a garden, a neighborhood garden committee or association is formed, and from the committee or association, officials are elected to administer the use of the garden and its finances. After the initial research, designing, and planning, the garden is constructed and should be properly maintained by the community garden members. Other factors affecting the development of a community garden include a reliable water source, equipment/tools, compost, landscaping, and fencing. Community gardening may also occur at public and private schools and other institutions, such as hospitals, jails, or day care centers.

Because urban areas contain fewer areas for open space and gardening, community roof-top gardens and green roofs provide alternative opportunities to participate in gardening. Benefits of rooftop gardens include retaining water thus reducing run-off; providing building insulation, improving air quality; and providing scenic views. In the last five years, rooftop gardening has increased in the City of Milwaukee as a number of locations are in operation. Green roofs, such as the "Rooftop Sculpture Garden" located on the roof of the Grohmann Museum on the Milwaukee School of Engineering campus, are also being developed in the City of Milwaukee.

Other examples of community gardens include vertical farms, whereby products are grown vertically on large buildings or structures (examples are located in the City of Toronto and City of Chicago); and hydroponics, which is described earlier in this Chapter.

Community gardens are also a major focus of the "Let's Move" initiative, a comprehensive initiative launched by the First Lady, Michelle Obama, and dedicated to ending childhood obesity. The initiative also seeks to provide parents with helpful information and foster environments that support healthy choices, provide healthier foods in schools, ensure all families have access to healthy, affordable food, and help children become more physically active.

In Ozaukee County, community gardens are located at the Feith Family Ozaukee YMCA in the Village of Saukville. Plots are rented by season to both YMCA members and nonmembers for a nominal fee. The YMCA also reserves several plots for educational purposes, which are used to teach children in the organization's day camps and preschool. The community gardens also donate food to area food pantries. The Ozaukee Master Gardeners also operate a community garden in the City of West Bend in Washington County. Started in 2007, the

West Bend garden has been expanded every year in an attempt to address the typical 20-person waiting list. In 2010, there were 76 plots that produced more than 3,000 pounds of produce worth about \$6,000. The Ozaukee Master Gardeners also agreed to help the City of Port Washington Parks and Recreation Department manage the Hales Trail Community Garden established in 2012. The garden has about 70 rentable garden plots.

Farm to School Program

The Farm to School program aims to connect local farms with schools to serve more healthful, locally produced foods to students; provide agriculture, health, and nutrition education opportunities; and improve Wisconsin's economy by developing new markets for farmers. The program also provides farmers with a valuable direct marketing outlet for their products.

In May 2010, Act 293 was enacted by the Legislature to promote farm to school programs. The bill created a farm to school council, comprised of farmers, child health experts, school food service personnel, and representatives from DATCP, the Department of Public Instruction, and Department of Health Services. The bill authorizes a position to promote farm to school programs and a grant program for school districts, nonprofit organizations, farmers, and other agencies that implement or contribute to farm to school programs. The Act also allows any public or private school to purchase locally grown fresh, whole, raw fruits and vegetables and/or accept donations of such items. Sources of locally grown fresh produce may include farms, farmers' markets, produce auctions, community gardens, community supported agriculture programs, school gardens, and home gardens. Farms and other establishments that supply prepared or processed products to school programs are required to be licensed. Currently, over 70 school districts in the State of Wisconsin are participating in farm to school activities, such as procuring one or more local products, developing school gardens, and offering local food tastings. DATCP administers the Farm to School program, which is further described in Appendix E.

REAP Food Group and the University of Wisconsin's Center for Integrated Agricultural Systems (CIAS) jointly developed the Wisconsin Homegrown Lunch (WHL) program, a farm to school program that seeks to introduce locally and sustainably grown foods to schoolchildren through their lunchrooms and classrooms. The WHL's goals are to increase students access to and acceptance of fresh foods, create additional markets for local producers, assist school food services to identify local foods available for purchase, and assist educators to integrate food education into their classroom curriculum. Initially focused in the Madison School District, WHL is now providing resources to school districts across the State.

Farm to Restaurant Program

The Farm to Restaurant Program promotes a viable food system by facilitating local food sourcing between local restaurants and regional food producers. The program provides farmers with a valuable direct marketing outlet for their products, and, in return, restaurants may provide valuable feedback about farm products, be willing to pay premium price for quality products, and/or advertise the "locally grown" farm name on their menus. Many restaurants realize the benefits of preparing foods with the freshest ingredients available and are also aware of the public's interest in gourmet foods and eating more healthfully.

The Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin grant program described in the previous section encourages Wisconsin restaurants and businesses to make 10 percent of their food purchases in-State. As a result, many Southeastern Wisconsin businesses have become restaurant supported agriculture customers. Restaurant supported agriculture allows local, peak of season produce to be easily accessible to area restaurants by networking with area farms and restaurants in a cooperative effort. Restaurant supported agriculture addresses the obstacles that have discouraged restaurants from using local products due to the time and cost associated with sourcing locally. Some Ozaukee County farms are currently contributing their food products, through contracts and agreements with restaurateurs, to Milwaukee-area restaurants.

Culinary Incubators

Culinary incubators serve as a place where farmers and small business owners can process and sell their foods by making use of shared kitchen facilities, equipment, and supplies. The licensed kitchens can be rented hourly or daily, depending on the project, and can also be used to produce television shows; teach cooking classes; host

food tastings; serve as a place for food service preparation for catering or community events; or act as a small restaurant. Incubator kitchens are intended to create numerous food-based companies or businesses by providing access to business development assistance while providing a larger work area with restaurant-quality equipment.

Farmers who market locally may also prepare value-added products as a way to earn a greater portion of the consumer's food dollar. For some consumers, just knowing that an item was grown locally has added value. Processing raw commodities into ready-to-eat foods can also broaden a farmer's market to include customers who are not interested in making their own jam, salsa, bread, sausage, and other products, and thus add value in the form of convenience.

Culinary incubators are ideal locations for the development of business partnerships and collaborations, and provide a place where local residents can gain experience in the service and hospitality employment sector. These collaborators may receive additional support from the community if their products are marketed in local stores. Collaborations such as these have the potential to strengthen the local agricultural industry as well as contributing significantly to the overall economic well-being of a community.

Incubator kitchens in Wisconsin are inspected and licensed by DATCP to meet State and local health and safety codes. All recipes prepared in incubator kitchens are also required to be licensed. Currently, there are eight existing and proposed incubator kitchens in Wisconsin. The closest incubator kitchen to Ozaukee County is the proposed "Creative Chefs" kitchen, to be located in the City of Milwaukee. There are operating incubator kitchens in the City of Waukesha and City of Watertown.

Events

Farmers, in association with State and local farm bureaus and other agricultural organizations, are educating, promoting, and stimulating interest in agriculture through agricultural events, such as fairs and festivals. These events allow the public to become familiar with farm operations and production. Farmers, such as community supported agriculture farmers, also organize on-site thematic or seasonal events weekly to attract more customers. Typically, organizations and institutions such as the Chamber of Commerce, local governments, school districts, and local development organizations and businesses support and promote such events.

Examples of countywide agricultural-related events include Breakfast-on-the-Farm, which is held annually in Ozaukee County, the annual Ozaukee County Fair, and annual communitywide fairs and festivals, such as the Pumpkin Festival in Grafton and the Strawberry Festival and Wine and Harvest Festival in Cedarburg. Examples of on-farm events may include seasonal fairs and festivals, weddings, reunions, picnics, hay/sleigh rides, school and educational tours, dances, craft shows, and similar activities.

Marketing Farming and Products

If farming is to remain viable, practical marketing concepts are needed for new and existing farmers. Direct and intermediate marketing opportunities enable farmers to have an active role in determining the sale price of their products.

Direct marketing is the selling of farm products directly to consumers for their personal use, and those products are not considered for resale. This marketing strategy allows for a direct connection at the point of sale for the producer and the consumer. The most common examples of direct marketing include farmers' markets, community supported agriculture farms, agri-tourism, U-Pick farms, roadside stands, and on-farm retail stores.

Intermediate marketing is selling a product to a specific buyer for resale. Benefits of intermediate marketing include a greater range of product exposure with the potential to attract more customers, consistency of sales from buyers, and larger volumes, which tends to increase efficiency. Wholesalers and distributors are among a variety of establishments and institutions that can be considered potential customers for intermediate sales. This type of marketing can include restaurants using food as a menu item or in food preparation, grocery stores or super markets selling to the consumer, and institutions, such as schools and hospitals, serving students, patients, or staff at their cafeterias. A farmer also needs to develop an awareness of his or her farm and its products with buyers by

developing a marketing strategy. The initial phase is typically choosing a farm name or product names, and may also include developing a farm logo and providing informational materials, such as newsletters or brochures.

Collaborative marketing, a form of intermediate marketing, includes farmers and consumers or nonprofit groups working together to benefit the farmer and/or buyers. Examples of collaborative marketing groups include multistakeholder cooperatives, aggregation partnerships, and produce auctions. Produce auctions are a one-stop sales outlet for local producers where they can access many markets through selling cooperatively. The BuyFresh/Buy Local, Savor Wisconsin, and Something Special *from* Wisconsin programs and marketing cooperatives, such as the Home Grown Wisconsin Cooperative, are also examples of collaborative marketing.

SUMMARY

This Chapter presented information on trends and projections that may affect farmland preservation in addition to those identified in Chapter II and the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan. The key findings of this Chapter are as follows:

- Projected demographic and economic characteristics have important implications on farmland preservation, since the conversion of agricultural and opens lands to meet future demand for urban uses depends directly on future population, household, and employment levels. The projected population for the County in 2035, based on local comprehensive plans, is 116,186 persons. This is a projected increase of 29,977 persons, or about 35 percent, over the existing 2010 population of 86,209. The projected number of households, based on the population projection, is 46,260. This is a projected increase of 12,112 households, or about 36 percent, over the 31,148 households in 2010. In 2010, there were about 53,700 jobs located in the County. A total of 62,135 jobs are projected for the County in 2035, based on local comprehensive plans. This is a projected increase of 8,435 jobs, or about 16 percent.
- Urban land uses encompassed about 62.1 square miles, or about 26 percent of the County, while nonurban land uses encompassed about 174.5 square miles, or about 74 percent of the County in 2007. Agricultural land uses were the predominate nonurban and overall land uses in the County, encompassing 121.9 square miles, or 70 percent of nonurban land and 51 percent of the total County. Residential was the predominate urban land use, encompassing about 34.1 square miles, or 56 percent of urban land uses and 15 percent of the total County. Single-family residential comprised about 95 percent of the residential land.
- The Regional Planning Commission has inventoried existing land uses since 1963. Between 1963 and 2000, the percentage decrease in agricultural uses due to conversion to other land uses occurred mostly within and near city and village urban service areas. The amount of land in agricultural use in the County declined by about 22,950 acres, or by about 22 percent, between 1963 and 2000 due to conversion of such lands to urban use, which is an average annual loss of about 620 acres of agricultural lands over this period.
- Detailed land use trends in Ozaukee County between 1980 and 2007 have been inventoried. All urban land uses, with the exception of railroad rights-of-way, experienced an increase in acreage between 1980 and 2007. Residential land uses experienced an increase of 8,568 acres, which was the largest increase of all land use categories in the County. Single-family residential accounted for 7,842 acres, or about 92 percent of the total residential land increase. During this same period, nonurban land uses decreased by 13,304 acres, or by about 11 percent, due to a decrease in agricultural land uses. Agricultural land uses the only nonurban land use to experience a decrease in acreage. All other nonurban land uses, including natural resource areas, landfills, nonmetallic mining sites, and open lands, experienced an increase in acreage. Agricultural lands decreased by 15,807 acres, or by about 17 percent, between 1980 and 2007.
- Ozaukee County experienced an overall increase in the equalized value of land of about 58 percent between 2000 and 2010, which was above the approximately 43 percent increase State-wide over the same period. Residential properties in Ozaukee County experienced the greatest increase in equalized value, with an increase of almost 61 percent. Agricultural land, forest land, manufacturing properties, and other lands experienced a decrease in value between 2000 and 2010. Although the equalized value of agricultural land has

decreased, the average sale price of agricultural land increased in the County from \$1,618 per acre in 1976 (equivalent to \$5,805 in 2007 dollars) to \$11,963 in 2007, or an increase of 106 percent when using constant dollars. The average sales price dropped significantly between 2007 and 2009, to less than the sales price in 1976 when expressed in constant dollars, due to the economic recession.

- In 2007, 513 farms in Ozaukee County sold \$59,056,000 of agricultural products, based on market value, which is about 84 percent more than the 1997 level of about \$32,047,000. This is the highest percent increase in comparison to those of the other six counties in the Region for that time period.
- Racine County had the highest average market value of agricultural products sold per farm of \$156,324 in 2007, while Ozaukee County had the second highest of \$115,120, which was an increase of about 53 percent from the 1997 level of about \$75,052.
- Ozaukee County's agricultural sales as a percent contribution to the total business sales revenue of the County increased from 0.6 percent in 1997 to 1.1 percent in 2007.
- Technological development and intensifying competition are fundamentally reshaping the agriculture industry from the production of bulk commodities to the production of specialized markets. Efforts to develop and expand new types of land uses for bulk agricultural commodities, alternative agricultural production systems, niche markets, and specialty crops are creating new agricultural enterprises that are improving the economic viability of agriculture.
 - In 2007, dairy farming continued to be the predominant agricultural industry in Ozaukee County as dairy sales totaled \$33.2 million in the County. In terms of sales, the next largest agricultural sectors in the County in 2007 were grain production sales at \$8.4 million, horticulture sales at \$8.2 million, cattle and calves sales at \$4.1 million, and vegetable sales at \$2.0 million. Sales in "other" agricultural industries increased 30 percent in Ozaukee County from 2002 to 2007.
 - The number of farms in Ozaukee County declined by 20 from 2002 to 2007, while the acreage of farmlands decreased by about 4,000 acres from 2000 to 2007. The total number of farms and the number of dairy farms also decreased in Ozaukee County from 1986 to 2007. The number of milk cows decreased during this 20-year period by nearly 3,000, or 26 percent. Despite the decrease in total number, the average number of milk cows per dairy farm nearly doubled, from 58 to 112, between 1986 and 2007.
 - In terms of crop production, corn and forage crops were Ozaukee County's largest crop producers in 2002. Soy crops are the only crop product that increased from 1990 to 2002 in Ozaukee County. Soy crops tripled during this period and overtook small grain crops as Ozaukee County's third largest crop producer in the total number of acres of crop production in the County.
- Agricultural diversification is an important mechanism for sustainability and economic growth. Factors to diversify agricultural production may include reducing economic risk, reducing impacts on environmental resources, responding to changing consumer demands or changing government policy, exploiting profitable niche markets, and creating new agricultural industries. Some examples of agricultural diversification include organic farming, aquaculture, specialty crops farming, horticulture, agri-tourism, and value-added farming.
- In 2010, Wisconsin ranked ninth nationally for ethanol production at 545 million gallons of annual capacity, according to the Renewable Fuels Association. In 2010, there were nine large capacity and three small-scale operating ethanol production facilities, as well as one proposed facility in Wisconsin. About 58 percent of the ethanol produced in the State was blended with gasoline.
- Local food consumption is increasing in Wisconsin creating viable opportunities for Wisconsin farmers. Buying locally grown foods has become increasingly popular and the trend is expected to continue. The range of local agricultural products available has expanded as farmers have responded to the public's interest. Some examples of collaborative and promotional efforts in Wisconsin that serve to promote locally grown foods include Buy Fresh/Buy Local, Something Special from Wisconsin, Savor Wisconsin, and Grocers Buy Local.

- Community Supported Agriculture is an arrangement between local residents and farmers who work together to share the responsibility of producing and delivering fresh food. Wisconsin is currently ranked first nationally in the number of community supported agriculture farmers per capita. In 2010, there were three community supported agriculture farms in Ozaukee County.
- Farmers' markets are one of the oldest forms of direct marketing by small- and medium-sized farms. A farmers' market is a group of farmers who collaborate to sell their farm-fresh, convenient, and healthy products weekly or daily at a designated time and location. There were eight farmers' markets in Ozaukee County in 2011.
- In 2011, there were two community gardens associated with Ozaukee County, the community gardens located at the Feith Family Ozaukee YMCA in the Village of Saukville, and the community garden located in the City of West Bend in Washington County operated by the Ozaukee Master Gardeners. The City of Port Washington opened a community garden in 2012.
- The Farm to School program aims to connect local farms with schools to serve more healthful, locally produced foods to students; provide agriculture, health, and nutrition education opportunities; and improve Wisconsin's economy by developing new markets for farmers. Currently, over 70 school districts in the State of Wisconsin are participating in farm to school activities.
- Farm to Restaurant Programs promote a viable food system by facilitating local food sourcing between local restaurants and regional food producers and educating the public about the benefits of supporting locally grown and prepared foods. In 2008, the Buy Local/Buy Wisconsin grant program was initiated to keep food spending in local communities by encouraging Wisconsin restaurants and businesses to make 10 percent of their food purchases in-State. As a result, many Southeastern Wisconsin businesses have become restaurant supported agriculture customers.
- Some of the most visible local food sales are direct from farmer to consumer. There are also opportunities to connect to a local food system through intermediate marketing. The most commonly recognized examples of direct marketing include farmers' markets, community supported agriculture farms, agri-tourism, U-Pick farms, roadside stands, and on-farm retail stores. Some examples of intermediate marketing include selling a product to specific buyers such as wholesalers, or distributors, who consolidate products for sale to restaurants, grocery stores, supermarkets, or institutions.

Chapter IV

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

INTRODUCTION

For any planning process, it is good practice to provide opportunities for the public to become acquainted with the planning process and to solicit public involvement in the development of plan recommendations. In the case of a farmland preservation plan, it is beneficial to gather information related to public perceptions of agriculture as well as other related natural resources and open space lands. To ensure community involvement, a public participation plan (PPP) was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors in December 2011 as an amendment to the Public Participation Plan for the Ozaukee County Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan: 2035. The amendment to the PPP is included in Appendix B. The PPP for the farmland preservation planning process, which was adopted by the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board and is also included in Appendix B, outlines a series of outreach efforts and public participation sessions designed to gain input from County farmers as well as residents and business owners throughout the farmland preservation planning process. In addition to input by an Ozaukee County citizen advisory committee and review boards, public participation efforts carried out during the plan preparation process included, but were not limited to, County farmland preservation kick-off and local information meetings, a countywide public opinion survey, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis workshops, and agriculture focus group sessions. The comments and suggestions obtained were used to help guide the preparation of a vision statement and goals, objectives, and plan recommendations contained in the County farmland preservation plan. A summary of public participation efforts and their results is presented in this Chapter.

PLANNING WEBSITE

In 2002, Ozaukee County launched a comprehensive planning website and added a separate link in 2010 pertaining to farmland preservation planning. The intent of the web page was to inform citizens about the farmland preservation plan and the planning process, how to become involved in this process, and how to make public comments. Over time, documents and resources related to the planning process have been added to the site which has become a valuable resource for community leaders, County officials, Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC) members, and local government staff. The website can be viewed at: http://www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningParks_Planning.asp.

WORKING LANDS INITIATIVE INFORMATION MEETINGS

Three Working Lands Initiative information meetings were held in March and April 2010. The first meeting, held jointly by Ozaukee and Washington Counties on March 25, 2010, at the Riveredge Nature Center in the Town of Saukville, invited local government officials and staff within the two counties. The second meeting was held on

April 1, 2010, at the Saukville Town Hall for agricultural producers and landowners in Ozaukee County. The last meeting was held as part of the First Friday Forum series on April 2, 2010, at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in the City of Port Washington and was geared towards the general public. Attendees were given the opportunity to learn about the State's new Working Lands Initiative (WLI) legislation, Ozaukee County's process and timeline for updating its farmland preservation plan, and an example of a successful land preservation effort from Dakota County, Minnesota. Staff from Washington and Ozaukee Counties; a representative from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP); and a speaker from Dakota County gave presentations at various meetings.

KICK-OFF MEETINGS

Two kick-off meetings on the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County were conducted on September 27 and 29, 2010, at the Fredonia Village/Town Hall and the Ozaukee County Administration Center, respectively. Attendees learned more about the State's WLI including planning requirements, tax credits, Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) and Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) programs, and the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County timeline, process, and public participation opportunities. Staff from the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, UW-Extension, SEWRPC, and DATCP gave presentations and/or answered questions.

PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

A key method of obtaining public input was conducting a statistically significant, mail-out countywide survey. In fall 2010, a survey was conducted on behalf of the County by the University of Wisconsin-River Falls Survey Research Center. The survey was designed with the assistance of the Ozaukee County Land Preservation Board (LPB), the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB), UW-Extension, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, and SEWRPC. It was viewed as an important means of broadening citizen input in the preparation of the new County farmland preservation plan and County park and open space plan. Responses to these questions also helped guide preparation of a vision statement for the farmland preservation plan.

The survey was designed to include a wide range of questions on quality of life, farmland preservation and funding, natural and cultural resource protection, park and open space preservation and funding, park development and recreational facilities, and basic demographics. A total of 1,146 surveys were mailed with postage-paid return envelopes to a random sample of adult residents (voting age-18 and older) in Ozaukee County. The results provided in the survey report are accurate to within \pm 4.75 percent with 95 percent confidence. The report, which is provided in Appendix F, indicated the proportion of farmers among the survey respondents was about 1 percent, which is proportional to the number of farmers in the County population; however, the small number of farmers in the survey precludes adequate statistical analysis of the opinions of Ozaukee County farmers. It recommended, therefore, that County officials seek additional input from the farm community, such as from SWOT analyses and focus group sessions, as they deliberate farmland preservation policies. Statistical tests further indicated that "non-response bias" was not a problem in this sample.

Of the 1,146 surveys mailed, 422 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of about 37 percent. Overall, the survey results from a majority of the respondents indicated agreement or support for:

- Preserving farmland for food and maintaining rural character;
- Establishing an Agricultural Enterprise Area to allow farmers to claim the maximum state farmland preservation tax credits to help preserve farmland in the County;
- Maintaining open space, protecting important environmental/natural resources, and preserving wildlife habitat, especially near County parks;
- Concentrating urban development in existing cities and villages;
- Supporting river restoration projects; and
- Preserving historic structures and archaeological sites.

In addition, support or agreement was expressed for:

- Purchasing conservation easements for farmland preservation, with conservancy trust funds, private donations, and State/Federal grants or funds as the preferred funding source;
- Creating a County program to purchase conservation easements for natural areas, with private donations, conservancy trust funds, and State/Federal grants or funds as the preferred funding sources;
- Funding park, open space, and farmland preservation projects without raising property or sales taxes;
- Preferring residential cluster design (conservation subdivisions) with smaller lots and shared open space compared to traditional design with large lots and no shared open space;
- Protecting water quality; and
- Preserving rural and small town character.

A Countywide public opinion survey was also conducted as part the of Ozaukee County comprehensive planning process with the survey results presented in Appendix N of the County comprehensive plan. This survey included a wide range of questions on planning and development topics, including agricultural and natural resources. Several communities within the County also conducted local public opinion surveys to supplement this Countywide survey. In general, these survey results concur with the overall results of the farmland preservation survey in which the majority of the respondents favored preserving farmland, natural resources, and small town character.

STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES, AND THREATS (SWOT) ANALYSES

At meetings of the Ozaukee Farmland Preservation Planning Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC), the Ozaukee County Land Preservation Board (LPB), and the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) in March and April 2011, members were invited to take part in a SWOT Analysis workshop conducted by UW-Extension. A SWOT analysis is a planning tool used to identify a community's current assets and liabilities, as well trends that might have a positive or negative impact on its future. Participants identified and discussed the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats that they perceived in Ozaukee County in relation to agriculture and farmland preservation; when appropriate, they were asked to prioritize the issues by identifying those they believed were most important.

The SWOT analyses carried out with the FPPCAC, LPB, and CPB were intended to focus primarily on farmland preservation. The results of these exercises are presented in Figure 5. The issues identified as top priorities in the County are highlighted in bold on the Figure and are listed below.

FPPCAC, LPB, and CPB SWOT Analyses Results – Top Priorities *Strengths*

- Good farm to market roads/interstate
- Prime/available farmland
- Rural and urban areas
- Diversified agriculture
- Close to urban population/Milwaukee Metro area for direct marketing
- Farmers markets growing in popularity/good community support
- Strong farming history
- Good and productive farmland worth protecting
- Many parks and green spaces available for public use
- Major regional component of the County's economy
- Large contiguous tracts of agricultural (ag) land
- Agricultural economy complements quality of life related to groundwater recharge areas and local foods

Figure 5

RESULTS OF STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS (SWOT) ANALYSES FOR THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN

156



SWOT Analysis conducted at an Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee meeting held on March 29, 2011

Figure 5 (continued)



SWOT Analysis conducted at an Ozaukee County Land Preservation Board meeting held on April 14, 2011.

Source: Ozaukee County and SEWRPC.

SWOT Analysis conducted at an Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board meeting held on April 20, 2011. Issues in bold were identified as top priorities in the County.

Weaknesses

- Urban sprawl
- Lack of coordination between towns/cities/villages regarding zoning issues
- Lack of ag labor force
- Population moving into ag areas
- Land values too high for use in production ag
- Complaints by urban development on regular farm practices
- Not enough locally grown food
- Push for growth to increase tax base may cause conversion of farmland/urbanization/urban sprawl
- High cost of living and high tax rate may cause sales of land
- Loss of support for PACE at the state level and budget cuts
- Lack of understanding subsidization of ag and "Cheap Food Act"
- Division and destruction of farms for less productive purposes
- Misperception of why and where the size of farms is going and difficulty of expansion
- Zoning restrictions inhibit smaller farms because of regulations and allows disruption of farmland
- Perspective of ag land as not developed land, but land that is to be developed

Opportunities

- Develop a strong Farmland Preservation Plan
- Urban support for farming and farming infrastructure
- Demand for products
- Infrastructure to get products to market
- Niche ag due to farm markets close to urban center (diverse marketing opportunities)
- Suppliers of inputs in close proximity
- Ag-related jobs
- Local farmers markets, niche produce
- County planning
- Education opportunities (schools, farm trips, Breakfast on the Farm)
- Preserve the maximum amount of land
- Preserve quality of life in Ozaukee County
- Connect non-farm people to the ag community
- Public relations campaign on importance of ag in the County
- Water recharge

Threats

- Lack of government support
- Economics of current farming/increasing costs
- Declining or lack of grants/funds
- Apathy/indifference
- Urban development

- Expanding need for population density without higher housing density
- Limited knowledge/concern for agriculture/food
- Urban sprawl
- Mega developers
- Rising cost of farmland
- Cheap food and lack of respect/value of food
- Lack of understanding/education of importance of farmland preservation

FOCUS GROUPS

The Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department and UW-Extension held two public focus group meetings during the planning process to solicit input from farmers and residents employed in the agribusiness industry. The focus group sessions were held at the Hawthorne Hills Golf Course Club House in the Town of Saukville on April 19, 2011 and the Ozaukee County Administration Center on April 20, 2011. Attendees were asked a series of questions related to agriculture and farmland preservation while responses were recorded. Appendix G includes the agenda and questions used for the focus group meetings and a list of responses to these questions. Some of the common responses or suggestions were the following:

- Smaller farms still exist in the County
- Close to markets-Milwaukee, co-ops, Cedar Valley Cheese Factory
- Input costs very high
- Lack of government support
- Farms getting bigger/need more land
- Tax credits provide more funding in the long term than easements
- Keep the northern part of the County in agriculture
- More specialty farms/niche farms
- Increasingly difficult to find younger generation to farm
- Direct marketing options
- Development (urban) needs control
- Accommodate growth, but on non-farmable land
- No respect when passing farm machinery on roads
- Create incentives to rent farmland out to farmers rather than selling the land
- Mixture between niche and extremely large (farms)
- Easier for existing large farms to finance. Lending for new/younger farmers is very difficult to obtain

TOWN OF DUNN TOUR

The Gathering Waters Conservancy and the Land Conservation Partnership for Ozaukee County (LCP OZ) sponsored a bus tour on May 13, 2011 to the Town of Dunn, located in Dane County, Wisconsin. The Town has been implementing a successful purchase of development rights (PDR) program since 1993 that has preserved large tracts of quality agricultural land and open space near the City of Madison. Town officials, staff, and participants in the PDR program gave presentations and a farm tour to the LCP OZ, FPPCAC, LPB, and CPB members invited on the tour to learn about their PDR program.

PUBLIC EVENTS

A farmland preservation planning booth was on display at three public events. A booth was set up at the 27th Annual Ozaukee County Breakfast on the Farm event held on June 25, 2011 on the Melichar Broad Acres dairy farm in the Town of Port Washington. The event was organized by the Ozaukee County Dairy Promotion Committee in coordination with the Melichar family. A similar booth was on display in the Commercial Building at two Ozaukee County Fairs from August 3 through 7, 2011, and August 1 through 5, 2012. The booth included inventory data maps, fact sheets, timelines, and other information about the Ozaukee County farmland preservation planning process as well as the Working Lands Initiative legislation. Staff was present to provide information and answer questions.

COUNTYWIDE PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS AND PUBLIC HEARING

Two meetings were held as part of the First Friday Forum series to inform the general public about farmland preservation. The first meeting was held on April 2, 2010, at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in the City of Port Washington to educate the public about the State's new farmland preservation requirements, known as the Working Lands Initiative. The second meeting was held on April 13, 2012, at the Milwaukee Area Technical College-North Campus in the City of Mequon to present the updated Ozaukee County farmland preservation plan, including inventory findings, a map showing recommended farmland preservation areas, and the goals and objectives of the plan.

Open house informational meetings were also held in September 2011 to share with the general public the accumulated inventory data related to the farmland preservation planning process and results of the Countywide public opinion survey and other public input. Following completion of a draft plan, a Countywide public informational meeting was held on June 4, 2013, to share the recommendations of the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. A second open house on the draft plan was sponsored by the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) on June 11, 2013, prior to a public hearing on the plan also held by the CPB on the same day. The public had the opportunity to both learn about and comment on the farmland preservation planning process, data, and recommendations at these meetings.

A presentation on the plan was made to the County Board of Supervisors on June 19, 2013. The County Board approved the plan as a stand-alone plan on July 3, 2013, before the plan was re-submitted to DATCP for certification. Following certification by DATCP, the plan was approved by the CPB and adopted by an ordinance of the County Board as an amendment to the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan. Additional information on the plan review and adoption process is provided in Chapter VII.

OTHER PUBLIC INPUT

In addition to the public involvement efforts described above, the County received other public input throughout the planning process via e-mails, letters, telephone calls, and other contacts. Other techniques to secure public participation include local public meetings, newsletters, and news releases and articles.

SUMMARY

This Chapter presents the results of the public involvement efforts carried out during the process of preparing a new Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. These efforts included, but were not limited to, review and input by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Board, and Comprehensive Planning Board; a Countywide public opinion mail-out survey; two agriculture focus group sessions; and three strength, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) workshops. The results were used to help guide the development of a vision statement and goals, objectives, and plan recommendations for farmland preservation in Ozaukee County.
The aforementioned public input efforts provided County residents opportunities to express their views regarding a range of agricultural issues and concerns and to offer suggestions for future farmland preservation in Ozaukee County. A summary of some public participation effort results follows.

- The public opinion survey of County residents conducted in fall 2010 included a range of questions on farmland preservation and park and open space topics. In general, the survey indicated public agreement or support for preserving farmland and rural character; maintaining and protecting open space, protecting important environmental/natural resources, and preserving wildlife habitat; concentrating urban development in existing cities and villages; supporting river restoration projects; and preserving historic structures and archaeological sites. The detailed results of the survey are presented in Appendix F.
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) exercises conducted in March and April 2011 provided the members of Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Board, and Comprehensive Planning Board an opportunity to express opinions on various farming issues at the outset of the farmland preservation plan update. Each Committee and Board identified a number of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats pertaining to farmland preservation in the County for consideration in preparing the new Farmland Preservation Plan. The results of the SWOT analyses are set forth in Figure 5.
- At agriculture focus group meetings held on April 19 and 20, 2011, attendees offered numerous comments and suggestions with respect to questions pertaining to farming and future farmland preservation. Some of the common responses or suggestions were input costs are very high; government support was lacking; farms are getting bigger and need more land; tax credits provide more funding in the long term than easements; accommodate more specialty/niche farms; provide direct marketing options; accommodate (urban) growth, but on non-farmable land; create incentives to rent farmland out to farmers rather than selling the land; and accommodate a mix of niche and extremely large farms. The results of the focus group sessions are set forth in Appendix G.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter V

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

INTRODUCTION

Ozaukee County includes expanding urban areas as well as significant amounts of farmland and environmentally sensitive areas. In recent decades there has been a substantial conversion of farmland and rural open land to urban uses within the County. Future population and employment increases may be expected to convert additional land in the County from rural to urban uses. Through proper planning, the impact on remaining agricultural and other rural land can be managed for the public interest.

This Chapter identifies farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County. The farmland preservation plan map is intended to serve as a guide for attaining orderly development in Ozaukee County, and to minimize, insofar as practicable, the loss of productive farmland and other important components of the natural resource base. The plan map seeks to discourage incompatible urban uses in agricultural and environmentally significant areas, and recommends that intensive urban development occur only in the planned urban (sanitary sewer) service areas of the County.

In accordance with Section 91.10(1)(d) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, a county farmland preservation plan must clearly identify areas that the county plans to preserve for agricultural and agricultural-related uses. Farmland preservation areas may include undeveloped natural resource and open space lands but may not include any areas that are planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted. This is accomplished through the identification and delineation of farmland preservation areas (FPAs). This Chapter describes the criteria used to identify FPAs in the County and a map of parcels included in the FPAs. A map and description of the land use categories shown on the Ozaukee County farmland preservation plan map is also included. Larger-scale FPA and plan maps are included for each community that agreed, in cooperation with the County, to designate FPAs within the community.

CRITERIA USED TO IDENTIFY FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

Section 91.10 of the *Statutes* requires that the rationale used to identify farmland preservation areas be described in the County plan and that maps be included that clearly delineate farmland preservations areas and parcels within such areas planned to be preserved for agricultural and agricultural-related uses. The rationale may include criteria such as soil type, topography, agricultural productivity, current agricultural use, and proximity to incorporated areas, major arterials, and rural subdivisions.¹ All of these criteria were considered as part of the LESA analysis conducted as part of the County comprehensive planning process.

A set of criteria for delineating farmland preservation areas (FPAs) in Ozaukee County was established by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department staff, UW-Extension staff, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) staff, and Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC) members working together. Parcels must meet all of the following criteria to be eligible for inclusion in a FPA.

A. Municipal Boundaries

Parcels must be located entirely in the following local governments:

- City of Mequon
- Town of Belgium
- Town of Cedarburg
- Town of Fredonia
- Town of Grafton
- Town of Port Washington
- Town of Saukville

Local government boundaries used for determination were current as of January 1, 2011. Cities and villages, other than the City of Mequon, were excluded from the analysis because they intend to develop with urban uses. The City of Mequon is the only incorporated community in the County that includes areas that are intended to be maintained in long-term non-urban uses in addition to areas intended to be developed for urban uses.

B. Sewer Service Areas

Parcels must be located entirely outside adopted planned sanitary sewer service areas approved by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

Sewer service area boundaries used for this determination were current as of January 1, 2011.

C. Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Score

Parcels must have a LESA score of 6.4 or higher.

A LESA analysis was conducted as part of the Ozaukee County comprehensive planning process to help identify areas of the County that are most suitable for long-term agricultural use. The designation of high priority farmland protection areas was intended to help ensure that farms most in need and deserving of limited government resources receive them. The LESA analysis was conducted using SEWRPC and County Geographic Information System (GIS) data to assign each agricultural parcel in the County a LESA score between 0 and 10, with 10 being the best possible score. Parcels outside adopted planned sewer service areas with 2 percent or more of the land in agricultural use were included in the analysis. The Land Evaluation (LE) component of the analysis comprises 40 percent of the score, and used ratings determined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service based on soil type, slope, agricultural capability class, and soil productivity. The other 60 percent of the LESA score is comprised of the 11 Site Assessment (SA) factors listed

¹Criteria are listed in the document entitled "County Application for Farmland Preservation Plan Certification" prepared by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP). Criteria for the identification of farmland preservation areas are not specified in Chapter 91 of the Statutes, and regulations to implement Chapter 91 had not been issued by DATCP prior to adoption of this plan in July 2013.

below. Each factor received a weight based on its perceived importance to the analysis by various workgroups, committees, and boards. County and local officials may review parcels that received a score below 6.4 and determine on a case-by-case basis whether they are suitable for long-term protection.

- *SA-1 factors (agricultural productivity)* SA-1A. Size of parcel in agricultural use SA-1B. Size of contiguous agricultural land block SA-1C. Compatibility of adjacent land uses SA-1D. Compatibility of land uses within 0.5 mile SA-1E. Population density within 0.5 mile
- *SA-2 factors (development pressures impacting continued agricultural use of a parcel)* SA-2A. Distance from planned sewer service areas SA-2B. Distance from IH 43 interchanges
- SA-3 factors (other public values of a parcel)
 - SA-3A. Primary or secondary environmental corridor, isolated natural resource area, natural area, or critical species habitat present on parcel
 - SA-3B. Wetlands less than five acres or floodplains present on parcel
 - SA-3C. Proximity to permanently protected land greater than 20 acres in size
 - SA-3D. Parcel has been placed on the National Register of Historic Places, designated as a local historic landmark, or is adjacent to a rustic road

The median score for the parcels analyzed was 6.4. Parcels in the highest scoring categories should be given highest priority for farmland preservation. Parcels scoring less than 6.4 should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. Six parcels with a combined total of 401 acres received a score in the 9.0 to 9.9 category, 164 parcels with a combined total of 10,450 acres received a score in the 8.0 to 8.9 category, and 806 parcels with a combined total of 28,213 acres received a score in the 7.0 to 7.9 category. A detailed description of the LESA analysis is outlined in SEWRPC Memorandum Report No. 170, *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Analysis of Farmlands in Ozaukee County: 2007*, January 2008.

D. Planned Land Uses

Parcels must be located entirely in the following planned land use categories based on the adopted Ozaukee County comprehensive plan:

- farmland protection
- primary environmental corridor
- secondary environmental corridor
- isolated natural resource area
- other conservancy lands to be preserved

Planned land uses were determined by Map 96, "Planned Land Uses in the Ozaukee County Planning Area: 2035" in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 285, *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035*, April 2008, Amended May 2009 (reprinted as Map 24 in Chapter II of this report).

E. Zoning

Parcels must be located entirely in the following zoning districts:

- agricultural (if single-family residential use is allowed, then no more than one dwelling unit per 20 acres)
- lowland conservancy
- upland conservancy

Permitted zoning districts were determined based on the requirements of Section 91.44 of the *Statutes* and as shown on Map 26 in Chapter II (Generalized Existing Basic Zoning For Participating Communities in Ozaukee County: 2010). County and SEWRPC staff compiled and digitized zoning districts to create the Countywide generalized zoning map, which was based on the detailed existing zoning maps of participating communities included in Appendix D. The map is current as of January 1, 2011. Permitted local government zoning districts are listed below.

City of Mequon:

- A-1 Agricultural Preservation District
- C-1 Shoreland/Wetland Conservancy District
- C-2 General Conservancy District

Town of Belgium:

- A-1 Agricultural District
- A-2 Agricultural District with parcels of 20 acres or larger
- C-1 Conservancy Overlay District

Town of Cedarburg:

- A-2 Prime Agricultural District
- C-1 Conservancy District

Town of Fredonia:

- A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District
- C-1 Lowland Conservancy District

Town of Grafton:

- A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District
- C-1 Conservancy Overlay District

Town of Port Washington:

- A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District

Town of Saukville:

- No zoning districts are eligible at this time.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS

Farmland preservation areas in Ozaukee County are presented on Map 28 for the plan design year 2035. The delineation of farmland preservation areas (FPAs) was based on the criteria described in the preceding section. In accordance with guidelines provided by DATCP, only entire parcels are included within FPAs. Conservancy areas, which include natural resources such as woodlands and wetlands, are shown as overlays on Map 28; also in accordance with guidelines provided by DATCP. FPAs occupy about 29,109 acres, or about 19 percent of the County, which includes approximately 2,567 acres of lowland conservancy areas and 1,057 acres of upland conservancy areas. Table 43 summarizes the area included in FPAs and conservancy overlays in the County and participating local governments.

Table 43

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS IN OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035

	Farmland	Lowland	Upland	
	Preservation	Conservancy	Conservancy	
Community	(acres) ^{a,b}	(acres) ^b	(acres)	
Town of Belgium	16,610	968	432	
Town of Fredonia	12,499	1,599	625	
Ozaukee County	29,109	2,567	1,057	

^aIncludes areas within conservancy overlays.

^bIncludes surface waters.

Source: SEWRPC.



Source: Local Governments, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

Larger-scale maps of FPAs were prepared for those communities within Ozaukee County that qualify and agreed, in cooperation with the County, to designate farmland preservation areas within the community, which are shown on Map 29 for the Town of Belgium and Map 30 for the Town of Fredonia. Other communities involved in this farmland preservation planning process decided not to participate in the State farmland preservation program and/or did not qualify to do so based on the criteria described in the preceding section, or on the requirements of Chapter 91 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* as determined through DATCP review of the draft plan. As noted earlier in this report, the other Towns in the County and the City of Mequon, which participated in this farmland preservation planning effort, wish to protect agricultural lands in a different manner to the extent possible and may implement many of the agricultural-related preservation policies and programs described in the next chapter.

All towns, villages, and cities in Ozaukee County enforce their own general zoning ordinance.² The mapping of farmland preservation areas has direct implications on the preparation of farmland preservation zoning ordinances by local governments in the County, since the certification of farmland preservation zoning districts requires that the district be located within a farmland preservation area. Proposed agricultural enterprise areas (AEA) and PACE easements must also be located in a farmland preservation area in order to receive grant funds from DATCP.

Uses within farmland preservation areas are set forth in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*, and include crop production; keeping livestock; beekeeping; nursery, sod, and Christmas tree production; floriculture; fur farming; forest management; and land enrolled in a Federal or State agricultural land conservation or agricultural commodity payment program. Agricultural-related uses such as agricultural equipment dealerships and storage and processing facilities for agricultural products are also listed as allowable uses in Chapter 91.

The lowland conservancy overlay shown on Maps 28 through 30 represents existing (2005) nonfarmed wetlands and surface waters. The upland conservancy overlay represents the upland portions, including woodlands and steep slopes, of existing (2000) environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. The conservancy overlay information is included on the maps to indicate the extent and general type of natural features that exist on parcels within the farmland preservation areas so that communities could use this information to help identify lowland and upland conservancy overlay areas on local zoning maps.

In accordance with Section 91.38(1)(h) of the *Statutes*, an overlay zoning district, such as an overlay zoning district representing environmental corridors and other natural features, may be superimposed on a farmland preservation zoning district. Farmland preservation tax credits may be claimed for natural resource areas within FPAs provided the natural areas are preserved as permanent undeveloped natural resource areas or open space lands on the site and the conservancy overlay district does not remove land use restrictions from the underlying farmland preservation zoning district.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN

Map 31 shows the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County. The number of acres and percent of the County in each category on the plan map is provided on Table 44. The plan map depicts FPAs in relation to natural resources, existing and planned urban development, and rural and agricultural uses outside FPAs in order to provide a general overview of farmland preservation in relation to other land uses and natural resources in the County. Larger-scale versions of the Farmland Preservation Plan map were also prepared for participating local governments, which are shown on Map 32 for the Town of Belgium and Map 33 for the Town of Fredonia.

²Ozaukee County enforces a shoreland and floodplain protection ordinance in shoreland portions of the six towns in the County.



FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS IN THE TOWN OF BELGIUM: 2035

- PARCEL BOUNDARY OUTSIDE SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREA
- FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREA
- OTHER LAND USES
- LOWLAND CONSERVANCY OVERLAY
- UPLAND CONSERVANCY OVERLAY
- ADOPTED REFINED AND PLANNED SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREA
- SURFACE WATER
- ----- VILLAGE BOUNDARY

Source: Town of Belgium, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.





FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS IN THE TOWN OF FREDONIA: 2035

- PARCEL BOUNDARY OUTSIDE SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREA
- FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREA
- OTHER LAND USES
- LOWLAND CONSERVANCY OVERLAY
- UPLAND CONSERVANCY OVERLAY
- ADOPTED REFINED AND PLANNED SANITARY SEWER SERVICE AREA
- SURFACE WATER
- ----- VILLAGE BOUNDARY

Source: Town of Fredonia, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.



OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN: 2035



Source: Local Governments, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

Table 44

	Acros	Percent of	Percent of
Land Use Category	Acres	Subiolai	TOLAI
Farmiand Preservation Areas and Other Agricultural and Rural Lands			
Farmland Preservation Areas ^a	25,383	46.2	16.9
Other Agricultural and Rural Lands ^b	29,517	53.8	19.6
Subtotal	54,900	100.0	36.5
Natural Resource Areas			
Primary Environmental Corridor ^c	18,311	52.5	12.2
Secondary Environmental Corridor ^c	4,581	13.1	3.0
Isolated Natural Resource Areas ^c	3,329	9.5	2.2
Other Conservancy Lands to be Preserved ^d	3,617	10.4	2.4
Non-Farmed Wetlands ^e	2,368	6.8	1.6
Surface Water	2,704	7.7	1.8
Subtotal	34,910	100.0	23.2
Urban Development ^f			
Existing Urban Land Uses ⁹	36,645	60.3	24.3
Planned Urban Land Uses ^h	24,139	39.7	16.0
Subtotal	60,784	100.0	40.3
Total	150,594		100.0
Overlay Category			
100-Year Floodplain	18,385		
Farmed Wetlands ¹	196		

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035

^aIncludes farmland preservation areas shown on Map 28 outside upland and lowland conservancy areas.

^bIncludes rural-density residential uses at a density of no more than one dwelling unit per five acres and the agricultural/conservation subdivision land use category with a maximum density of one dwelling unit per 3.5 acres within the Town of Port Washington (see Map 24 in Chapter II). Parcels in these categories that are enrolled in the farmland preservation program through an agreement between the property owner and DATCP will be limited to the uses specified in the agreement. Uses on parcels subject to farmland preservation zoning will be limited to the uses specified in Subchapter III of Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes and the local zoning ordinance.

^cReflects environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas in the year 2000. Total acreage does not include associated surface water areas, which is a separate category.

^dIncludes certain areas located outside of environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas, such as woodlands, wetlands, natural areas, critical species habitat sites, State-owned wildlife areas; significant geological sites; and existing common open areas of residential developments, including conservation subdivisions.

^eIncludes mostly those wetlands that are not being farmed and contain wetland vegetation and supporting soils that are located outside environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other conservancy lands to be preserved. This category also includes existing farmed wetlands located within parcels containing existing or planned urban land use/development (ranging from rural residential uses to industrial uses).

^fIncludes concentrations of urban residential (one dwelling unit per 4.9 or less acres), commercial, industrial, extractive, governmental, institutional, recreational, transportation (including street and railway rights-of-way), and utility lands.

⁹Reflects existing urban land uses for the year 2007.

^hReflects planned 2035 urban land uses from the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County (see Map 24 in Chapter II).

¹Includes those wetlands that do not contain wetland vegetation due to farming (cultivation, pasturing, or other agricultural activities) that are located outside environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other conservancy lands to be preserved, in areas not anticipated to be developed for urban use during the planning period. If natural vegetation develops on some of these wetlands with supporting soils when farming ceases, the re-vegetated areas may eventually be reclassified as part of an environmental corridor or isolated natural resource area, or as a nonfarmed wetland.

Source: SEWRPC.



FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR THE TOWN OF BELGIUM: 2035

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREAS AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LANDS FARMLAND PRESERVATION AREA

OTHER AGRICULTURAL



AND RURAL LANDS (INCLUDES RURAL-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL LAND USES WITH AVERAGE DENSITY EQUATING TO ONE DWELLING UNIT PER 5.0 CR MORE ACRES)

NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS

PRIMARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR

SECONDARY ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDOR

ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREA

OTHER CONSERVANCY AREAS TO BE PRESERVED

AREAS TO BE PRESERVED NONFARMED WETLANDS OUTSIDE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CORRIDORS, ISOLATED NATURAL RESOURCE AREAS, AND OTHER CONSERVANCY LANDS TO BE PRESERVED



ale

SURFACE WATER (2005)



FLOODPLAIN OVERLAY

Source: Town of Belgium, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

EXISTING LAND USES (2007)

NOTE:



INCLUDES URBAN- AND SUBURBAN-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH AVERAGE DENSITY EQUATING TO ONE DWELLING UNIT PER 4.9 OR LESS ACRES.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



.............

RAILROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY

STREET AND HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

2005 WISCONSIN WETLAND INVENTORY

VILLAGE BOUNDARY

PROJECT AREAS



U. S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES PROJECT AREA BOUNDARY N N 0 0.25 0.5 1 MILE



Source: Town of Fredonia, Ozaukee County, and SEWRPC.

174

Farmland Preservation Areas and Other Agricultural and Rural Lands

Farmland Preservation Areas

Farmland Preservation Areas (FPAs) are described in the preceding section. Map 31 shows primary and secondary environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other natural resources (wetlands, surface water, and floodplains) located on parcels included in the FPAs for informational purposes. County, local, and regional plans have long recognized the importance of identifying and preserving important natural resources, including those in agricultural areas.

Other Agricultural and Rural Lands

Other general agricultural and rural land uses occupy 29,517 acres, or about 20 percent of the County, on the farmland preservation plan map. The other agricultural and rural land use category would allow all agricultural uses, as well as rural residential development with an average density of one dwelling unit for each five to 34.9 acres of land. Rural land uses may also include open land consisting of pasturelands and fallow fields. The plan map encourages continuation of agricultural related activity in this area, including dairy farming, row crops, equestrian farms, agricultural related warehousing and food processing, and plant nurseries. Niche agricultural uses such as orchards, hobby farms, and organic farming farms are also encouraged. This category further allows for residential development at a density of at least 3.5 acres per dwelling unit within the Town of Port Washington which utilize conservation subdivision design to preserve high-quality agricultural, natural, and cultural resources as part of the open space area of such subdivisions.

The use of conservation subdivision design or lot-averaging techniques is encouraged to help preserve rural character in areas where rural-density residential development is allowed, provided minimum required lot size standards are met. Under conservation design, individual lot sizes may be reduced below those permitted by the basic zoning district for conventional development, provided the average density of the land division complies with zoning regulations. Land not included in individual lots is typically maintained in open space for agricultural, recreational, or resource protection purposes.

Urban Development

Existing and planned urban land uses would occupy 60,784 acres, or about 40 percent of the County by 2035, as shown on Map 31. Existing urban development occupied 36,645 acres, or about 24 percent of the County in 2007, as indicated on the plan map. Planned urban development areas occupy an additional 24,139 acres, or about 16 percent of the County. Urban development essentially consists of urban- and suburban-density residential uses (less than five acres per dwelling unit), general commercial, office/professional, industrial, governmental, institutional, recreational, transportation, communication, and utility land uses.

Environmentally Significant Areas

To effectively guide urban development and redevelopment in the County into a pattern that is efficient, stable, safe, healthful, and attractive, it is necessary to carefully consider the location of planned land uses in relation to natural resources. Locating new urban development outside of environmental corridors and other environmentally sensitive areas will serve to maintain a high level of environmental quality in the County, and will also avoid costly development problems such as flood damage, wet basements, failing pavements, and infiltration of clear water into sanitary sewerage systems. Properly relating new development outside urban areas to environmentally significant areas will help preserve the rural character and scenic beauty of the County. As shown on Map 31, many of these natural features exist on parcels in farmland preservation areas. Such natural features as wetlands and woodlands adjacent to or within cultivated areas are important to proper land management by acting as groundwater recharge and discharge areas or trapping sediments while slowing stormwater runoff from cultivated areas.

Primary Environmental Corridor

Environmental corridors, more fully described in Chapter II, are linear areas in the landscape that contain concentrations of high-value elements of the natural resource base. Primary environmental corridors contain almost all of the best remaining woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat areas, as well as floodplains and steeply sloped areas where intensive urban development would be ill-advised. Primary environmental corridors are at

least two miles in length, 400 acres in area, and 200 feet in width. The protection of primary environmental corridors from additional intrusion by urban development is one of the objectives of this plan. Primary environmental corridors occupy 18,311 acres, excluding associated surface water areas, or about 12 percent of the County.

Secondary Environmental Corridor

Secondary environmental corridors contain concentrations of high-value elements of the natural resource base, but are smaller in area than primary environmental corridors. Such corridors are at least one mile in length and 100 acres in area, except where secondary corridors connect to or serve to link primary environmental corridor segments. In such cases, no minimum area or length criteria apply. Secondary environmental corridors occupy 4,581 acres, excluding associated surface water areas, or about 3 percent of the County. Secondary corridors should be preserved where possible or carefully integrated into urban development with the goal of preserving corridor resources. Such areas may serve as corridors for the movement of wildlife and may also be appropriate for use as parks, drainageways, or stormwater detention or retention areas.

Isolated Natural Resource Areas

Isolated natural resource areas consist of areas with important natural resource values which are separated geographically from primary and secondary environmental corridors. Most of the isolated natural resource areas in the County are wetlands or tracts of woodlands that are at least 200 feet wide and five acres in area. Isolated natural resource areas occupy 3,329 acres, excluding associated surface water areas, or about 2 percent of the County. The plan recommends that these areas be preserved in essentially natural, open space uses whenever possible, since these areas sometimes serve as the only available wildlife habitat in an area and provide natural diversity to the landscape. Isolated natural resource areas may also be appropriate for use as parks, drainageways, or stormwater detention or retention areas.

Other Conservancy Lands to be Preserved

The plan recommends that 3,617 acres, or about 2 percent of the County, of other conservancy lands be preserved. This land use category includes woodlands, wetlands, natural areas, and critical species habitat sites located outside environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas; significant geological sites; and common open areas of residential developments, including conservation subdivisions. This category also includes portions of State-owned wildlife areas and certain nonfarmed wetlands that are outside environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. The preservation of these areas may provide the only available wildlife habitat in an area and lend unique character and natural diversity to the community in a manner similar to isolated natural resource areas. If natural vegetation develops on some of this open land, the re-vegetated areas may eventually be reclassified as an environmental corridor or isolated natural resource area.

Nonfarmed Wetlands

This category consists of primarily nonfarmed wetlands (wetlands with natural vegetation), typically less than five acres in size, that are located outside environmental corridors, isolated natural resource areas, and other conservancy lands to be preserved. These areas contain soils that are poorly drained and support wetland vegetation during years of normal or high precipitation or periods of normal or high water table. Nonfarmed wetlands five acres or larger are typically located within environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas. This land use category also includes certain existing farmed wetlands that are located within parcels of existing or planned urban development (ranging from rural residential uses to industrial uses), where farming activities may likely cease, and the wetland will revert to natural conditions. Wetlands are regulated under State and Federal laws and the County shoreland zoning ordinance. Development of wetlands, usually requiring them to be filled, is limited. Permits to allow development in wetlands generally require "mitigation," which requires new wetlands to be created or existing degraded wetlands to be restored. Mitigation may be required on the same development site or in a different location. Wetlands under this land use category encompass 2,368 acres, or about 2 percent of the County.

Farmed Wetland (Overlay)

This category consists of farmed wetlands located outside existing or planned urban development that contain soil conditions which can support wetland vegetation; however, wetland vegetation is absent due to cultivation, use as a pasture, or other agricultural activities. Farming may continue in accordance with County and local zoning ordinances and other applicable laws. If natural vegetation develops on some of these wetlands when farming ceases, the re-vegetated areas may eventually be reclassified as part of an environmental corridor or isolated natural resource area. Wetlands under this land use category encompass 196 acres, or less than 1 percent of the County.

Surface Water

The surface water land use category includes lakes, ponds, and major rivers, including those associated with environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. Surface waters encompass 2,704 acres, or about 2 percent of the County.

100-Year Floodplain (Overlay)

Floodplains are identified as an overlay on the farmland preservation plan map, and encompass 18,385 acres, or about 12 percent of the County. The floodplain overlay includes areas adjacent to rivers, streams, and lakes that are subject to inundation by the 100-year recurrence interval flood event. Floodplains shown on Map 31 are based on the FEMA Map Modernization program. Since floodplains are continuously refined and amended, local communities and/or the County should be consulted for the most current floodplain delineations.

Project Boundaries

Map 31 includes the project boundaries of conservation agencies or organizations where lands are targeted for preservation and/or recreational purposes. Project boundaries delineating potential acquisitions associated with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) sites in Ozaukee County are all located in the Town of Belgium. Lands within the project boundaries would be acquired primarily for preserving and improving breeding habitat for waterfowl in Wisconsin. Currently, the USFWS owns about 681 acres of planned primary or secondary environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas and other open space lands. An additional 1,423 acres of such areas are proposed to be acquired within the identified project boundaries as recommended in the adopted County park and open space plan.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) project boundaries delineate potential additions to adjacent State parks, wildlife areas, or heritage area for natural resource and limited recreational purposes. The WDNR project boundaries include the Harrington Beach State Park Project and Cedarburg Bog State Natural Area Project. These areas have been approved by the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board for acquisition by the WDNR on a "willing seller-willing buyer" basis. Currently, the State owns about 2,319 acres of planned primary or secondary environmental corridors or isolated natural resource areas and other open space lands within those project areas. An additional 991 acres of such areas are proposed to be acquired within the identified project boundaries according to the adopted County park and open space plan.

The WDNR project boundaries also include the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area in which the WDNR does not intend to rely as heavily on fee simple acquisition as it does in other project areas in the County. Rather, the WDNR anticipates implementing the long term plan of preserving both natural resource and agricultural land within the project area through a combination of public ownership, conservation easements, and agricultural conservation easements. Consequently, State acquisition of lands within the project area shown on Map 31 is limited to the acquisition of identified natural areas.

Map 31 also shows Ozaukee County project boundaries which indicate areas that are recommended to be acquired by Ozaukee County to both preserve natural areas and critical species habitat sites, and to provide valuable buffer areas adjacent to such natural areas and habitat sites. About 1,894 acres are recommended by the County park and open space plan for acquisition by the County within the identified project areas.

In addition to the project areas established by public agencies, the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT) has identified several project areas in Ozaukee and Washington Counties in their ongoing efforts to protect and preserve important natural resource areas. OWLT project areas that are located at least partially in Ozaukee County are shown on Map 31 and include the Cedar Sauk Area located partially in the Towns of Cedarburg and Saukville, the Huiras Lake Area located in the Town of Fredonia, and the Shady Lane Woods Area located partially in the Town of Saukville and partially in the Town of Trenton in Washington County. The purpose of the project areas is to identify areas where the OWLT would focus their conservation efforts. The Land Trust is expected to acquire additional yet-to-be-determined open space within those project areas. For purposes of the County park and open space plan, the Land Trust acquisition of lands in the project areas is limited to the acquisition of identified natural areas.

The Land Trust has also identified broader areas of focus that include the Milwaukee River and Lake Michigan watershed areas. The goal of the Land Trust in these areas is to preserve and protect habitat and for water quality protection.

SUMMARY

This Chapter includes maps of planned farmland preservation areas (FPAs) in the County and participating local governments, as well as the farmland preservation plan map. The maps, and this plan, are intended to serve as a guide to preserve productive agricultural land in Ozaukee County. This Chapter also includes recommendations for protecting environmentally significant resources and recommendations regarding the location of urban development within the County through the year 2035. The farmland preservation plan map is designed to help achieve the objectives identified in the next chapter based, in part, on public input and adopted local comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances and maps.

The principal function of the FPA and farmland preservation plan maps are to provide information that County and local officials can use over time when making decisions about growth and land preservation in Ozaukee County. The farmland preservation areas, along with the conservation of other environmentally significant areas and the supporting implementation measures discussed in Chapter VII, provide an important means for promoting the orderly development of the County while protecting important agricultural and natural resources. Consistent application of the plan map will help assure protection of the County's precious resources, while meeting the needs of future residents and businesses in Ozaukee County.

Chapter VI

VISION, ISSUES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Planning is a rational process for formulating and meeting goals and objectives. As part of the farmland preservation planning process, a set of planning goals and objectives, along with supporting policies and programs, were formulated and are presented in this Chapter. A "vision" statement was also developed by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Board, and Comprehensive Planning Board to help provide an overall framework for the preparation of the County farmland preservation plan. Key land use issues related to preserving farmland are also identified.

VISION STATEMENT

"To preserve its economically viable agriculture and rural character, Ozaukee County will create a plan to support and implement policies and programs that balance sustainable rural land uses with urban land uses by preserving productive farmland and ensuring orderly development."

The Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC) was responsible for developing the County's vision statement, which was reviewed and refined by the Land Preservation Board and Comprehensive Planning Board. The vision expresses the preferred future and key expectations for future agricultural and other land uses in the County and participating communities. The development of the vision statement was based on inventory data presented earlier, results of public input, and current and past planning efforts, including adopted County and local comprehensive plans. Vision statements from existing Ozaukee County and local government comprehensive plans were also taken into consideration while developing the vision.

BASIC CONCEPT AND DEFINITIONS

This Chapter sets forth goals, objectives, policies, and programs intended to promote the conservation and effective management of agricultural resources, including productive farmland, and to promote the economic viability of working farms in Ozaukee County. The goals, objectives, policies, and programs for the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County are based largely on those prepared and developed under the agricultural, natural, and cultural resources element and certain other plan elements that affect farmland preservation from the adopted Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County. The FPPCAC refined comprehensive plan recommendations as necessary based on the information and survey results presented in this document. Section 91.10(2) of the *Wisconsin Statutes* requires county farmland preservation plans and county comprehensive plans to be consistent with each other.

The agricultural, natural, and cultural resources element is one of the nine elements of a comprehensive plan required by Section 66.1001 of the *Statutes*. The County comprehensive plan includes such a plan element. Section 66.1001(2)(e) of the *Statutes* requires this element to compile goals, objectives, policies, and programs for the conservation and effective management of various natural resources, including productive agricultural areas. Of the 14 State comprehensive planning goals set forth in Section 16.965 of the *Statutes* that must be addressed as part of comprehensive planning if receiving Wisconsin Smart Growth grant funding, the following relate to farmland preservation and other related natural resources:

- Protection of natural areas, including wetlands, wildlife habitats, lakes, woodlands, open spaces, and groundwater resources.
- Protection of economically productive areas, including farmland and forests.
- Preservation of cultural, historic, and archaeological sites.
- Promoting the expansion or stabilization of the current economic base and the creation of a range of employment opportunities at the state, regional, and local level.
- Planning and development of land uses that create or preserve varied and unique urban and rural communities.

Section 66.1001(2)(a) of the *Statutes* requires that plan elements of a comprehensive plan include a "statement of the overall objectives, policies, goals, and programs of the governmental unit to guide the future development and redevelopment of the governmental unit (including preservation of agricultural and natural resources) over the planning period." The County farmland preservation plan follows a similar format as the County comprehensive plan document. Although not defined in the *Statutes*, the Wisconsin Department of Administration has provided the following definitions of these terms:

Goals: Broad and general expressions of a community's aspirations, towards which the planning effort is directed. Goals tend to be the ends rather than the means.

Objectives: More specific targets, derived from goals and necessary to achieve those goals. While still general in nature, objectives are more precise, concrete, and measurable than goals.

Policies: Rules or courses of action necessary to achieve the goals and objectives from which they are derived. They are precise and measurable.

Programs: A system of projects or services necessary to achieve plan goals, objectives, and policies.

Section 91.10 of the *Statutes* (the Farmland Preservation Statute) requires County farmland preservation plans to identify goals for agricultural development in the county; actions the county will take to preserve farmland and promote agricultural development; policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions to increase housing density in areas outside designated farmland preservation areas; and key land use issues related to preserving farmland. Although these terms are not defined in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*, "strategies" are considered to be the same as "objectives" and "actions" are considered to be the same as "programs" in this report.

KEY LAND USE ISSUES RELATED TO PRESERVING FARMLAND

Chapter 91, "Farmland Preservation," of the *Statutes* requires the County farmland preservation plan to identify key land use issues related to preserving farmland and to promoting agricultural development and plans for addressing those issues. Sources of public input, including but not limited to, the results of a public opinion survey, SWOT analyses, and focus group sessions, and existing inventory and plans such as the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2011–2015*, were reviewed to identify the agricultural issues to be addressed by the plan and attendant goals, objectives, policies, and programs presented in the next section.

Chapter IV describes the results of public participation opportunities pertaining to the preparation of this plan. Overall, Ozaukee County residents placed a high priority on farmland preservation, environmental conservation, and the preservation of the County's rural and small town character.

Land Use and Urban Development

Agriculture and urban land use data collected in Chapter II indicate there are significant areas of the County with soils that are suitable for agricultural production. The inventory data further indicate that there is a high level of agricultural activity in the County and that agriculture and agricultural related businesses are an important segment of the County economy. In addition, many parcels in the County have been identified as suitable for long-term agricultural use through a LESA analysis, the results of which are shown on Map 6. The data, however, indicate development pressure, as shown through the LESA analysis and Map 18 (Historical Urban Growth in Ozaukee County: 1850–2000) in Chapter II, has converted agricultural lands to urban uses over the years. The conversion of agricultural land to urban development is one of the key issues affecting farmland preservation in Ozaukee County.

Public Opinion Survey

The following are key issues identified from the Countywide public opinion survey conducted during the farmland preservation planning process:

- Preserving farmland for food production;
- Establishing an Agricultural Enterprise Area to allow farmers to claim the maximum state farmland preservation tax credits to help preserve farmland in the County;
- Maintaining open space, protecting important environmental/natural resources, and preserving wildlife habitat;
- Concentrating urban development in existing cities and villages;
- There is enough farmland in the County to support the long-term economic viability of agriculture, but the cost of farmland is making agriculture less sustainable;
- Preserving historic structures and archaeological sites;
- Funding park, open space, and farmland preservation projects without raising property or sales taxes;
- Preferring residential cluster design (conservation subdivisions) with smaller lots and shared open space compared to traditional design with large lots and no shared open space; and
- Preserving rural and small town character.

SWOT Analyses

The following are key issues or threats and weaknesses identified from the SWOT analyses conducted as part of this planning process. The strengths and opportunities results from this analysis are presented in Chapter IV:

- Urban development/sprawl
- Lack of coordination between towns/cities/villages/zoning issues
- Population moving into agricultural areas
- Land values too high for use in production agriculture
- Rising cost of farmland
- Complaints by urban development on regular farm practices
- Not enough locally grown food

- Push for growth to increase tax base may cause conversion of farmland/urbanization/urban sprawl
- High cost of living and high tax rate may cause sales of land
- Lack of understanding subsidization of agricultural and "Cheap Food Act"
- Division and destruction of farms for less productive purposes
- Misperception of why and where the size of farms is going and difficulty of expansion
- Zoning restrictions inhibit smaller farms because of regulations and allows disruption of farmland
- Perspective of agricultural land as not developed land, but land that is to be developed
- Economics of current farming/increasing costs
- Expanding need for population density without higher housing density
- Limited knowledge/concern for agriculture/food
- Mega developers

Focus Group Workshops

Two public focus group sessions were held to obtain input from farmers and residents working in the agricultural industry. Some common issues identified in these workshops are as follows:

- Input costs very high
- Lack of government support
- Farms getting bigger/need more land
- Keep the northern part of the County in agriculture
- More specialty farms/niche farms
- Increasingly difficult to find younger generation to farm
- Development (urban) needs control
- Accommodate growth, but on non-farmable land
- Create incentives to rent farmland out to farmers rather than selling the land
- Mixture between niche and extremely large (farms)

AGRICULTURAL-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

This section sets forth agricultural resource goals, objectives, policies, and programs through the plan design year of 2035. Recommendations were developed using the agricultural resource data inventoried in Chapter II, the LESA analysis, the planning issue statements and goals and objectives related to agricultural resources identified in the comprehensive plan, and the key issues identified in the preceding section. This section also includes agricultural resource recommendations for local government consideration. Local recommendations were prepared because local governments will have additional influence over agricultural resources in the County, especially with regard to providing protection for agricultural lands through local zoning and land division ordinances. Each participating community should refine the local recommendations through the development of goals, objectives, policies, and programs in the agricultural, natural, and cultural resources element of their local comprehensive plan to meet specific community needs. Local governments may also choose not to include local recommendations that are not relevant to their community's needs.

Recommendations related to natural resources and land uses other than agriculture are set forth in the following section of this Chapter. Planned farmland preservation areas are identified in Chapter V.

Overall Agricultural Resources Goals and Objectives

Goal:

• Preserve and enhance Ozaukee County's natural resources, including Lake Michigan, open space, and agricultural land.

Objectives:

- o Develop methods to protect and preserve agricultural areas.
- Develop methods to retain and encourage agriculture as a viable part of the economy.
- o Encourage safe agricultural practices to minimize impact on the natural resources base.
- o Discourage development that is incompatible with agricultural uses.

Goal:

• Preserve and enhance the rural and small town character of Ozaukee County.

Objectives:

- Encourage preservation of agricultural activities outside urban (sewer) service areas.
- Develop methods to preserve rural (agrarian) character and vistas outside planned urban (sewer) service areas.

Soil Suitability for Agricultural Production Recommendations

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has classified the agricultural capability of soils based on their general suitability for most kinds of farming. The classifications are based on the limitations of the soils, the risk of damage to soils when used, and the way in which the soils respond to treatment. Using this methodology, Class I and II soils are considered "National Prime Farmlands" and Class III soils are considered "Farmlands of Statewide Significance." The location and amount of Class I, II, and III soils were critical in identifying farmland preservation areas in the initial Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County prepared in 1983. The NRCS developed the LESA method described in Chapter II for identifying farmland appropriate for protection following the preparation of the initial farmland preservation plan. The land evaluation (LE) portion of the LESA analysis identifies soil quality. A large portion of Ozaukee County has high quality soils based on the LE scores assigned as part of the LESA analysis, which were based on soil ratings developed by the NRCS. Over 50 percent of the soils in the County received an LE of 90 points or higher on a scale of 0 to 100, as shown on Table 3 and Map 4 in Chapter II. Proper land management practices can help retain the amount of high quality soils in the County through the plan design year of 2035, which will be a key to sustaining agriculture in the County.

Goal:

• Preserve soils suitable for agricultural production in Ozaukee County.

Objective:

• Encourage soil conservation practices to reduce farmland erosion and sustain and increase farmland productivity in the County.

Policy:

• Encourage the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) by farmers.

Programs:

- Develop an educational program and distribute educational materials regarding farming techniques that promote soil conservation such as conservation tillage (where crops are grown with minimal or reduced cultivation of the soil), no till and zone tilling farming, contour stripping, grass waterways, terracing, crop rotation, and nutrient management through soil sampling. The educational program focus should include local governments and individual farmers. Information and application assistance for Federal and State programs to implement farming practices that promote soil conservation should be provided to farmers through the County educational program.
- Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and BMP resources and grants available through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other Federal agencies. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal agency assistance and Federal agencies as part of program implementation.
- Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and BMP resources and grants available through State agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in State agency assistance and State agencies as part of program implementation.
- Work with the UW-Discovery Farms and Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship Initiative programs to promote an increased understanding of agricultural impacts on soil quality and how to implement BMPs among farmers and government officials in Ozaukee County.
- Continue to pursue Federal and State soil resource conservation grant funds available to County governments.
- Develop methods to ensure nutrient management plans required by Section NR 151.07 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* are implemented in the County.

Policy:

• Implement strategies regarding the reduction of cropland erosion as recommended in the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2011–2015*, and any subsequent updates.

Programs:

- Update the land and water resource management plan every five years.
- Continue to promote the use of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) in Ozaukee County.
- Enforce the land and water management standards required of participants in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program (FPP).
- Promote the removal of highly erodible land from agricultural use through implementing the County Soil and Water Resource Management Program.
- Continue to support and implement recommendations in the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan to protect land and water resources, including farmland.
- Continue to identify croplands that do not have a conservation plan and help develop these plans. Also, continue to assist in updating existing conservation plans.

Local Recommendations

Local governments should support and/or adopt programs similar to those of the County. The local government should serve as a liaison between farmers and County, State, and Federal governments to disseminate information and assistance with government soil conservation programs and Best Management Practices.

Farmland Protection and LESA Analysis Recommendations

As stated earlier, Ozaukee County residents have placed a high priority on ensuring that farming in the County remains viable in the future for economic, cultural, and aesthetic purposes. A sufficient amount of land must remain in agricultural use to ensure that farming remains viable in the County. There are many programs and techniques for protecting farmland and associated rural lands available to the County and local governments and individual farm operators and owners. Several of these programs are outlined in Chapter VII and Appendix E, and include the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program (FPP), Soil and Water Resource Management Program (SWRM), Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), and Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP).

Although there are many government programs available to promote farmland protection, resources are often limited. A LESA analysis was conducted as part of the County comprehensive planning process to help identify areas of the County that are most suitable for long-term agricultural use. The results of the analysis, as shown in Map 6 in Chapter II, are intended to be used by the County and local governments to help identify areas that should be designated for farmland protection in the County and local government comprehensive plans as well as in the County farmland preservation plan. The analysis results have been provided to communities within Ozaukee County for their consideration in local planning processes. The designation of high priority farmland protection areas will help to ensure that farms most in need and deserving of limited government resources receive them.

Goal:

• Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remains viable in Ozaukee County.

Objectives:

- Protect farmland outside urban (sewer) service areas for long-term agricultural use, with priority given to parcels with a LESA score of 6.4 or higher.
- Protect the most productive agricultural lands in the County for long-term agricultural use.
- Protect parcels that were determined to be most suitable for long-term agricultural use through the LESA analysis from non-farm development.

Policies:

- Protect high priority farmland protection parcels identified on Map 6 in Chapter II. Parcels with LESA scores of 8.0 and higher should be given the highest priority for allocation of farmland protection resources. Parcels with scores of 7.0 to 7.9 should be given the next highest priority for allocation of farmland protection resources.
- Promote agricultural use on parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or greater and located outside of urban service (sewer) areas.
- Discourage land divisions on high priority farmland protection parcels and in large contiguous areas of agricultural use located outside of urban (sewer) service areas.
- Discourage incompatible uses near farms and large contiguous areas of agricultural use.
- Support implementation of the Working Lands Initiative recommendation to establish farmland
 preservation areas and agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs) outside planned urban (sewer) service
 areas. AEAs would cluster active farms and slow farmland conversion by targeting funding and other
 resources, such as the State Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program, to
 farmlands within enterprise areas.
- Encourage and assist, where requested, in developing boundary agreements between towns and adjacent cities and villages to limit conversion of farmland to urban uses.

- Encourage denser, more compact development within urban (sewer) service areas to minimize the development of farmland or urban uses.
- Encourage the use of development transitions between urban development (served with sanitary sewer) and agricultural development using, where practicable, open space development concepts such as rural cluster (sometimes called conservation subdivisions) and other cluster development as the transitional development type.
- Encourage development of highways, streets, and utilities in a manner that minimizes disruption of productive farmlands.

Programs:

- Assign agricultural use to parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or higher on the Ozaukee County Planned Land Use Map: 2035 (Map 24 in Chapter II), if also designated for agricultural use on the applicable local government adopted planned land use map.
- Study and develop a County land division ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect agricultural resource areas identified on Map 6 in Chapter II.
- Develop a County agricultural conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program or a County agricultural conservation easement program to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis.
- Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural areas.
- Work with the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT), the Land Conservation Partnership of Ozaukee County, and other land trusts to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis through agricultural conservation easements and/or land purchases.
- Develop and adopt a County right-to-farm ordinance that defines agricultural operations, normal agricultural practices, and the specific farmland that is affected by the ordinance; a reference to the State Statute¹ that protects farmers from nuisance law suits; and a grievance procedure that outlines how complaints against agricultural operations will be resolved.
- Support Wisconsin's Working Lands Initiative recommendations.
- Study the feasibility of providing a tax break or incentive on the County portion of the property tax for agricultural parcels, including those donating conservation easements.
- Develop a cost/revenue model comparing the cost of County and local government services to various types of land use compared to agricultural land uses.
- Develop a fact sheet outlining the impact of agricultural land conversion in Ozaukee County.
- Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of farming, including economic impacts, and the need to protect enough farmland in Ozaukee County for farming to remain viable in the future.
- Continue to pursue Federal and State farmland protection grant funds available to County governments, and use the LESA analysis to prioritize areas.
- Continue to update as needed the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County based on the LESA analysis and any revisions made to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program (FPP).

¹A "right-to-farm" ordinance is intended to provide protection to farmers from nuisance claims due to noise, dust, odors, and other effects of farm operations. Wisconsin's right-to-farm law is set forth in Section 823.08 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

- Continue to encourage local governments to participate in future updates to the County Farmland Preservation Plan.
- Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation to protect farmland, including the use of boundary agreements.

Policy:

• Implement strategies regarding the preservation and protection of farmland and other working lands recommended in the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2011–2015* and *Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan: 2035* and any subsequent updates.

Programs:

- Implement the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) and ensure compliance of farms with FPP rules.
- Encourage the use of the WDNR Managed Forest Law/Land program in the County and update the geographic information system (GIS) database.
- Promote the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) and assist communities, nongovernment organizations, and the WDNR in identifying appropriate areas to apply for FRPP grants.
- Encourage County and local programs to protect farmland through education and the development of programs to support farmland protection. The County should also provide technical assistance to towns for town farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural (or farmland preservation) zoning.
- Provide technical assistance to the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area including maps, title locations, soils information, and conservation plans to the WDNR and OWLT on parcels of interest. County representatives should also continue to participate on the Heritage Area technical and advisory committees.
- Establish an Agricultural Enterprise Area(s) containing contiguous lands devoted primarily to agricultural use. An AEA would be part of a broader strategy to protect farmland and promote agriculture and agriculturally-related development.
- Continue to publicize and furnish information on sustainable and alternative agricultural practices.
- Assist, where requested, local governments in preparing a Livestock Facility Siting Ordinance under Section 93.90 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*.

Local Recommendations

Communities should use the land use plan map in their local adopted or amended comprehensive plan and the County LESA analysis (Map 6 in Chapter II) to identify areas most suitable for long term agricultural use and to direct future growth away from productive farmlands as well as environmentally sensitive areas where possible. Zoning ordinances in the Towns and the City of Mequon should be reviewed and revised if necessary to be consistent with the local planned land use map. An exclusive agricultural or farmland preservation zoning district should be considered as part of the local zoning ordinance revisions in order to protect designated farmland protection areas. Towns and the City of Mequon should use additional land use control ordinances such as land division ordinances to protect agricultural land in areas identified for agricultural land use on the local land use plan map.

Cities and villages should promote the protection of agricultural lands in the County by accommodating residential development at medium or higher densities within their sewer service areas, therefore alleviating the need for additional sub-urban and rural density housing within the areas identified for future agricultural use in

the Towns and City of Mequon. Cities and villages should also consider limiting the use of TIF districts to redevelopment and infill areas, rather than using TIFs as a means to develop "greenfield" sites.

The Towns and the City of Mequon should also work with the County to develop programming to protect farmland through education and potential funding programs. Part of the education component should assist local farmers in obtaining grants from Federal and State agencies as outlined in the County programs listed in this section and in Appendix E. Another component may include educating the public about the benefits of farmland and farming. In addition, communities should work with Ozaukee County to study the development of countywide and/or local purchase of development rights (PDR) and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs, and work with the County to help implement such programs if they are consistent with local goals and objectives.

Protection of Farms and Farming Recommendations

Preserving soil quality and open farmland are not the only agricultural issues in Ozaukee County. Agriculture cannot remain in the County if farming is not economically viable. The agricultural activity statistics inventoried in Chapter II show that agriculture is still economically viable in Ozaukee County. County farms combined to sell about \$59 million worth of agricultural products in 2007, although several indicators of agricultural activity have been declining in recent years, as indicated in Table 12 in Chapter II. The total number of farms decreased from 620 in 1976 to 513 in 2007, and the amount of land in farms decreased from 105,000 to about 70,000 acres, or by 33 percent, during that period. During that same time period the number of dairy farms in the County has decreased from 255 to 69; however, the number of dairy cows in the County decreased much less dramatically, from about 9,800 to 8,253.

While the number of farms and dairy farms has decreased in the County over the last three decades, there were 54 farms growing vegetables for sale and 18 farms with orchards located in the County in 2007. Some of these farms may fit into the category of "small scale farming" and "niche agriculture," which has been identified in public input processes as both desirable businesses to retain and attract to the County and as a strategy to preserve agriculture in the County. These types of operations may also be sustainable and desirable near the County's urban areas where parcels are generally smaller than in the County's historically rural areas, and a market for fresh, locally grown agricultural products is located nearby.

Development pressure in Ozaukee County creates additional challenges for the agricultural industry. Nearby incompatible uses, including urban-density residential development in rural areas, pose a threat to long term agricultural use for some areas of the County. Programs enacted as part of the Working Lands Initiative may help to promote the long term viability of agriculture in the County.

Goal:

• Protect farms and farming in Ozaukee County.

Objectives:

- Preserve the economic viability of agricultural activities in Ozaukee County.
- Retain existing farm operations outside planned urban (sewer) service areas in Ozaukee County to the extent possible.
- o Retain existing agri-business in Ozaukee County to the extent possible.
- Encourage agricultural activity on lands identified for agricultural use on the County Planned Land Use Map for 2035.

Policies

• Support economic initiatives to ensure farming remains viable in Ozaukee County, including funding programs, agri-tourism, and direct marketing of farm products.

- Existing farmlands in planned urban (sewer) service areas should be encouraged to remain in agricultural use until public sewer and water services are extended to the parcel.
- Protect agricultural infrastructure in Ozaukee County to support farm operations.
- Encourage niche farming operations in Ozaukee County, such as organic farms, orchards, and landscape nurseries.
- Encourage farming by younger age groups in Ozaukee County.
- Encourage retiring farmers to pass farms on to heirs or to sell farms to other farmers.
- Support establishment by the State of a beginning farmer program to recruit and train the next generation of farmers.
- Consider the use and development of biofuels as an alternative energy source as well as other energy sources such as wind, solar, and geothermal.
- Encourage and support urban and peri-urban (perimeter of urban center) agriculture.

Programs:

- Implement programs recommended under the Farmland Protection Recommendations to preserve agricultural activity in Ozaukee County, including those in the Wisconsin Working Lands law (Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*) and study a County property tax deduction on agricultural uses.
- Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for beginning farmers. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies a part of program implementation.
- Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for youth programs, including 4-H Clubs and Future Farmers of America (FFA). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies a part of program implementation.
- Study the potential development of health care purchasing programs for farmers in Ozaukee County, similar to the program being developed by the Wisconsin Health Care Cooperative established under Section 185.99 of the *Statutes*, to allow self-employed farmers or small businesses to purchase affordable health insurance.
- Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.
- Identify and consider establishing AEAs to include areas with an agricultural economic cluster of farming operations and appropriate agri-businesses on lands designated for agricultural use on the County Planned Land Use Map for 2035.
- Develop a program to market and link Ozaukee County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants, stores, schools, hospitals, and group residential facilities (nursing homes, for example) in Ozaukee County and surrounding areas.
- Establish a program to promote agri-tourism in Ozaukee County through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms. The program could include an educational component for farmers regarding possible agri-tourism enterprises.
- Work with UW-Extension and local high schools and colleges to promote agribusiness education programs.

- Work with UW-Extension to provide information to farmers on succession planning to help ensure farming activity continues into the future.
- Continue to promote allowing produce stands, bed-and-breakfast establishments, "commercial kitchens,"² and other types of home occupations or "home-based" businesses on farms to help supplement farming incomes.
- Publicize and furnish information on alternative specialized or niche farming operations, including "urban," "aquaponics," "hydroponics," aquaculture, organic, herb (including herbology, use of herbs as natural remedies), apiculture (beekeeping), equestrian, and "bioenergy" (sustainable biomass and biofuel³ production) farming.
- Continue to support farmland preservation educational efforts by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, and UW-Extension to assist landowners and the public, including distribution of WDNR and DATCP educational materials to local landowners on farmland preservation, through the County newsletter and website, public informational meetings, and individual contacts with landowners.

Local Recommendations

Local governments should include programs in their comprehensive plan, where desired, to help implement the County farmland preservation plan. The local government should serve as a liaison between farmers and County, State, and Federal governments to disseminate information and assistance with government grants and funding targeted for farm start-up costs, farm operation costs (including farmland and equipment acquisition), and youth farming programs.

Local governments should also support County programs that promote local agricultural products to restaurants and stores within the community. Local governments should review and, if necessary, revise the local zoning ordinance to allow for certain home occupations or home-based businesses on farms, including produce stands and bed-and-breakfast establishments. Local governments may also provide incentives for activities such as produce stands and farmers markets through an expedited permitting process and reduced permitting fees.

OTHER RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS

Although there are many goals, objectives, policies, and/or programs for various plan elements in the County comprehensive plan that are related to agricultural uses, this section identifies key ones that may directly affect farmland preservation in some manner. For example, concentrating urban development in compact urban centers or urban service areas (sanitary sewer service areas of usually cities and villages) will help preserve farmlands surrounding the perimeter of such centers. Another example is the preservation of historic farmsteads including barns, silos, hedgerows, and stone fencerows contributing to the rural character of an area by reflecting the agrarian heritage. The preservation of pockets of natural vegetation that often exist on agricultural sites also contributes to the natural rural character of an area and helps improve water quality on the site (wetlands on the

 $^{^{2}}A$ commercial kitchen is used for preparing food for sale to the public or membership in an organization that uses the kitchen. Such kitchens usually require an inspection by the local health department before use for commercial purposes. A private kitchen does not require an inspection unless a person using it plans to sell to the public.

³Biofuels may also include cellulosic biofuels produced as "biogasoline" or "drop-in fuel" (replace or blend with gasoline) from waste products such as, for example, corn stover (corn cobs, stalks, and leaves) left on farms after the corn harvest or tree branches, needles/leaves, and stumps left on forest floors after timber harvest on managed forest lands. Such biofuels are important since they do not compete with food sources, and are projected to generate significantly fewer emissions than traditional gasoline and certain other biofuels.

site capture sedimentation and may serve as groundwater recharge areas). Other policies that may affect farmland preservation include providing a range of affordable housing choices for all income levels and age groups, including persons who work in the farming industry; improving transportation infrastructure, including railway and trucking infrastructures to help transport farm produce; maintaining and enhancing the existing level of public services, including those for the farming community such as health, education, and fire protection services; and supporting and encouraging sustainable energy options in public and private development, including biofuels.

In addition to supporting farmland preservation, survey and other public input results indicate that County residents place a high priority on protecting existing woodlands, wetlands, and river corridors which often exist on farm properties, and applying stricter regulations for water quality. The public opinion survey further revealed that residents support conservation subdivisions and the creation of dedicated funds by the County to preserve natural resource areas.

Protection of Natural Resources

Goal:

• Ensure the protection, wise use, and enhancement of the natural resource base in Ozaukee County.

Objectives:

- Preserve rural natural character and vistas outside planned urban (sewer) service areas.
- Encourage the preservation of open spaces including, for example, natural and agricultural areas in conservation subdivisions as part of future development proposals in the County.
- Guide urban land uses to land that can sustain urban development.

Policies:

- Discourage urban land uses⁴ in areas identified as environmentally sensitive on Map 16 in Chapter II.
- Discourage urban land uses in areas identified as lands with natural limitations for building site development on Map 17 in Chapter II.
- Discourage incompatible uses in environmental corridors, natural areas, and critical species habitat and aquatic sites in Ozaukee County.

Programs:

- Develop an education program and distribute educational materials regarding techniques that promote land use patterns that are sensitive to natural resource conservation such as overlay zoning, incentive zoning, planned unit development (PUD), conservation subdivisions, and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs. The educational program focus should include local governments and developers.
- Further develop the County conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program to protect natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17.
- Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of natural resource areas.
- Develop a model zoning ordinance for local government use that provides for protection of natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17.

⁴*Urban land uses include residential, at densities greater than one home per five areas; commercial; industrial; transportation, communication, and utility; governmental and institutional; and intensive recreational land uses.*

- Encourage the adoption of lowland conservancy and upland conservancy zoning districts that are based on Table 96, *Guidelines for Development Considered Compatible with Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas*, in Chapter VII of the County comprehensive plan for use in local government zoning ordinances.⁵
- Protect environmental corridors through the County plat review process.
- Protect natural areas and critical species habitat and aquatic sites identified in the Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan.
- Develop a County Land Division Ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect identified natural resource areas.
- Promote model conservation subdivision ordinances, such as the *Rural Cluster Development Guide*,⁶ to local governments. Assist local governments in interpreting and implementing conservation subdivision ordinances, including requiring stewardship plans to ensure proper management of common open space which may also contain farmstead features.

Invasive Species

Goal:

• Protect Ozaukee County's naturally occurring bio-diversity.

Objective:

• Control and reduce the spread of invasive species in Ozaukee County, including both land and aquatic species.

Policies:

- Develop programs to control and reduce the spread of invasive species in Ozaukee County.
- Implement strategies regarding the management of invasive plant species recommended in the *Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan: 2035* and the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2011-2015*, and subsequent updates.

Programs:

- Develop a model landscaping ordinance for local government use that restricts landscaping with invasive plant species.
- Develop a public educational program to discourage the use of invasive plant species in landscaping.
- Work with nongovernmental organizations to support implementation of methods to control invasive species, with a focus along major transportation routes and corridors through the County such as IH 43 and the Milwaukee River.

⁵*Examples of ordinances to protect conservancy areas are available from SEWRPC on request.*

⁶See SEWRPC Planning Guide No. 7, Rural Cluster Development Guide, December 1996, or <u>http://www.sewrpc.org/SEWRPCFiles/Publications/pg/pg-07_rural_cluster_development.pdf</u>? for more information.

- Continue to support the Southeastern Wisconsin Invasive Species Consortium (SEWISC), Inc., which functions as the Southeastern Wisconsin Cooperative Weed Management Area,⁷ covering the Milwaukee River watershed and surrounding counties, along with other government agencies and nonprofit organizations.
- Develop model public/private landscaping construction and facilities maintenance guidelines to ensure transported soil, fill, and rock do not contain invasive plants or seeds, and use the guidelines for County projects.
- Study and incorporate invasive plant species control and management requirements into the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance.
- Implement noxious weed ordinances in County parks and local parks by working cooperatively with local governments.
- Provide for an invasive plant education and outreach program in Ozaukee County through a partnership with the Invasive Plant Association of Wisconsin, SEWISC, and other partners.
- Require vegetation management plans for land divisions in the County through a revision to the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance.
- Follow the provisions of Chapter NR 40, *Invasive Species Identification, Classification and Control,* of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*.

Water Quality

Goals:

- Encourage integrated water resource management of surface water, groundwater, and water dependent natural resources.
- Protect and enhance surface and groundwater quality and quantity, floodplains, wetlands, and Lake Michigan shorelines and bluffs.

Objectives:

- Reduce sedimentation, pollution, and eutrophication⁸ of lakes, rivers, and streams in Ozaukee County.
- Reduce reliance on groundwater resources for water supply in Ozaukee County.

Policies:

• Support the development of land use patterns and water quality control facilities, programs, and operational improvements, including nonpoint pollution controls and sewage and stormwater management systems, to effectively meet the wastewater disposal and stormwater runoff control needs of the County.

⁷A Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA) is typically formed to integrate invasive plant and animal management resources across jurisdictional boundaries to benefit an entire region. The SEWISC was established as a consortium that promotes efficient and effective management of invasive species throughout an eight-county region or essentially a CWMA consisting of Sheboygan, Ozaukee, Washington, Waukesha, Milwaukee, Walworth, Racine, and Kenosha Counties.

⁸Eutrophication is caused by the increase of chemical nutrients, typically compounds containing nitrogen or phosphorus, in an ecosystem. Eutrophication typically occurs when nutrient pollution is released into water bodies and results in enhanced growth of phytoplankton (an algal bloom), which disrupts normal functioning of the ecosystem.

- Support the development of land use patterns, water supply infrastructure, including operational improvements, and water consumption methods to effectively meet the water supply needs of the County.
- Implement strategies regarding pollution reduction and control and watershed basin planning recommended in the *Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan 2011–2015*, and any subsequent updates.

Programs:

- Support and, where applicable, implement sanitary sewer, water supply, and stormwater management standards recommended in the regional water supply plan and regional water quality management plan (RWQMP) update.
- Continue to administer and enforce the Ozaukee County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance in accordance with State and Federal requirements.
- Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding non-point and point source pollution.
- Develop public educational programs and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of natural resources and the need to protect them from degradation; floodplain and wetlands including statutory requirements and authorities related to these features; limitations of saturated soils for development; projects homeowners can implement to reduce non-point source pollution, such as rain gardens, replacing lawn areas with native landscaping, and reducing impervious surfaces; well water safety information and well monitoring; and importance of bluff setback requirements and the bluff erosion process. The education programs focus should include local governments, developers, and the public.
- Work to install buffers along all watercourses in Ozaukee County.
- Enforce farm compliance with Chapter 12, *Animal Waste Storage*, of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances.
- Enforce the recommendations for management of animal waste storage facilities and utilization of waste set forth in Standard 590 of the USDA-NRCS Technical Guide and conduct yearly follow-up inspections.
- Develop methods to reduce the amount of winter spread manure on 50 percent of the critical areas in 303(d) list waters⁹ and waters within the Great Lakes Watershed.
- Develop methods to collaborate with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the WDNR to remove PCB's in 303(d) listed waters. This effort should include a public education component.
- Develop and adopt a countywide Stormwater and Construction Site Erosion Control Ordinance that includes an illicit discharge detection, elimination, and enforcement component.
- Ensure compliance with Chapter NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* through plat and shoreland zoning reviews, including construction site pollutant control (including plan review and compliance inspections) and post-construction stormwater management (including plan review and compliance inspections).
- Assist other government agencies with implementation of the RWQMP.

⁹Section 303(d) of the Federal Clean Water Act requires the State to develop a list of impaired waters, commonly referred to as the "303(d) list." A documented methodology is used by the WDNR to list waters in Wisconsin.

- Work collaboratively with MMSD and SEWRPC to implement and update the RWQMP.
- Use the Milwaukee River Basin Plan and Sheboygan River Basin Plan to target priority farms by identifying sediment delivery fields, and phosphorus runoff sites in 303(d) list waters areas.
- Maintain, update, and implement recommendations set forth in the Ozaukee County flood mitigation plan, including acquisition of properties in the floodplain without "buildable" areas.
- Support and, where applicable, establish and utilize an adaptive watershed management¹⁰ option as a strategy to meet the phosphorus water quality criteria set forth in Section NR 102.06 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* in an economically efficient manner while considering the contributions of phosphorus from point and nonpoint sources in a watershed.

Cultural Resources

Goals:

- Preserve the rural and small town character of Ozaukee County.
- Preserve and enhance the historic, cultural, and archaeological resources that contribute to Ozaukee County's heritage.
- Promote cultural resource and heritage related tourism in the County.

Objectives:

- Discourage urban development within the rural areas of Ozaukee County. Encourage the location of major retail, service, institutional, and other urban uses within urban (sewer) service areas.
- Encourage development and redevelopment that is sensitive to the preservation of significant natural, historic, and cultural features, and is compatible with such uses.
- Encourage the preservation of historic and cultural structures and districts and archaeological sites.
- o Capitalize on tourism amenities.
- Support the efforts of local historical societies to research and display Ozaukee County's history and heritage to the public.

Policy:

• Preserve historic structures and sites that have been listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places or are identified as local landmarks.

Programs:

- Preserve and maintain structures with significant historical and archaeological value in the County.
- Develop model historic and archaeological preservation ordinances for towns under the provisions of Section 60.04 of the *Statutes* and for cities and villages based on Section 62.23(7)(em) of the *Statutes* (consult the State Historical Society Division of Historic

¹⁰A process where new information on the health of the watershed is included into a watershed management plan as a combination of scientific research, monitoring, and practical management that allows for experimentation and provides the opportunity to "learn by doing" because of the uncertainty about how ecosystems function and how management affects ecosystems.

Preservation model ordinance). The archaeological model ordinance would be similar to a historic preservation ordinance; however, its focus is preservation of archaeological sites.¹¹

- Observe Section 66.1111 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, which requires local governments, including counties, to consider how a project may affect historic properties and archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or State Register of Historic Places.
- Develop and distribute educational materials to local governments, historical societies, and the public regarding agencies, such as the State Historical Society Office of Local History, and funding sources that may support the work and facilities of local historical societies in Ozaukee County.

Land Uses

Goal:

• Guide projected growth in a manner that protects Ozaukee County's agricultural and natural resource base and the character of local communities and neighborhoods, including those communities that wish to retain an agricultural economy and rural character.

Objectives:

- Encourage a balanced and sustainable allocation of space between various types of land uses to meet the social, physical, and economic needs of County residents.
- Discourage urban development within the rural areas of Ozaukee County. Encourage the location of major retail, service, institutional, and other urban uses within the historic urban service centers of the County.

Policies:

- Provide a spatial distribution of various land uses on the County land use plan map that will result in a convenient, sustainable, and compatible arrangement of land uses.
- Develop methods to analyze and measure the sustainable (environmental, economic, and societal) allocation of space between various types of land uses.
- Encourage concentrated urban and infill development within urban (sewer) service areas to minimize the conversion of farmland to urban uses.
- Rural and suburban residential development should be located and designed to minimize impact on the natural resource base, minimize impacts on the scenic beauty and character of rural areas, and minimize the loss of farmland covered by agricultural soil suitability Class I and Class II soils, and soils that have high or very high LESA scores. When accommodated, rural residential development should be located in such a way as to minimize conflicts associated with dust, odors, and noise from farming activity that may arise when residences are located in the vicinity of agricultural operations.
- Encourage the use of conservation subdivision design concepts with attendant stewardship plans in rural- and suburban-density residential development to the extent practicable.

Programs:

• Continue to incorporate city, village, and town land use plans into the County land use plan for areas within their respective municipal boundaries, in accordance with the procedure for plan amendments described in Part 2 of Chapter XIV in the County comprehensive plan. Ozaukee County will continue to work with communities to prepare necessary plan amendments for inclusion in the County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan.

¹¹*The City of La Crosse has adopted an archaeological preservation ordinance that may serve as a model.*
- The cities, villages, and towns in the County will continue to administer and enforce their respective community zoning and land division ordinances in accordance with the recommendations of the adopted community comprehensive plan, and amend zoning and land division ordinances and zoning maps as necessary to implement the local comprehensive plan. Such amendments may include the creation of new zoning districts or regulations in order to implement the local comprehensive plan.
- Communities may establish urban and rural design guidelines for which compliance may be mandatory (regulatory approach by converting guidelines into ordinance regulations) or voluntary (nonregulatory approach by encouraging developers to follow a design manual).

Housing

Goal:

• Promote the addition of an adequate number of housing units to the current housing stock in Ozaukee County to meet housing demand through 2035.

Objectives:

- Promote a range of affordable housing choices for all income levels, age groups, and special needs groups in the County.
- o Encourage sustainable development of land for residential use.

Policies:

- Promote the development of housing with various unit sizes, lot sizes, and structure types in each urban (sewer) service area in the County to meet the needs of County residents and businesses.
- Encourage new housing to occur at urban densities in sewer service areas.

Programs:

- A full range of housing structure types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multifamily dwelling units, should be planned for in existing urban (sewer) service areas in accordance with adopted County and local land use plan maps to provide affordable housing options for households of all income levels, ages, and special needs projected for Ozaukee County in 2035.
- Allocate residential land in existing urban (sewer) service areas to urban densities if recommended by the concerned local government land use plan map.
- Encourage the use of conservation subdivision design for residential developments outside of urban (sewer) service areas.
- Encourage infill housing development.

Transportation

Goals:

- Improve transportation infrastructure and land use design to support a range of transportation choices for all citizens and businesses.
- Provide an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all businesses and citizens, including transit-dependant residents, persons with disabilities, and the elderly.
- Maintain a street and highway system and public transportation system that efficiently serve the anticipated land use development pattern set forth on the County land use plan map.

• Provide region-, nation-, and world-wide transportation access to Ozaukee County for passengers and freight.

Objectives:

- Provide a variety of transportation choices to meet the needs of all income, age, special needs groups, and businesses in Ozaukee County.
- Encourage development patterns with transportation infrastructure that minimizes environmental and aesthetic impacts.
- Encourage new land use and transportation patterns that relieve congestion and reduce fuel consumption, air pollution, noise pollution, and the need for new roads and expansions to existing roads, thereby also maintaining the rural character of the County.
- Provide region-, nation-, and world-wide transportation access to effectively move people and goods into and through the County to promote a strong economy within the County.

Policies:

- Ensure planned land uses are adequately served by street and highway networks.
- Work to ensure balance and consistency between regional, County, and local land use and transportation plans so that the arterial street network, transit services, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities are appropriately sized and located to serve County residents and businesses.

Programs:

- Work to implement the recommendations of the Ozaukee County Jurisdictional Highway System Plan and the Regional Transportation System Plan.
- Allocate a mix of residential land use categories, including urban density and multi-family/high density residential uses, to the residential areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems.
- Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses to the business areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems.

Utilities and Community Facilities

Goals:

- Ensure provision of utilities and community facilities to efficiently and adequately serve County residents, workers, and businesses.
- Encourage land uses and densities that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal, State government, and utility costs.
- Maintain and enhance the existing level of public services in Ozaukee County, including the use of renewable energy and "green" infrastructure, when possible.

Objectives:

- Encourage development patterns and preservation of existing developments that are energy efficient.
- o Encourage land use development patterns with utility infrastructure that minimizes environmental impact.
- Guide urban land uses to land that can sustain urban development.

• Develop methods to maintain and enhance County services to the public and consider potential publicprivate partnerships to enhance the level of public services.

Policies:

- Ensure an adequate amount of land is allocated to communication and utility uses, such as sewage disposal plants and treatment lagoons, waters towers, water supply plants, and stormwater management facilities on the County land use plan map to efficiently serve County residents and businesses.
- Ensure an adequate amount of land is allocated to institutional and governmental service uses such as governmental administration, safety, and assembly buildings; educational buildings and institutions; hospitals; and cemeteries on the County land use plan map to efficiently serve County residents and businesses. Major institutions, such as hospitals and secondary schools, should be located in sewer service areas.
- Promote the redevelopment of land with existing infrastructure and public services and the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing residential, commercial, and industrial structures.
- Support the development of land use patterns and water quality control programs to maintain or improve water quality and quantity and energy conservation and efficiency, including use of alternative energy sources.

Programs:

- Allocate an adequate amount of land on the County land use plan map and to incorporate the programs recommended in Chapter XI, Utilities and Community Element, of the County comprehensive plan, including accommodating necessary expansion of utilities and community facilities where warranted.
- Preserve groundwater recharge areas identified on Map 11 in Chapter II through the County subdivision review process and encourage local governments to preserve groundwater recharge areas through local comprehensive plans and consistent implementation of land use control ordinances, such as the zoning ordinance.

Economic Development

Goals:

- Promote an adequate number of sites for business retention, expansion, and attraction in Ozaukee County through 2035.
- Provide for diversified, balanced, environmentally compatible business development that will offer a variety of goods and services through conveniently located, well-designed business clusters while providing needed services for County residents and businesses.

Objectives:

- Promote an adequate amount of available and suitable land with supporting infrastructure for businesses retention, expansion, and attraction through 2035.
- Protect lands identified as best suited for long-term farmland preservation, in order to provide the land base needed to maintain agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.
- Promote redevelopment of underutilized commercial and industrial land in the urban (sewer) service areas of Ozaukee County through 2035.
- Encourage sustainable development of land for business use.
- o Identify a diversity of business "clusters" to be encouraged within the County.

- o Develop methods to retain farmland and encourage agriculture as a viable part of the economy.
- o Encourage business development that matches the educational attainment of residents within the County.
- Promote educational programs to prepare workers for jobs in the desirable businesses and industries identified in Chapter XII of the County comprehensive plan, including niche agriculture, crop production for bio-fuel industry, dairy farming, and other existing types of agriculture in the County.
- o Capitalize on tourism amenities, including agri- and eco-tourism.
- Encourage and support entrepreneurialism (i.e. small businesses, business incubators, and home-based businesses).

Policies:

- Promote the development of new businesses, or business expansion, in areas with existing infrastructure and community services, or in areas near or contiguous to existing service areas that can readily be served by extending infrastructure. An exception should be made for home-based businesses that do not require urban services.
- Promote agricultural use on parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or greater in order to provide the land base needed to maintain agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.
- Encourage cooperation between schools and the business community to develop educational programs that provide the County's labor force with skills to meet the employment needs of County businesses and to provide services needed by County residents.
- Promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.
- Promote the tourism industry, including agri-tourism and eco-tourism, in Ozaukee County.
- Encourage and support potential business incubators, including culinary and small business incubators.

Programs:

- Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses on the County land use plan map to encourage sustainable development of land for business use. Guide these land uses away from lands delineated on Maps 16 and 17 in Chapter II, unless otherwise delineated on local government land use plan maps.
- Identify sustainable lands to be retained in long-term agricultural use in consultation with local governments, and using the results of the LESA analysis.
- Study the administration of additional partnerships and educational opportunities designed to develop the job skills sought by employers and potential employers in Ozaukee County.
- Develop telecommunications and technology strategies for the County to ensure access to wireless voice and data communications networks for County businesses and residents, including residents who telecommute or operate a home-based business.
- Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.
- Study the use of County funding to support staffing for the Ozaukee County Tourism Council.

SUMMARY

This Chapter presents a vision statement and the goals, objectives, policies, and programs for the County farmland preservation plan. A vision statement was developed by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee to provide an overall framework for farmland preservation in the County. The vision

statement expresses the preferred future and key expectations for farming desired by the County and participating communities. Key issues affecting farmland preservation are also identified.

Planning goals and objectives were developed to define the future intent of farmland preservation, as well as protection of other related natural resources, for Ozaukee County and participating local governments and to guide the implementation of such preservation efforts through 2035. The goals and objectives provided the framework for preserving farmlands and other related natural resources in Ozaukee County. Each set of goals and objectives also include a set of recommended policies and programs to facilitate and help attain the goals and objectives. These goals and objectives were based, in part, upon inventory data, public input results, and past and current planning efforts within Ozaukee County.

Other interrelated goals, objectives, policies, and programs that affect farmland preservation were also established and pertain to natural resources, invasive species, cultural resources, land uses, housing, transportation, utilities and community facilities, and economic development. (This page intentionally left blank)

Chapter VII

IMPLEMENTATION

INTRODUCTION

This Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County provides recommendations for preserving productive agricultural lands as well as other important natural resources. The recommended plan, presented in Chapter V, provides a design for attaining farmland preservation goals and objectives identified in Chapter VI, promoting the effective management of agricultural resources, and sustaining the economic viability of farming in Ozaukee County. In a practical sense, however, these recommendations are not complete until the steps required to implement the plan have been specified. This Chapter outlines the actions which should be taken by various units and agencies of government to help implement the plan. This Chapter also describes program priorities associated with implementing the plan.

PLAN REVIEW, ADOPTION, AND INTEGRATION

For any planning process, it is good practice to hold public informational meetings and hearings on recommended plans before their adoption. Such actions provide an additional opportunity to acquaint residents and landowners with the recommended plan and to solicit public reactions to plan recommendations. The plan should then be modified to reflect any pertinent new information and to incorporate any sound and desirable new ideas advanced at these meetings. Countywide public informational meetings on the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County were held at the Village/Town Hall of Fredonia on June 4, 2013, and at the County Administration Center in Port Washington on June 11, 2013. A public hearing was held before the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) on June 11, 2013, following the public informational meeting. Additional public input was also solicited during the planning process as part of a public participation plan approved by the CPB. Public participation activities are described in Chapter IV and Appendix B.

As an initial step, the CPB approved the plan on June 11, 2013, and recommended adoption of the plan by a resolution of the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors as a stand-alone plan. The Ozaukee County Board approved the plan on July 3, 2013. A copy of the County Board resolution is provided in Appendix H-1. Following approval by the County Board as a stand-alone plan, the plan was re-submitted to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) for certification.¹

¹The draft plan was submitted to DATCP for review and certification in late 2012. DATCP requested revisions to the plan, which were reviewed and approved by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee and Land Preservation Board in March and April, 2013, respectively. The CPB approved the plan revisions in April 2013.

Sections 91.16, 91.18, and 91.20 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* outline the plan certification process and requirements. Following approval of the plan as a stand-alone plan by the County Board, the plan was re-submitted to DATCP for certification prior to adoption of the farmland preservation plan as an amendment to the County comprehensive plan. DATCP can either grant or deny certification within 90 days and may certify a farmland preservation plan for a period not to exceed 10 years. Once adopted, the plan becomes the official guide for County officials and staff in making farmland preservation and related land use decisions. The plan should also serve as a guide for local government officials and staff when developing, amending, or implementing local plans and ordinances pertaining to farmland preservation.

Following certification by DATCP, the County scheduled a public hearing before the CPB and provided public notice of the hearing in accordance with the requirements of Section 66.1001 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. An important step in plan implementation is the formal adoption of the farmland preservation plan by the County Board as a component of and an amendment to the County comprehensive plan. Through a resolution of the CPB adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors, the CPB formally approved the plan and recommended adoption of the updated farmland preservation plan by an ordinance of the County Board as a component of and an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035. A copy of the resolution, which was adopted on December 4, 2013, is provided in Appendix H-2. The County Board adopted the plan as a component of and an amendment to the comprehensive plan by ordinance on December 4, 2013. A copy of the adopting ordinance is provided in Appendix H-3.

Even though this Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County is published as a separate report, the plan is part of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan and was adopted as a component of and an amendment to the comprehensive plan. The adoption of the County farmland preservation plan further refines and details the agricultural, natural, and cultural resources element and the land use element (Chapters VII and VIII of the comprehensive plan, respectively), as well as related inventory data.

PLAN AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

Section 91.10(3) of the *Statutes* requires a county to follow the plan adoption and amendment procedures outlined in Section 66.1001(4), the comprehensive planning law, when adopting or amending a farmland preservation plan. These adoption and amendment procedures are summarized in Chapter XIV (Implementation Element) of the Ozaukee County comprehensive plan. Section 91.10(5) of the *Statutes* also requires a county to notify DATCP prior to holding a public hearing on the farmland preservation plan and provide DATCP a copy of the plan for review.

In addition to the procedures outlined in Section 66.1001(4), any amendment to this farmland preservation plan requires a review and recertification of the farmland preservation plan by DATCP, which involves a timeframe not to exceed 90 days. The certification of an amendment to the approved farmland preservation plan expires on the date that the certification of the farmland preservation plan expires; however, a comprehensive revision to a farmland preservation plan may be treated as a new plan and DATCP may specify a new expiration date for a period that does not exceed 10 years.

A plan amendment, such as parcels added or deleted to designated farmland preservation areas, may be initiated by the County Board, a County Board committee, a City Common Council, a Village Board, or a Town Board. Because authority for regulating land use development in Ozaukee County rests primarily with cities, villages, and towns through implementation of local zoning ordinances, land owners wanting to amend the plan must first receive approval from the common council or village or town board. The mayor, village president, or town chairman should submit a written request to amend the County farmland preservation plan to the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department prior to approving local plan or zoning amendments. Ozaukee County and the respective local government will coordinate and work cooperatively through the amendment process. Countylocal cooperation is important because Chapter 91 of the *Statutes* requires areas zoned by local governments for farmland preservation in order to claim tax credits to be consistent with the County farmland preservation plan.

CONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANS AND ORDINANCES

Section 91.10(2) of the *Statutes* requires that if a county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan, and ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board on April 2, 2008. This farmland preservation plan was adopted by the Ozaukee County Board as a component of and an amendment to the County comprehensive plan on December 4, 2013. Ozaukee County will make changes needed to ensure the multi-jurisdictional County comprehensive plan is consistent with the County farmland preservation plan. Until needed amendments are made to the County comprehensive plan, this farmland preservation plan supersedes the County comprehensive plan where any map and/or text inconsistencies appear between the two plans except with regard to program priorities.²

Consistency between the comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan ensures that planned development areas do not overlap with areas planned for farmland preservation. Chapter 91 of the *Statutes* requires that a County's comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan be carefully examined for inconsistencies, and that any identified inconsistencies be resolved. Requiring the farmland preservation plan to be adopted as an amendment to the comprehensive plan helps ensure consistency between the comprehensive plan and farmland preservation plan.

Ozaukee County and SEWRPC staff and farmland preservation plan advisory committee members worked carefully to ensure consistency between recommendations adopted as part of the comprehensive plan and the farmland preservation plan. All recommendations were reviewed by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Board, and Comprehensive Planning Board. An amendment to the land use element of the County comprehensive plan was adopted in December 2013 to achieve consistency between the planned land use map in the comprehensive plan and this farmland preservation plan. Amendments may also be needed to local government comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances to enable landowners to claim farmland preservation tax credits. Changes to local plans and ordinances are described in later sections of this chapter.

PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM PRIORITIES

In Section 66.1001(2)(i) of the *Statutes*, the comprehensive planning law requires the compilation of programs, in a specified sequence, to implement the recommendations set forth in the County comprehensive plan. To fulfill this requirement, the Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPPCAC), comprised of appointed staff or officials from each of the local governments participating in the farmland preservation planning process and citizen representatives from throughout the County, reviewed the programs developed for the farmland preservation plan and established a priority ranking for their implementation. Some of the programs related to farmland preservation previously identified in the comprehensive plan were updated or amended as part of this farmland preservation plan. In addition, new programs related to farmland preservation were developed. Both the FPPCAC and the Land Preservation Board (LPB) members undertook the ranking method described in the following paragraph to identify high-priority programs. The overall rankings were ultimately reviewed and approved by the Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB).

Within the "Agricultural-Related Recommendations" section, the three goals under the three subsections, titled "Soil Suitability for Agricultural Production Recommendations," "Farmland Protection and LESA Analysis Recommendations," and "Protection of Farms and Farming Recommendations," in Chapter VI were ranked or

²The Ozaukee County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan was amended on December 4, 2013, as part of Amendment 2013-02, to amend the land use plan map and goals, objective, policies, and programs to make the comprehensive plan and the farmland preservation plan consistent with each other. The farmland preservation plan was also adopted as a component of the comprehensive plan as part of Amendment 2013-02.

"weighted" with 3 being the highest ranking and 1 being the lowest. This process was initiated by the FPPCAC as Committee members determined programs under the Agricultural-Related Recommendations section should "weigh" more or have a higher priority than those listed under the Other Related Recommendations section. Next, programs listed under each of the three agricultural-related, as well as those listed within the subsections under the Other Related Recommendations section in Chapter VI, were ranked within their respective subsection. The ranking or value of programs within each subsection was then "normalized" by dividing the program ranking by the total number of programs within the respective subsection to help reduce skewing results where one subsection may have more programs than another, thereby artificially increasing a program ranking in subsections containing more programs. Lastly, the initial ranking number or "weight" of the three goals under the Agricultural-Related Recommendations section were multiplied by the average ranking of each program under their respective subsection to calculate an overall weighted score. Those with the highest scores were considered to have a high ranking or higher priority than those with lower scores. Of the total 104 programs included in Chapter VI, the LPB and CPB determined that programs with scores of 1.00 or higher (about the top 30 percent), or those ranked from 1 to 34, were high priority programs. High priority programs are listed below. The full combined FPPCAC and LPB results of all program rankings are presented in Appendix I. Remaining programs not identified as high priority will be implemented as funding and staffing resources allow.

High Priority Programs

Program Rankings (About top 30 percent)

- 1. Assign agricultural use to parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or higher on the Ozaukee County Planned Land Use Map: 2035 (Map 24 in Chapter II), if also designated for agricultural use on the applicable local government adopted planned land use map.
- 2. Develop a County agricultural conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program or a County agricultural conservation easement program to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis.
- 3. Study and develop a County land division ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect agricultural resource areas identified on Map 6 in Chapter II.
- 4. Continue to support farmland preservation educational efforts by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, and UW-Extension to assist landowners and the public, including distribution of WDNR and DATCP educational materials to local landowners on farmland preservation, through the County newsletter and website, public informational meetings, and individual contacts with landowners.
- 5. Work with the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT), the Land Conservation Partnership of Ozaukee County, and other land trusts to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis through agricultural conservation easements and/or land purchases.
- 6. Establish an Agricultural Enterprise Area(s) containing contiguous lands devoted primarily to agricultural use. An AEA would be part of a broader strategy to protect farmland and promote agriculture and agriculturally-related development.
- 7. Continue to update as needed the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County based on the LESA analysis and any revisions made to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program. Continue to encourage local governments to participate in future updates to the County Farmland Preservation Plan.
- 8. Encourage County and local programs to protect farmland through education and the development of programs to support farmland protection. The County should also provide technical assistance to towns for town farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural (or farmland preservation) zoning.
- 9. Continue to support and to implement recommendations in the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan to protect land and water resources, including farmland.

- 10. Develop and adopt a County right-to-farm ordinance that defines agricultural operations, normal agricultural practices, and the specific farmland that is affected by the ordinance; a reference to the State Statute that protects farmers from nuisance law suits; and a grievance procedure that outlines how complaints against agricultural operations will be resolved.
- 11. Implement programs recommended under the Farmland Protection Recommendations to preserve agricultural activity in Ozaukee County, including those included in the Wisconsin Working Lands law (Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*) and study a County property tax deduction on agricultural uses.
- 12. Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural areas.
- 13. Continue to pursue Federal and State farmland protection grant funds available to County governments, and use the LESA analysis to prioritize areas.
- 14. Continue to promote allowing produce stands, bed-and-breakfast establishments, "commercial kitchens," and other types of home occupations or "home-based" businesses on farms to help supplement farming incomes.
- 15. Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for beginning farmers. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies as part of program implementation.
- 16. Develop a program to market and link Ozaukee County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants, stores, schools, hospitals, and group residential facilities (nursing homes, for example) in Ozaukee County and surrounding areas.
- 17. Implement the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) and ensure compliance of farms with FPP rules.
- 18. Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and Best Management Practices (BMP) resources and grants available through State agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in State agency assistance and State agencies as part of program implementation.
- 19. Publicize and furnish information on alternative specialized or niche farming operations, including "urban," "aquaponics," "hydroponics," aquaculture, organic, herb (including herbology, use of herbs as natural remedies), apiculture (beekeeping), equestrian, and "bioenergy" (sustainable biomass and biofuel production) farming.
- 20. Develop an educational program and distribute educational materials regarding farming techniques that promote soil conservation such as conservation tillage (where crops are grown with minimal or reduced cultivation of the soil), no till and zone tilling farming, contour stripping, grass waterways, terracing, crop rotation, and nutrient management through soil sampling. The educational program focus should include local governments and individual farmers. Information and application assistance for Federal and State programs to implement farming practices that promote soil conservation should be provided to farmers through the County educational program.
- 21. Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and BMP resources and grants available through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other Federal agencies. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal agency assistance and Federal agencies as part of program implementation.
- 22. Support Wisconsin's Working Lands Initiative recommendations.
- 23. Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of farming, including economic impacts, and the need to protect enough farmland in Ozaukee County for farming to remain viable in the future.

- 24. Identify and consider establishing AEAs to include areas with an agricultural economic cluster of farming operations and appropriate agri-businesses on lands designated for agricultural use on the County Planned Land Use Map for 2035.
- 25. Promote the removal of highly erodible land from agricultural use through implementing the County Soil and Water Resource Management Program.
- 26. Continue to identify croplands that do not have a conservation plan and help develop these plans. Also, continue to assist in updating existing conservation plans.
- 27. Work with UW-Extension to provide information to farmers on succession planning to help ensure farming activity continues into the future.
- 28. Develop a cost/revenue model comparing the cost of County and local government services to various types of land use compared to agricultural land uses.
- 29. Study the feasibility of providing a tax break or incentive on the County portion of the property tax for agricultural parcels, including those donating conservation easements.
- 30. Enforce the land and water management standards required of participants in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program.
- 31. Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation to protect farmland, including the use of boundary agreements.
- 32. Provide technical assistance to the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area including maps, tile locations, soils information, and conservation plans to the WDNR and OWLT on parcels of interest. County representatives should also continue to participate on the Heritage Area technical and advisory committees.
- 33. Continue to pursue Federal and State soil resource conservation grant funds available to County governments.
- 34. Establish a program to promote agri-tourism in Ozaukee County through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms. The program could include an educational component for farmers regarding possible agri-tourism enterprises.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION TOOLS UNDER THE STATE PROGRAM

Chapter 91 of the *Statutes* identifies several farmland preservation tools and techniques that farmers and local officials can use to protect agricultural lands and establish eligibility to claim farmland tax credits. These tools include identification of farmland preservation areas, farmland preservation zoning, agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs), and purchase of agricultural conservation easements (PACE).

Farmland Preservation Zoning

One of the most effective implementation tools available to local governments to preserve farmland is zoning. The most important function of zoning is to implement the land use element of a local government's comprehensive plan, including planned farmland preservation areas and other agricultural uses. A secondary function of zoning is to protect desirable existing land uses and environmental features, including agricultural and natural resources.

Farmland preservation zoning can be an effective way to protect large tracts of farmland from conversion to other uses. Farmland preservation zoning is most effectively utilized in areas where there is limited pressure for residential development and in areas with prime agricultural soil. Farmland preservation zoning promotes both the preservation of agricultural land and agriculture as an industry. Farmland preservation zoning can also help supply locally grown food and agricultural products. Other advantages for implementing farmland preservation zoning include:

- Protecting productive farms;
- Avoiding conflicts with other land uses;
- Maintaining a viable agricultural economic base; and
- Maintaining open space and rural character.

Farmland preservation zoning is a preservation method that may be implemented by a local zoning authority, including each city, village, and town in Ozaukee County, if it voluntarily elects to adopt a farmland preservation zoning ordinance. Ozaukee County has limited zoning authority outside shoreland and floodplain areas.³ If a local government chooses to adopt and map a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance, it ensures that landowners covered by the ordinance are eligible to claim farmland preservation tax credits, as set forth in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*. In compliance with the certification, a farmland preservation zoning ordinance and the corresponding zoning map should identify the zoning district(s) intended for certified farmland preservation areas and specify the uses allowed within such district(s). The zoning regulations for a farmland preservation zoning district(s) must be at least as restrictive as the provisions in Sections 91.38, 91.42, 91.44, and 91.46 of the *Statutes* for parcels within the farmland preservation areas identified in this County farmland preservation plan.

Zoning Districts

Section 91.38(1)(g) of the *Statutes* provides that only parcels located in a farmland preservation area (FPA) identified in a certified county farmland preservation plan are eligible for farmland preservation zoning and may be included in a farmland preservation zoning district in order to enable landowners to claim State farmland preservation tax credits. If a community wishes to regulate other agricultural areas located outside certified FPAs to protect the intent and character of an agricultural area, then a separate agricultural zoning district must be used for the other agricultural areas. If a community desires to create more than one farmland preservation zoning district with different minimum lot size or other requirements, the districts must, at a minimum, meet the farmland preservation area regulations set forth in Sections 91.38, 91.42, 91.44, and 91.46 of the *Statutes* in order for landowners to be eligible to claim tax credits.

In accordance with Section 91.38(1)(h) of the *Statutes*, an overlay zoning district, such as an overlay zoning district intended to protect environmental corridors and other natural features, may be superimposed on a farmland preservation zoning district. Farmland preservation tax credits may be claimed for natural resource areas within FPAs provided the natural areas are identified with an overlay district, preserved as permanent undeveloped natural resource areas or open space lands on the site, and the conservancy overlay district does not remove land use restrictions from the underlying basic or principal farmland preservation zoning district(s) that impose State farmland preservation requirements. Maps 28 through 30 in Chapter V show examples of lowland and upland conservancy zoning overlays within FPAs in Ozaukee County. The lowland conservancy overlays represent existing (2005) nonfarmed wetlands and surface waters. The upland conservancy overlays represent the upland portions (areas outside nonfarmed wetlands and surface waters), including woodlands and steep slopes, of existing (2000) environmental corridors and isolated natural resource areas. The conservancy overlay information is included on the maps to indicate the extent and general type of natural features that exist on parcels within the FPAs to help communities delineate lowland and upland conservancy overlay zoning districts on local zoning maps. The lowland district, for example, may be titled "LC Lowland Conservancy Overlay District" or "C-1 Conservancy Overlay District," while the upland district may be titled "UC Upland Conservancy Overlay District" or "C-2 Conservancy Overlay District."

Local governments in Ozaukee County that currently have certified farmland preservation zoning ordinances include the Towns of Belgium, Cedarburg, Fredonia, Grafton, Saukville,⁴ and Port Washington. These

³Ozaukee County also exercises zoning authority over County-owned lands in unincorporated areas, in accordance with an ordinance adopted by the County Board on May 1, 2013.

⁴*Recent changes to the Town of Saukville zoning ordinance have not been submitted to DATCP for review and recertification.*

ordinances, which were created under the former farmland preservation program, expired on December 31, 2012, based on Section 91.34 of the *Statutes*, unless extended by DATCP. The certification of a local government's farmland preservation zoning ordinance may be extended for a maximum of two years from the expiration date contingent upon a written request to the DATCP secretary, and the DATCP secretary considers the extension necessary to allow the political subdivision to concurrently develop a farmland preservation zoning ordinance and an update or amendment to the local comprehensive plan. Any local government that desires to continue or initiate farmland preservation zoning must adopt a new farmland preservation zoning ordinance that has been certified by DATCP as meeting the requirements specified in Chapter 91 of the *Statutes*. As implied by Maps 31 through 33 in Chapter V, the Towns of Belgium and Fredonia intend to seek recertification of their local zoning ordinances and maps.

Farmland Preservation Zoning Ordinance Certification and Updates/Recertification

DATCP determines if a farmland preservation zoning ordinance is eligible for certification. DATCP will also determine the certification period, which may not exceed 10 years. Once the certification expires, the zoning authority (local government) may make necessary amendments and submit the farmland preservation zoning ordinance for recertification. If agricultural land is rezoned to a nonagricultural use, the landowner can no longer claim farmland preservation tax credits for the land rezoned.

Rezoning

The conditions to rezone land to remove parcels from a certified farmland preservation zoning district are specified in Section 91.48 of the *Statutes*. A local government may rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district without having to submit the local zoning ordinance and map to DATCP for recertification if the local government finds all of the following, after holding a public hearing on the requested rezoning:

- The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.
- The rezoning is consistent with the local comprehensive plan.
- The rezoning is substantially consistent with the county's certified farmland preservation plan.
- The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use.

A local government with a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance is required to provide a report to DATCP by March 1 of each year indicating the number of acres that the local government has rezoned out of a farmland preservation zoning district. The report must include a map that specifically identifies the location of the lands that were rezoned. A copy of the report must also be submitted to the County.

Conditional Use as an Alternative to Rezoning

Because most of the rezoning requests submitted are likely to rezone agricultural parcels for residential development, the new farmland preservation law allows nonfarm residential development to a limited extent within a farmland preservation zoning district, without the need for rezoning, pursuant to a conditional use permit granted by the local government. Conditional use permit standards ensure that approved nonfarm residences are compatible with the farmland preservation zoning district.

A local government may adopt zoning ordinance text amendments that allows nonfarm residential development within a farmland preservation zoning district under a conditional use permit (CUP), if the development adheres to or is at least as restrictive as the requirements of Section 91.46(2) of the *Statutes*. The CUP allows farmers to continue claiming tax credits and also allows compatible nonfarm residential development within the farmland preservation district. The CUP alternative does not require a rezoning of the parcel.

Developing nonfarm residences within farmland preservation zoning districts through a CUP is an option if all of the following criteria specified in the *Statutes* are met. A local government can chose to be more restrictive or may choose not to include the CUP option in its zoning ordinance.

- The ratio of nonfarm residential acreage to farm acreage on the base farm tract⁵ on which the residence is or will be located will not be greater than one to 20 after the residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.
- There will not be more than four dwelling units in nonfarm residences, nor more than five dwelling units of any kind, on the base farm tract if a residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.

The location and size of a proposed nonfarm residential parcel does not:

- Convert prime farmland from agricultural use or convert land previously used as cropland, other than a woodlot, from agricultural use if there is a reasonable alternative location on the farm for a nonfarm residential parcel or nonfarm residence.
- Significantly impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

A local government may issue one CUP that includes more than one nonfarm residence in a qualifying nonfarm residential cluster. The *Statutes* specify the following criteria for development of a nonfarm residential cluster:

- The parcels on which the nonfarm residences would be located are contiguous.
- The zoning authority imposes legal restrictions on the construction of the nonfarm residences so that if all of the nonfarm residences were constructed, each would satisfy the requirements listed previously for nonfarm residences.

Local governments that choose to include the CUP option for allowing nonfarm residential development in farmland preservation zoning districts must delineate the location and actual configuration of base farm tracts on zoning maps which are then "frozen" at the time of zoning certification by DATCP. Reconfiguration or removal of an established base farm tract may occur by amending the farmland preservation ordinance and submitting it to DATCP for recertification.

Tax Credit Eligibility Requirements

Beginning in the 2010 tax year, there was \$27 million available Statewide annually to provide farmland preservation tax credits to landowners. In 2010, there were 15,791 farmland preservation tax credit claims reported under the farmland preservation program, and those claims totaled about \$18 million Statewide with an average credit per claim of \$1,145.⁶ The total acreage reported as the base for all claims was nearly three million acres with an average of about 187 acres per claim. There is no cap on the amount of credit that an individual can claim or on the amount of acreage eligible for a credit; however, if the total amount of claims exceeds \$27 million in a given year, the state is obligated to pro-rate the value of the credits available to individuals. Even though a property located within a certified farmland preservation area is the principal criterion, Chapter 91 of the *Statutes* requires landowners to meet the following additional criteria in order to be considered eligible to claim farmland preservation tax credits:

⁶Documented in a report titled, Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program: 2010-2011 Biennial Report, December 2011, prepared by DATCP.

⁵Section 91.01(5) of the Statutes defines a base farm tract as one of the following: 1) all land, whether one parcel or two or more contiguous parcels, that is in a farmland preservation zoning district and that is part of a single farm (all land under common ownership that is primarily devoted to agricultural use) on the date that DATCP first certifies the farmland preservation zoning ordinance covering the land or on an earlier date specified in the farmland preservation zoning ordinance, regardless of subsequent changes in the size of the farm, or 2) any other tract that DATCP by rule defines as a base farm tract. According to DATCP staff, contiguous means parcels which are part of a single farm operation under common ownership that are abutting or immediately adjacent to each other with the exception of being separated by a waterway or street, railway, or utility right-of-way. Contiguous does not include a situation where only the corner points of parcels are touching.

- Acres claimed must be located in a farmland preservation area identified in a certified county farmland preservation plan. Eligible land includes agricultural land or permanent undeveloped natural resource areas or open space land that is in:
 - _ an area certified for farmland preservation zoning; and/or
 - a designated agricultural enterprise area and under a farmland preservation agreement.
- The land is operated as part of a farm that produced at least \$6,000 in gross farm revenue during the preceding tax year or \$18,000 in the prior three years. Income from rental receipts of farm acres does not count toward gross farm revenue; however, gross farm revenue produced by the renter on the landowner's farmland can be used to meet this eligibility requirement.
- Claimants must be able to certify that all property taxes owed from the previous year have been paid.
- Farmers claiming farmland preservation tax credits must certify on their tax form that they comply with State soil and water conservation standards. New claimants must also submit a certification of compliance with soil and water conservation standards that has been issued by the County land conservation committee.

If landowners achieve all of the above requirements, they are eligible to claim tax credits through their income tax return for one of the following amounts:

- \$5.00 per acre for farmland located in an agricultural enterprise area (AEA) with a farmland preservation agreement signed after July 1, 2009.
- \$7.50 per acre for farmland in an area zoned for farmland preservation.
- \$10.00 per acre for farmland in an area zoned for farmland preservation and in an agricultural enterprise area, with a farmland preservation agreement signed after July 1, 2009.

Soil and Water Conservation Compliance

As part of the Farmland Preservation Program under Sections 91.80 and 91.82 of the *Statutes*, landowners who claim a farmland preservation tax credit must comply with State soil and water conservation standards. Beginning with tax year 2010, landowners cannot claim the farmland preservation tax credit under the new program unless they certify on their tax returns that they are in compliance with State conservation standards. For a claimant to certify compliance on a tax return, the claimant's farm must:

- Comply with Chapter NR 151, "Runoff Management," of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code* runoff pollution performance standards and prohibitions incorporated into Chapter ATCP 50, "Soil and Water Resource Management Program," of the *Administrative Code*, or
- Have a schedule of compliance designed to meet State conservation standards by a specific deadline set by the County, which cannot extend beyond December 31, 2015.

Landowners who are uncertain about their compliance status can remain eligible for tax credits only if they contact a conservation professional to assess their farm's compliance status and take further actions to achieve compliance, if needed.

Counties have new responsibilities to monitor compliance with the standards, including farm inspections at least once every four years. If a claimant is found not in compliance with the standards, the County will take appropriate action to address the concerns, and in certain cases, may issue a notice of noncompliance to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. Once the claimant regains compliance, the County will notify the Department of Revenue that the claimant is again eligible to receive tax credits.

Agricultural Enterprise Areas

The new farmland preservation law establishes a program that allows DATCP to designate by administrative rule certain lands as Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs). AEAs may be established in response to resolutions adopted by local governing bodies petitioning identified contiguous farmlands to be preserved. DATCP defines an AEA as a contiguous land area devoted primarily to agricultural use and locally targeted for agricultural preservation or agricultural development. AEAs may be established whether or not the local government adopts a farmland preservation zoning ordinance. Landowners within designated AEAs may enter into voluntary farmland preservation agreements with DATCP to establish eligibility to collect farmland preservation tax credits in exchange for agreeing to keep their farm in agricultural use for at least 15 years. The program requires a minimum of five individual farm owners to submit a petition for consideration with the support of their local government. There currently is no minimum size requirement for an AEA, but State law requires DATCP to give higher priority to any AEA application that contains at least 1,000 contiguous acres. Contiguous means parcels that meet at more than one point and are only separated by a lake, stream, or transportation or utility right-of-way, and eligible farms must have at least \$6,000 in gross farm revenues in the previous year, or \$18,000 over the previous three years. AEAs may also span political jurisdictions, which may involve two or more towns or counties. Chapter 91 of the Statutes gives DATCP the authority to designate AEAs with a combined area of not more than one million acres Statewide.

The overall boundary of a proposed AEA must enclose a contiguous area containing at least the land owned by each of the farm owners petitioning; however, the land owned by the petitioners need not be contiguous, and the boundary may include lands owned by others who are not petitioners. While AEAs are oriented towards agricultural preservation and agricultural development, they may include other compatible land uses such as significant natural resources or compatible infrastructure that supports agriculture.

The designation of an AEA does not control or limit land uses within the designated area nor does it protect such areas from encroaching incompatible development or land use conflicts. The designation of an AEA identifies the area as valuable for current and future agricultural use, with the potential to promote investment in agriculture and agricultural-related businesses. Local governments may establish and enforce land use controls, such as farmland preservation zoning, to preserve, protect, and promote agricultural enterprises as appropriate. The designation of an AEA remains in effect unless the designation is terminated by the State through administrative rule, an action which requires a public hearing.

Between 2009, the year the program was initiated, and 2012, DATCP designated 25 AEAs Statewide, totaling about 743,500 acres. Several AEAs in the State are focusing on increasing vegetable production to support the local food processing industry, while others are oriented to producing local foods with community supported agriculture and organic production. In addition to increasing produce yields, some AEAs have existing renewable energy sources, such as anaerobic digesters for biogas and wind energy systems for electricity, or have implemented energy conservation practices.

AEAs could potentially be established within Ozaukee County. For example, an area in the north and northwest portions of the County, which includes portions of the Towns of Belgium and Fredonia, in and near the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area could be ideal for an AEA. Furthermore, the Towns could associate with the Town of Sherman to the north in Sheboygan County and the Town of Farmington to the west in Washington County to establish a larger AEA boundary within the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area, and jointly petition DATCP for an AEA designation.

A project boundary has been established for the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area by the Wisconsin Natural Resources Board. The WDNR does not intend to rely as heavily on fee simple acquisition as it does in other project areas in the County. Rather, the WDNR anticipates implementing the long-term plan of preserving both natural resources and agricultural land within this project area through a combination of public ownership, conservation easements, and agricultural conservation easements.

Farmland Preservation Agreements

The designation of an AEA does not automatically qualify landowners within an AEA to claim tax credits. Landowners within an AEA must voluntarily sign a farmland preservation agreement with DATCP to be eligible to collect tax credits, and the agreement requires the land to be in agricultural use for a minimum of 15 years. Proposed agreements must be submitted to the County for confirmation that the land subject to the proposed agreement is located within a farmland preservation area and an AEA. The County then forwards the proposed agreement to DATCP. Tax credits available to landowners in an AEA are:

- \$5.00 per acre for land that is covered by a farmland preservation agreement, or
- \$10.00 per acre for land that is covered by a farmland preservation agreement and located in a certified farmland preservation zoning district.

Agreement Conversion Fees

A landowner that signed and agreed to the terms of a farmland preservation agreement may terminate the agreement on any or all acres of land outlined in the agreement prior to the expiration date, a minimum 15-year term, by paying a conversion fee. Conversion fees involved with the termination of farmland preservation agreements are equal to three times the Grade 1 Agricultural Land Assessment Value for each acre being released from the agreement. Land located within a designated AEA can only be removed from the AEA through the State administrative rule process. If the land is sold, the land still remains part of the designated AEA.

Conservation Easements

A conservation easement is a legally recorded agreement of deed restrictions that landowners voluntarily place on their property to protect agricultural, natural, or cultural resources, such as farmland, water resources, open space, wildlife habitat, or historic sites, by prohibiting specified uses. For example, most agricultural easements restrict uses other than those associated with agricultural practices, such as residential, commercial, or industrial uses. Land remains on the tax roll, sometimes at a reduced rate. Landowners can sell⁷ or donate either a portion or the entire parcel to either a governmental unit or a qualified conservation organization such as a land trust (i.e. the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust) to monitor and enforce the restrictions set forth in the easement. In return, landowners can receive tax benefits for granting easements.

Usually, the terms of an easement are specific and include restrictions on allowable uses on the property and the time period set for the easement. Although most conservation easements are permanent, some impose restrictions for a specified number of years. The easement also legally binds future landowners to the terms set forth in the legally recorded easement attached to the land.

Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE)

Purchase of Development Rights, or "PDR" programs, represent another potential means to ensure the preservation of agricultural lands as well as other natural areas and open space. Under a PDR program, landowners are compensated for permanently committing their land to agricultural or open space use. Deed restrictions or easements are used to ensure that the lands concerned remain in agricultural or open space use. Such restrictions are attached to the land in perpetuity and remain in effect regardless of future sale or other transfer of the land.

PDR programs may be administered and funded by State, county, or local units of government, land trusts and other private organizations, or combinations of these. The amounts paid to farmland owners, for example, under PDR programs may be calculated on the basis of the number of dwelling units permitted under existing zoning, on the basis of the difference between the market value of the land and its value solely for agricultural purposes, or on some other basis.

⁷*Purchase of development rights (PDR) programs typically involve the placement of a conservation easement on a parcel in return for compensation to the property owner.*

PDR programs provide assurance that farmland or other open space areas will be permanently retained in open use. Landowners receive a cash payment while retaining all other rights to the land, including the right to continue farming. The money paid to the landowner may be used for any purpose, such as debt reduction, capital improvement to the farm, or retirement income. Lands included in a PDR program remain on the tax roll and continue to generate property taxes.

Section 93.73 of the *Statutes* includes a voluntary program for the purchase of developments rights, the Purchase of Agricultural Conservation Easements (PACE) program. Under this program, landowners would sell an agricultural conservation easement to a qualified government agency or nonprofit conservation organization. Presumed development rights to the land are relinquished in exchange for compensation. The landowner retains full ownership and uses the land for agricultural purposes. Only lands designated for farmland preservation in a certified County farmland preservation plan are eligible for participation in this program. Easements are voluntary and allow a landowner to be compensated for limiting development on their farmland. Easements are permanent and are transferred to subsequent landowners if the property is sold.

The PACE program provides State funds to cooperating local governments or nonprofit conservation organizations for up to 50 percent of the fair market value of the agricultural conservation easement, plus reasonable transaction costs. Land with an agricultural conservation easement cannot be developed for any purpose that would prevent its use for agriculture. Easements are intended to strengthen areas that have been planned and designated as a farmland preservation area in a certified county farmland preservation plan. Such easements may also provide additional protection to areas that have been designated as agricultural enterprise areas (AEAs). Permanent deed restrictions must be recorded with the land through the County Register of Deeds, which explicitly states the restrictions on the land's future use.

When appraising land for an agricultural conservation easement, both the development value and the agricultural value of the land must be computed. Consequently, the difference between the two values is the easement value, of which the State can fund up to 50 percent of the cost.

PACE is a competitive program where various criteria are used to rank applications for funding consideration. The State allocated \$12 million for the program during the 2009-2011 State fiscal years. In 2011, the Legislature eliminated funding for the program. Easement purchases that had been initiated in 2010 were funded through the Wisconsin Stewardship program. No new applications for the PACE program are being accepted at this time (in 2013). The Legislature directed DATCP to identify options to replace the PACE program with a less costly program and report its findings to the Legislature by June 30, 2012.

OTHER CONSERVATION TECHNIQUES⁸

In addition to zoning regulations and the tools provided through the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, other conservation programs and techniques that have been successful in Wisconsin communities and across the nation in areas that have experienced development pressures may have relevance for Ozaukee County communities. These examples are described in this section. Communities that do not include certified FPAs may use or encourage these alternative conservation methods to preserve natural resource areas and agricultural lands, while allowing limited development.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

A Transfer of Development Rights program, or "TDR" program, is a voluntary, incentive-based program that allows landowners to transfer the number of dwelling units allowed on a parcel under existing zoning from that parcel, which would be maintained in open space use, to a different parcel, where the number of dwelling units allowed would be correspondingly increased. When the parcels are held by the same owner, the development

⁸Additional information relative to farmland preservation can be found in the report, Saving American Farmland: What Works, American Farmland Trust, 1997.

rights are, in effect, simply transferred from one parcel to the other by the owner. When the parcels are held by different landowners, the transfer of development rights involves a sale of rights from one owner to another, at fair market value. In either case, the result is a shift in density away from areas proposed to be maintained in farming or other open space use toward areas recommended for development. This allows a community to preserve natural features and agricultural land and at the same time concentrate urban development around existing urban centers and infrastructure. The process is managed through dual zoning that provides property owners a choice whether or not to participate. Landowners who sell development rights are compensated without having to develop their parcel. Landowners can also continue to generate income from agricultural, forestry, or other natural land uses. Because of TDR's complexity, government management resources are required. TDR's are primarily feasible in areas where high-density urban development threatens valuable agricultural resources. The transfer of development rights may be permanent or may be for a specific period of time or set of conditions.

The transfer of development rights may be implemented only if authorized under local zoning. To enable the transfer of development rights, the zoning ordinance must establish procedures by which the TDR technique will be administered, including the formula for calculating the number of residential dwelling units which may be transferred from the "sending" area to the "receiving" area. The zoning district map must identify the sending and receiving areas, or at least identify the districts within which development rights can be transferred from one parcel to another.

While the creation and administration of a TDR program is somewhat complicated, the technique remains a potentially effective means for preserving open space and maintaining rural densities, while directing development to areas where it may best be accommodated. Currently, the *Wisconsin Statutes* do not authorize TDR programs at the County level, which may limit their use at the County level. In addition, counties without general zoning authority, including Ozaukee County, do not have authority to administer a TDR program.

The City of Mequon created a TDR program to protect the City's nature preserve from adjacent development. A developer purchased the development rights on 112 acres adjacent to the City's nature preserve. A conservation easement was placed on the 112 acres that guarantees that no development will occur on the property. The development rights were then transferred to a property north of the nature preserve that was owned by the same developer, which allowed for an increase in the number of homes that could be built on that parcel.

Conservation Subdivisions

Conservation subdivision design, sometimes referred to as cluster development design, involves the grouping of dwellings on a portion of a development parcel in order to preserve the remainder of the parcel in open space. Management options for the open space areas include, among others, preservation of existing natural features, restoration of natural conditions, and new or continued agricultural use. The open space may be owned by a homeowners association, the local municipality or County, the State, a land trust or other nonprofit conservation organization, or the original landowner. Conservation easements and attendant deed restrictions should be used to protect the common open space from future conversion to more intensive uses. Stewardship plans are also typically required to ensure proper management and maintenance of the common open space areas.

In comparison to conventional subdivision designs, conservation subdivisions afford greater opportunity for preserving open space and maintaining the natural resources of the parcel being developed, as illustrated in Figures 6 and 7. When properly designed, the visual impact of new residential development from surrounding streets and adjoining parcels can be minimized and significant natural features and agricultural lands can be protected from development. Infrastructure installation and maintenance costs may be reduced due to shortened street and utility lengths. The process for designing a conservation subdivision should take place in three basic steps, which are described and illustrated in Appendix J. Communities utilizing this tool should determine whether compliance with conservation subdivision design should be mandatory (regulatory approach where integrated into zoning and/or land division ordinances) or voluntary (nonregulatory approach where a manual is used to encourage such designs).

Figure 6

COMPARISON OF CONVENTIONAL AND CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGNS



Figure 6 (continued)



B-1. CONVENTIONAL SUBDIVISION DESIGN



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure 7

CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGNS WITHIN AGRICULTURAL AREAS



Source: SEWRPC.

Figure 8

EXAMPLE OF LOT AVERAGING



Source: SEWRPC.

Lot Averaging

In some cases it may be determined that a cluster development is not appropriate for a particular parcel. In other cases, the community may be uncomfortable with the idea of joint ownership of common open space. In such cases, the community concerned could consider allowing lot averaging as a means of preserving rural areas, as illustrated in Figure 8. Maintaining an overall rural density, the lot sizes would be permitted to vary as long as the lot area that is taken from one lot is transferred to one or more other lots in the tract of land being developed, so that a minimum "average" lot size required by the zoning ordinance is maintained within the development site. Lots within the development larger than the minimum lot size required by the zoning ordinance would be deed restricted to prevent further division. Although no common open space is created, the advantage of lot averaging is flexibility of site design and the ability to concentrate some of the permitted dwellings on smaller lots in certain areas of the development parcel while the remaining dwellings would be located on a few larger lots. Alternatively, a large parcel could be maintained in agricultural use with smaller lots developed with homes. Features of the rural landscape or environmentally sensitive areas can be preserved, albeit on private lots.

Lot averaging is a development technique providing a high degree of flexibility in the type of rural residential options accommodated. In addition to preserving natural resource areas and/or farmlands on large lots in private ownership, the balance of smaller than normal lots in a given development would be less expensive than their counterparts in conservation subdivisions, because no common open space is being leveraged.

Density Bonus Incentive

A density bonus is an incentive-based tool that permits developers to increase the maximum allowable development on a property if certain conditions are met. A density bonus is commonly used to promote the conservation or enhancement of natural resources, such as agricultural land and open space. A municipality may allow a developer to build more units than is permitted in an area, except State certified farmland preservation areas, in exchange for permanently protecting natural resource areas, restoring environmental lands, or providing environmental improvements such as landscaping or developing a nature trail. This technique can be used to improve land on the property being developed or on another property.

Density bonuses may be used to achieve an array of local government objectives, such as the preservation of agricultural land, open space, and vistas, and the conservation of wetlands, water bodies, woodlands, prairies, or other natural features that a local government values. Density bonus criteria typically vary among local governments and must be incorporated into a local government's subdivision, zoning, or other development review regulations, if such regulations are to be implemented.

The Village of Caledonia in Racine County includes the mandatory use of conservation design within its land division ordinance. The Village offers developers up to an additional 20 percent density bonus in the number of lots initially allowed if the developers are willing to meet standards such as self-funding for open space management and designing external connections for trails and open space.

Fee-Simple Purchase

A fee-simple land purchase is where a buyer acquires the full title to a parcel, along with the rights associated with it. This type of purchase allows for permanent open space protection. A local government or nonprofit conservation organization uses funds to purchase available land. In most cases, fee-simple acquisition for open space is based on a willing seller-willing buyer basis to obtain property. With open space preservation, fee-simple acquisition primarily involves a conservation organization, or the State, County, or local government working with a willing landowner.

Often, nonprofit conservation organizations purchase land and then lease it to the original owner or another individual. A conservation group may lease the land to a local farmer who will use the land for economic benefits, such as grazing or crop production. The conservation group benefits from this partnership by receiving rent and by having the land managed. The land also generates products and activities for the public, such as farm produce and recreational opportunities.

Fee-simple has its limitations. There is considerable cost in the outright purchase of lands, which reduces the amount of land that can be preserved as farmland or open space. In addition, if a nonprofit agency purchases the land, they may or may not allow public access. Also, as land is acquired, it may be taken off the tax rolls, although studies indicate that land adjoining preserved open space typically increases in value, possibly offsetting the loss of taxes. In addition, as more land is acquired by a nonprofit organization or local government, the overall cost of owning and maintaining the land(s) becomes increasingly more expensive.

Donations

A donation occurs when a landowner transfers agricultural land or open space to a governmental entity or to a land trust in the form of a charitable gift. Land donations of real property can be arranged in various ways to suit the needs and desires of a donor. The potential recipients of donated property should encourage donors to disclose their plans for a bequest, in advance, in order to assure that the donation is appropriate, and to discuss financial arrangements for the property's maintenance and operation.

Donations may also occur in the form of a conservation easement. As discussed earlier, land with such easements would remain under ownership of the property owner donating the easement while voluntarily placing deed restrictions on the land to protect agricultural, natural, or cultural resources. The land would remain on the tax roll, sometimes at a reduced rate, while donating a portion or the entire parcel to either a governmental unit or qualified conservation organization. As an example, a conservation easement on a 41 acre parcel in the Town of Grafton was recently donated from the Kaul Family Living Trust to Ozaukee County to be preserved as agricultural working land, in addition to preserving a natural area on the property. The easement, however, allows the construction of a house near the existing homestead.

Donations with a reserved life estate, also called a "life tenancy," are donations proposed by individuals who wish to continue owning and living on their property until death. At the time of death, the property is donated to a nonprofit organization or a government agency. The donor or heir is eligible to deduct the value of the gift, called a "remainder interest," at the time it is completed, although the recipient will not actually take control until the donor or heir dies.

Right-To-Farm Ordinances

A right-to-farm ordinance is intended to provide some degree of protection to farmers and farm operations from public and private nuisance claims.⁹ Wisconsin has right-to-farm legislation (Section 823.08 of the *Statutes*) which protects farmers against nuisance lawsuits, unreasonable local regulations, and recapture of legal costs. Local communities are encouraged by the State to use their zoning powers to further protect agricultural activities.¹⁰

Agricultural Nuisance Notices

Agricultural nuisance notices are used to alert buyers of agricultural land that agriculture is the primary economic activity of that area, and that the buyer may experience inconvenience or discomfort arising from accepted agricultural practices. In some cases, the notice may be recorded on the deeds to new homes. Such notices may help to ensure that people who purchase houses in an agricultural area will recognize and be more tolerant of the sometimes inconvenient impacts of agricultural activities.

Recommendations to Increase Housing Density

Section 91.10 (c)(7m) of the *Statutes* requires policies, goals, strategies, and actions to increase housing density in areas that are not identified as farmland preservation areas. Such goals, objectives, policies, and programs are identified in Chapter VI ("strategies" are considered to be the same as "objectives" and "actions" the same as "programs" in this report). Increasing housing density in areas that are not identified as farmland preservation areas, but are planned for redevelopment or new urban and infill development within planned urban (sewer) service areas can help preserve farmland by reducing the amount of land needed for nonfarm development, and conversely, reduce the pressure for agricultural land conversion to residential, commercial, or industrial development. *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035*, including the land use plan map, can serve as a long-range guide for officials, staff, and citizens to address future development and protect agricultural and natural resources through the year 2035.

⁹Nuisance claims are lawsuits relating to impacts from noise, dust, chemicals, irrigation, and odors generated by farming activities, or impeded traffic movements due to farm machinery using public roads.

¹⁰ "Right-to-farm" legislation in Iowa, similar to Wisconsin's legislation, was struck down in September 1998 by the Iowa Supreme Court on the basis that is constituted a "taking" of the property rights of landowners adjacent to farms. Although the Wisconsin "right to farm" legislation has not been challenged, local communities, in light of the Iowa decision, should consult with their attorneys before adopting local "right-to-farm" legislation.

When updating or amending local comprehensive plans, sewered communities may wish to consider increasing residential densities by accommodating additional multi-family housing or allowing smaller lot sizes for single-family housing. Increasing residential densities in sewered areas will result in more compact development patterns that may limit the need to convert agricultural lands to urban uses.

FUNDING AND SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Benefits of preserving farmland include the conservation of the environment (water and soils); protecting rural character and scenic vistas; providing locally-produced fresh food; supporting farm-related employment; and keeping property taxes low. In order to conserve such resources, State, County, and local governments, in cooperation with institutions, businesses, and organizations, have been developing and promoting programs and methods that support farmland preservation. Funding programs and agencies that support farmland preservation and related natural and cultural resources are described in this section and in Appendix E.

Although this report focuses on farmland preservation, farms also may contain natural features that play an important role in land management, including wetlands and woodlands adjacent to cultivated areas. These areas may act as groundwater recharge areas or help trap sediments, or slow stormwater runoff from fields that may otherwise harm nearby streams or lakes. Farmers often may claim both farmland and conservation tax credits by voluntarily preserving agricultural and natural features while practicing certain land management measures. For these reasons, programs that may help conserve natural features are also described in Appendix E.

Programs that focus on agricultural and natural resources include the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, Soil and Water Resource Management Program (SWRM), Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), and the Wetland Reserve Program (WRP). Federal and State programs are also available to help County and local governments and nonprofit conservation organizations (NCOs) acquire park and open space lands, and to help County and local governments provide recreational facilities. Additional Federal programs, including those indicated above, are described in a document titled, "Building Sustainable Farms, Ranches and Communities," which is located on the following website: https://attra.ncat.org/attra-pub/summaries/summary.php?pub=279

Most programs that assist in cultural preservation provide assistance primarily for the restoration of historic buildings, districts, and landmarks, including significant agrarian features, through preservation tax credits, grants, loans, or restoration guidance. In Wisconsin, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin provides assistance for properties listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places. Also, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, a private nonprofit organization, provides matching grants for rehabilitation of historic structures.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION AND AGREEMENTS

Ozaukee County will consider any intergovernmental opportunity with Federal, State, and local government agencies and nonprofit conservation organizations to preserve farmlands, as well as other natural resources, that are consistent with the agricultural goals and objectives identified in this farmland preservation plan and local government comprehensive plans. For example, the County may identify opportunities to work jointly with the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust on the preservation of a farm through a purchase of an agricultural easement, or the County may work with a local government to update the County comprehensive plan to identify areas where a local government intends to amend their adopted comprehensive plan to expand the area planned for farmland preservation.

In the preparation of this plan, participating local governments agreed to a cooperative approach to planning and decision-making regarding future farmland preservation. It is recommended that such efforts continue. Efforts may include periodic meetings of officials representing each local government for the purpose of discussing land use matters or development. Such cooperative efforts increase the likelihood for coordinated farmland preservation in Ozaukee County achieving, insofar as practicable, the farmland preservation goals and objectives in all local governments involved.

Local intergovernmental cooperation increases the likelihood that a city or village and the adjacent towns may agree on policies to manage growth and development. Chapter 66 of the *Statutes* authorizes the development of boundary agreements. Establishing a defined, long-term boundary between an urbanized community planning for growth and a rural, pro-agricultural community could identify a boundary beyond which urban development would be limited or not considered. Boundary agreements help a city or village identify future lands for annexation so that service and infrastructure needs can be planned and funded, and can provide assurance to a farmer that agricultural land will not be converted to urban use, thereby encouraging investment for long-term agricultural use.

PLAN UPDATES

Section 91.16 of the *Statutes* outlines the certification process for a county farmland preservation plan. DATCP may certify a farmland preservation plan for a period that does not exceed 10 years; therefore, this farmland preservation plan must be updated at least every 10 years to remain in compliance with the law. The County may choose to update the farmland preservation plan prior to the 10-year maximum certification period, to coincide with an update to the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County. Procedures such as public participation, plan review, and plan adoption that are required for a comprehensive plan also apply to the farmland preservation plan, in accordance with Section 91.10(3) of the *Statutes*.

SUMMARY

This Chapter identifies important methods to help implement recommendations of the farmland preservation plan. These include a description of the plan adoption and amendment processes in compliance with the *Wisconsin Statutes*; the State requirement that the farmland preservation plan be consistent with the County comprehensive plan; the identification of priority programs relative to farmland preservation; and a description of a variety of farmland preservation tools and techniques that Ozaukee County farmers and local governments can utilize to protect farmlands and other valuable natural resource areas. Tools and techniques include farmland preservation area certification and zoning, conservation easements, conservation subdivision design, lot averaging, and incentive-based development methods. Implementation of the plan also includes identifying and utilizing funding and support programs described in Chapter II and Appendix E. All require intergovernmental cooperation and a commitment by County and participating local governments to implement the plan.

APPENDICES

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix A

CHAPTER 91, "FARMLAND PRESERVATION," OF THE WISCONSIN STATUTES

(This page intentionally left blank)

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

91.01

CHAPTER 91

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

91.01 91.02 91.03 91.04	SUBCHAPTER I DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS Definitions. Rule making. Intergovernmental cooperation. Department to report. SUBCHAPTER II EARMI AND RESERVATION DI ANNING	91,42 91,44 91,46 91,48 91,50	Land use in farmland preservation zoning districts; general. Permitted uses. Conditional uses. Rezoning of land out of a farmland preservation zoning district. Exemption from special assessments. SUBCHAPTER IV FARMLAND PRESERVATION AGREEMENTS
91.10 91.12 91.14 91.16 91.18 91.20	County plan required; planning grants. Certified plan. Expiration of plan certification. Certification of plan by the department. Requirements for certification of plan. Applying for certification of plan. SUBCHAPTER III FARMI AND PRESERVATION ZONING.	91.60 91.62 91.64 91.66 91.68 91.70	Farmland preservation agreements; general. Farmland preservation agreements; requirements. Applying for a farmland preservation agreement. Terminating a farmland preservation agreement. Violations of farmland preservation agreements. Farmland preservation agreements; exemption from special assessments. SUBCHAPTER V SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION
91.30 91.32 91.34 91.36 91.38 91.40	Authority to adopt. Certified ordinance. Expiration of zoning certification. Certification of zoning ordinance by the department. Requirements for certification of ordinance. Applying for certification of ordinance.	91.80 91.82 91.84 91.86	Soil and water conservation by persons claiming tax credits. Compliance monitoring. SUBCHAPTER VI AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISE AREAS Agricultural enterprise areas; general. Agricultural enterprise area; petition.

SUBCHAPTER I

DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

91.01 Definitions. In this chapter:

(1) "Accessory use" means any of the following land uses on a farm:

(a) A building, structure, or improvement that is an integral part of, or is incidental to, an agricultural use.

(b) An activity or business operation that is an integral part of, or incidental to, an agricultural use.

(c) A farm residence.

(d) A business, activity, or enterprise, whether or not associated with an agricultural use, that is conducted by the owner or operator of a farm, that requires no buildings, structures, or improvements other than those described in par. (a) or (c), that employs no more than 4 full-time employees annually, and that does not impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of the farm or of other protected farmland.

(e) Any other use that the department, by rule, identifies as an accessory use.

(1m) "Agricultural enterprise area" means an area designated in accordance with s. 91.84.

(2) "Agricultural use" means any of the following:

(a) Any of the following activities conducted for the purpose of producing an income or livelihood:

- 1. Crop or forage production.
- 2. Keeping livestock.
- 3. Beekeeping.
- 4. Nursery, sod, or Christmas tree production.
- 4m. Floriculture.
- 5. Aquaculture.
- 6. Fur farming.
- 7. Forest management.

 Enrolling land in a federal agricultural commodity payment program or a federal or state agricultural land conservation payment program.

(b) Any other use that the department, by rule, identifies as an agricultural use. (3) "Agriculture-related use" means any of the following:

(a) An agricultural equipment dealership, facility providing agricultural supplies, facility for storing or processing agricultural products, or facility for processing agricultural wastes.

(b) Any other use that the department, by rule, identifies as an agriculture-related use.

(5) "Base farm tract" means one of the following:

(a) All land, whether one parcel or 2 or more contiguous parcels, that is in a farmland preservation zoning district and that is part of a single farm on the date that the department under s. 91.36 (1) first certifies the farmland preservation zoning ordinance covering the land or on an earlier date specified in the farmland preservation zoning ordinance, regardless of any subsequent changes in the size of the farm.

(b) Any other tract that the department by rule defines as a base farm tract.

(6) "Certified farmland preservation plan" means a farmland preservation plan that is certified as determined under s. 91.12.

(7) "Certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance" means a zoning ordinance that is certified as determined under s. 91.32.

(8) "Chief elected official" means the mayor of a city or, if the city is organized under subch. I of ch. 64, the president of the council of that city, the village president of a village, the town board chairperson of a town, or the county executive of a county, or, if the county does not have a county executive, the chairperson of the county board of supervisors.

(9) "Comprehensive plan" has the meaning given in s. 66.1001 (1) (a).

(10) "Conditional use" means a use allowed under a conditional use permit, special exception, or other special zoning permission issued by a political subdivision.

(11) "County land conservation committee" means a committee created under s. 92.06 (1).

(12) "Department" means the department of agriculture, trade and consumer protection.

(13) "Farm" means all land under common ownership that is primarily devoted to agricultural use.

(14) "Farm acreage" means size of a farm in acres.

91.01 FARMLAND PRESERVATION

(15) "Farmland preservation agreement" means any of the following agreements between an owner of land and the department under which the owner agrees to restrict the use of land in return for tax credits:

(a) A farmland preservation agreement or transition area agreement entered into under s. 91.13, 2007 stats., or s. 91.14, 2007 stats.

(b) An agreement entered into under s. 91.60 (1).

(16) "Farmland preservation area" means an area that is planned primarily for agricultural use or agriculture-related use, or both, and that is one of the following:

(a) Identified as an agricultural preservation area or transition area in a farmland preservation plan described in s. 91.12 (1).

(b) Identified under s. 91.10 (1) (d) in a farmland preservation plan described in s. 91.12 (2).

(17) "Farmland preservation plan" means a plan for the preservation of farmland in a county, including an agricultural preservation plan under subch. IV of ch. 91, 2007 stats.

(18) "Farmland preservation zoning district" means any of the following:

(a) An area zoned for exclusive agricultural use under an ordinance described in s. 91.32 (1).

(b) A farmland preservation zoning district designated under s. 91.38 (1) (c) in an ordinance described in s. 91.32 (2).

(19) "Farm residence" means any of the following structures that is located on a farm:

(a) A single-family or duplex residence that is the only residential structure on the farm or is occupied by any of the following:

1. An owner or operator of the farm.

2. A parent or child of an owner or operator of the farm.

3. An individual who earns more than 50 percent of his or her gross income from the farm.

(b) A migrant labor camp that is certified under s. 103.92.

(20) "Gross farm revenues" has the meaning given in s. 71.613 (1) (g).

(20m) "Livestock" means bovine animals, equine animals, goats, poultry, sheep, swine, farm-raised deer, farm-raised game birds, camelids, ratites, and farm-raised fish.

(21) "Nonfarm residence" means a single-family or multifamily residence other than a farm residence.

(22) "Nonfarm residential acreage" means the total number of acres of all parcels on which nonfarm residences are located.

(22m) "Overlay district" means a zoning district that is superimposed on one or more other zoning districts and imposes additional restrictions on the underlying districts.

(23) "Owner" means a person who has an ownership interest in land.

(23m) "Permitted use" means a use that is allowed without a conditional use permit, special exception, or other special zoning permission.

(24) "Political subdivision" means a city, village, town, or county.

(25) "Prime farmland" means any of the following:

(a) An area with a class I or class II land capability classification as identified by the natural resources conservation service of the federal department of agriculture.

(b) Land, other than land described in par. (a), that is identified as prime farmland in a certified farmland preservation plan.

(26) "Prior nonconforming use" means a land use that does not conform with a farmland preservation zoning ordinance, but that existed lawfully before the farmland preservation zoning ordinance was enacted.

(27) "Protected farmland" means land that is located in a farmland preservation zoning district, is covered by a farmland

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats. 2

preservation agreement, or is otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development.

(28) "Taxable year" has the meaning given in s. 71.01 (12). History: 2009 a. 28.

Wisconsin's Working Lands: Securing Our Future. Matson. Wis. Law. Dec. 2009.

91.02 Rule making. (1) The department shall promulgate rules that set forth technical specifications for farmland preservation zoning maps under s. 91.38(1)(d).

(2) The department may promulgate rules for the administration of this chapter, including rules that do any of the following:

(a) Identify accessory uses under s. 91.01 (1) (e).

(b) Identify agricultural uses under s. 91.01 (2) (b).

(c) Identify agriculture-related uses under s. 91.01 (3) (b).

(d) Identify base farm tracts under s. 91.01 (5) (b).

(e) Specify requirements for certification under s. 91.18 (1)
(b).

(f) Require information in an application for certification of a farmland preservation plan or amendment under s. 91.20 (4).

(g) Specify types of ordinance amendments for which certification is required under s. 91.36 (8) (b) 3.

(h) Specify exceptions to the requirement that land in a farmland preservation zoning district be included in a farmland preservation area under s. 91.38 (1) (g).

 (i) Specify requirements for certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance under s. 91.38 (1) (i).

 (j) Require information in an application for certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment under s. 91.40 (5).

(k) Authorize additional uses in a farmland preservation zoning district under s. 91.42 (4).

(L) Authorize additional uses as permitted uses in a farmland preservation zoning district under s. 91.44 (1) (g).

(m) Authorize additional uses as conditional uses in a farmland preservation zoning district under s. 91.46 (1) (j).

(p) Require information in an application for a farmland preservation agreement under s. 91.64 (2) (h).

 (r) Prescribe procedures for compliance monitoring under s. 91.82 (3).

History: 2009 a. 28: 2011 a. 253.

91.03 Intergovernmental cooperation. State agencies shall cooperate with the department in the administration of this chapter and in other matters related to the preservation of farmland in this state. State agencies shall, to the extent feasible, cooperate in sharing and standardizing relevant information, identifying and mapping significant agricultural resources, and planning and evaluating the impact of state actions on agriculture. History: 2009 a. 28.

91.04 Department to report. At least once every 2 years, beginning not later than December 31, 2011, the department shall submit a farmland preservation report to the board of agriculture, trade and consumer protection and provide copies of the report to the department of revenue and the department of administration. The department shall prepare the report in cooperation with the department of revenue and shall include all of the following in the report:

(1) A review and analysis of farmland availability, uses, and use trends in this state, including information related to farmland conversion statewide and by county.

(2) A review and analysis of relevant information related to the farmland preservation program under this chapter and associated tax credit claims under subch. IX of ch. 71, including information related to all of the following:

(a) Participation in the program by political subdivisions and landowners.

(b) Tax credit claims by landowners, including the number of claimants, the amount of credits claimed, acreage covered by tax

3 Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

credit claims, the amount of credits claimed under zoning ordinances and under farmland preservation agreements, and relevant projections and trends.

(c) The number, identity, and location of counties with certified farmland preservation plans.

(d) Trends and developments related to certification of farmland preservation plans.

(e) The number, identity, and location of political subdivisions with certified farmland preservation zoning ordinances.

(f) Trends and developments related to certification of farmland preservation zoning ordinances.

(g) The number, nature, and location of agricultural enterprise areas.

(h) The number and location of farms covered by farmland preservation agreements, including new farmland preservation agreements, and the number and location of farms for which farmland preservation agreements have expired.

(i) Conservation compliance by landowners under s. 91.80 and compliance activities by county land conservation committees under s. 91.82.

(j) Rezoning of land out of farmland preservation zoning districts under s. 91.48.

(k) Program costs, cost trends, and cost projections.

(L) Key issues related to program performance and key recommendations, if any, for enhancing the program.

History: 2009 a. 28; 2011 a. 32.

SUBCHAPTER II

FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANNING

91.10 County plan required; planning grants. (1) By January 1, 2016, a county shall adopt a farmland preservation plan that does all of the following:

(a) States the county's policy related to farmland preservation and agricultural development, including the development of enterprises related to agriculture.

(b) Identifies, describes, and documents other development trends, plans, or needs, that may affect farmland preservation and agricultural development in the county, including trends, plans, or needs related to population and economic growth, housing, transportation, utilities, communications, business development, community facilities and services, energy, waste management, municipal expansion, and environmental preservation.

(c) Identifies, describes, and documents all of the following:

 Agricultural uses of land in the county at the time that the farmland preservation plan is adopted, including key agricultural specialities, if any.

Key agricultural resources, including available land, soil, and water resources.

Key infrastructure for agriculture, including key processing, storage, transportation, and supply facilities.

4. Significant trends in the county related to agricultural land use, agricultural production, enterprises related to agriculture, and the conversion of agricultural lands to other uses.

5. Anticipated changes in the nature, scope, location, and focus of agricultural production, processing, supply, and distribution.

Goals for agricultural development in the county, including goals related to the development of enterprises related to agriculture.

Actions that the county will take to preserve farmland and to promote agricultural development.

7m. Policies, goals, strategies, and proposed actions to increase housing density in areas that are not identified under par. (d).

 Key land use issues related to preserving farmland and to promoting agricultural development and plans for addressing those issues.

91.14

(d) Clearly identifies areas that the county plans to preserve for agricultural use and agriculture-related uses, which may include undeveloped natural resource and open space areas but may not include any area that is planned for nonagricultural development within 15 years after the date on which the plan is adopted.

(dm) Describes the rationale used to determine which areas to identify under par. (d).

(e) Includes maps that clearly delineate all areas identified under par. (d), so that a reader can easily determine whether a parcel is within an identified area.

(f) Clearly correlates the maps under par. (c) with text that describes the types of land uses planned for each area on a map.

(g) Identifies programs and other actions that the county and local governmental units within the county may use to preserve the areas identified under par. (d).

(2) If the county has a comprehensive plan, the county shall include the farmland preservation plan in its comprehensive plan and shall ensure that the farmland preservation plan is consistent with the comprehensive plan. The county may incorporate information contained in other parts of the comprehensive plan into the farmland preservation plan by reference.

(3) To adopt a farmland preservation plan under sub. (1), a county shall follow the procedures under s. 66.1001 (4) for the adoption of a comprehensive plan.

(4) The department may provide information and assistance to a county in developing a farmland preservation plan under sub. (1).

(5) A county shall notify the department before the county holds a public hearing on a proposed farmland preservation plan under sub. (1) or on any amendment to a farmland preservation plan. The county shall include a copy of the proposed farmland preservation plan or amendment in the notice. The department may review and comment on the plan or amendment.

(6) (a) From the appropriation under s. 20.115 (7) (dm) or (tm), the department may award a planning grant to a county to provide reimbursement for up to 50 percent of the county's cost of preparing a farmland preservation plan required under sub. (1). In determining priorities for awarding grants under this subsection, the department shall consider the expiration dates for plan certification under s. 91.14.

(b) The department shall enter into a contract with a county to which it awards a planning grant under par. (a) before the department distributes any grant funds to the county. In the contract, the department shall identify the costs that are eligible for reimbursement through the grant.

(c) The department may distribute grant funds under this subsection only after the county shows that it has incurred costs that are eligible for reimbursement under par. (b). The department may not distribute more than 50 percent of the amount of a grant under this subsection for a farmland preservation plan before the county submits the farmland preservation plan for certification under s. 91.16.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.12 Certified plan. The following farmland preservation plans are certified, for the purposes of this chapter and s. 71.613:

(1) An agricultural preservation plan that was certified under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., if the certification has not expired.

(2) A farmland preservation plan that was certified under s. 91.16 if the certification has not expired or been withdrawn. History: 2009 a. 28.

91.14 Expiration of plan certification. (1) Except as provided under sub. (4), the certification of a farmland preservation plan that was certified under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., expires on the

91.14 FARMLAND PRESERVATION

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

date provided in the certification or, if the certification does not provide an expiration date, on the following date:

(a) December 31, 2011, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 9 persons per square mile.

(b) December 31, 2012, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 3.75 but not more than 9 persons per square mile.

(c) December 31, 2013, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 1.75 but not more than 3.75 persons per square mile.

(d) December 31, 2014, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 0.8 but not more than 1.75 persons per square mile.

(e) December 31, 2015, for a county with an increase in population density of not more than 0.8 person per square mile.

(2) The certification of a farmland preservation plan that the department certifies under s. 91.16 expires on the date specified under s. 91.16 (2).

(3) For the purposes of sub. (1), a county's increase in population density is the number by which the county's population per square mile based on the department of administration's 2007 population estimate under s. 16.96 exceeds the county's population per square mile based on the 2000 federal census.

(4) The secretary of agriculture, trade and consumer protection may delay the date for the expiration of a county's farmland preservation plan for up to 2 years beyond the date under sub. (1) upon a written request from the county demonstrating to the secretary's satisfaction that a delay would allow the county to concurrently develop a farmland preservation plan and a comprehensive plan or an update to a comprehensive plan.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.16 Certification of plan by the department. (1) GEN-ERAL. The department may certify a farmland preservation plan or an amendment to a farmland preservation plan as provided in this section.

(2) CERTIFICATION PERIOD. (a) The department may certify a farmland preservation plan for a period that does not exceed 10 years. The department shall specify the expiration date of the certification of the farmland preservation plan in the certification.

(b) The certification of an amendment to a certified farmland preservation plan expires on the date that the certification of the farmland preservation plan expires, except that the department may treat a comprehensive revision of a certified farmland preservation plan as a new farmland preservation plan and shall specify an expiration date for the certification of the revised farmland preservation plan as provided in par. (a).

(3) SCOPE OF DEPARTMENT REVIEW. (a) The department may certify a county's farmland preservation plan or an amendment to the farmland preservation plan based on the county's certification under s. 91.20 (3), without conducting any additional review or audit.

(b) The department may do any of the following before it certifies a county's farmland preservation plan or amendment:

 Review the farmland preservation plan or amendment for compliance with s. 91.18.

2. Review and independently verify the application for certification, including the statement under s. 91.20 (3).

(4) DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION. The department shall deny a county's application for certification of a farmland preservation plan or amendment if the department finds any of the following:

(a) That the farmland preservation plan or amendment does not comply with the requirements in s. 91.18.

(b) That the application for certification does not comply with s. 91.20.

(5) WRITTEN DECISION; DEADLINE. The department shall grant or deny an application for certification under this section no more than 90 days after the day on which the county submits a complete application, unless the county agrees to an extension. The department shall issue its decision in the form required by s. 227.47 (1).

(6) CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION. The department may grant an application for certification under this section subject to conditions specified by the department in its decision under sub. (5). The department may certify a farmland preservation plan or amendment contingent upon the county board adopting the farmland preservation plan or amendment as certified.

(7) EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTIFICATION. A certification under this section takes effect on the day on which the department issues its decision, except that if the department specifies conditions under sub. (6), the certification takes effect on the day on which the department determines that the county has met the conditions.

(8) EFFECTIVENESS OF PLAN AMENDMENTS. For purposes of this chapter and s. 71.613, a certified farmland preservation plan does not include an amendment adopted after July 1, 2009, unless the department certifies the amendment.

(9) WITHDRAWAL OF CERTIFICATION. The department may withdraw a certification that it granted under sub. (3) (a) if the department finds that the farmland preservation plan materially violates the requirements under s. 91.18. History: 2009 a. 28.

91.18 Requirements for certification of plan. (1) A farmland preservation plan qualifies for certification under s. 91.16 if it complies with all of the following:

(a) The requirements in s. 91.10 (1) and (2).

(b) Any other requirements that the department specifies by rule.

(2) An amendment to a farmland preservation plan qualifies for certification under s. 91.16 if it complies with all of the requirements in sub. (1) that are relevant to the amendment and it does not cause the farmland preservation plan to violate any of the requirements in sub. (1).

History: 2009 a. 28,

91.20 Applying for certification of plan. A county seeking certification of a farmland preservation plan or amendment to a farmland preservation plan shall submit all of the following to the department in writing, along with any other relevant information that the county chooses to provide:

(1) The proposed farmland preservation plan or amendment.

(2) All of the following background information:

(a) A concise summary of the farmland preservation plan or amendment, including key changes from any previously certified farmland preservation plan.

(b) A concise summary of the process by which the farmland preservation plan or amendment was developed, including public hearings, notice to and involvement of other governmental units within the county, approval by the county, and identification of any key unresolved issues between the county and other governmental units within the county related to the farmland preservation plan or amendment.

(c) The relationship of the farmland preservation plan or amendment to any county comprehensive plan.

(3) A statement, signed by the county corporation counsel and the county planning director or chief elected official, certifying that the farmland preservation plan or amendment complies with all of the requirements in s. 91.18.

(4) Other relevant information that the department requires by rule.

History: 2009 a. 28.

SUBCHAPTER III

FARMLAND PRESERVATION ZONING
5 Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

91.30 Authority to adopt. A political subdivision may adopt and administer a farmland preservation zoning ordinance in accordance with s. 59.69, 60.61, 60.62, or 62.23. History: 2009 a. 28.

History: 2009 a. 26.

91.32 Certified ordinance. The following zoning ordinances are certified, for the purposes of this chapter and s. 71.613:

(1) An exclusive agricultural use zoning ordinance that was certified under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., if the certification has not expired or been withdrawn.

(2) A farmland preservation zoning ordinance that was certified under s. 91.36 if the certification has not expired or been withdrawn.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.34 Expiration of zoning certification. (1) Except as provided under sub. (4), the certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance that was certified under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., expires on the date provided in the certification or, if the certification does not provide an expiration date, on the following date:

(a) December 31, 2012, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 9 persons per square mile or a city, village, or town in such a county.

(b) December 31, 2013, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 3.75 but not more than 9 persons per square mile or a city, village, or town in such a county.

(c) December 31, 2014, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 1.75 but not more than 3.75 persons per square mile or a city, village, or town in such a county.

(d) December 31, 2015, for a county with an increase in population density of more than 0.8 but not more than 1.75 persons per square mile or a city, village, or town in such a county.

(e) December 31, 2016, for a county with an increase in population density of not more than 0.8 person per square mile or a city, village, or town in such a county.

(2) The certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance that the department certifies under s. 91.36 expires on the date specified under s. 91.36 (2).

(3) For the purposes of sub. (1), a county's increase in population density is the number by which the county's population per square mile based on the department of administration's 2007 population estimate under s. 16.96 exceeds the county's population per square mile based on the 2000 federal census.

(4) The secretary of agriculture, trade and consumer protection may delay the date for the expiration of a political subdivision's farmland preservation zoning ordinance for up to 2 years beyond the date under sub. (1) upon a written request from the political subdivision demonstrating to the secretary's satisfaction that a delay would allow the political subdivision to concurrently develop a farmland preservation zoning ordinance and a comprehensive plan or an update to a comprehensive plan.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.36 Certification of zoning ordinance by the department. (1) GENERAL. The department may certify a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or an amendment to a farmland preservation zoning ordinance as provided in this section.

(2) CERTIFICATION PERIOD. (a) The department may certify a farmland preservation zoning ordinance for a period that does not exceed 10 years. The department shall specify the expiration date of the certification of the farmland preservation zoning ordinance in the certification.

(b) The certification of an amendment to a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance expires on the date that the certification of the farmland preservation zoning ordinance expires, except that the department may treat a comprehensive revision of a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance as a new farmland preservation zoning ordinance and specify an expiration date for the certification of the revised farmland preservation zoning ordinance as provided in par. (a).

91.36

(3) SCOPE OF DEPARTMENT REVIEW. (a) The department may certify a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment to a farmland preservation zoning ordinance based on statements submitted under s. 91.40 (3) and (4), without conducting any additional review or audit.

(b) The department may do any of the following before it certifies a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment:

 Review the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment for compliance with the requirements under s. 91.38.

2. Review and independently verify the application for certification, including the statements under s. 91.40 (3) and (4).

(4) DENIAL OF CERTIFICATION. The department shall deny an application for certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment if the department finds any of the following:

(a) That the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment does not comply with the requirements in s. 91.38.

(b) That the application for certification does not comply with s, 91.40.

(5) WRITTEN DECISION; DEADLINE. The department shall grant or deny an application for certification under this section no more than 90 days after the day on which the political subdivision submits a complete application, unless the political subdivision agrees to an extension. The department shall issue its decision in the form required by s. 227.47 (1).

(6) CONDITIONAL CERTIFICATION. The department may grant an application for certification under this section subject to conditions specified by the department in its decision under sub. (5). The department may certify a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment contingent upon the political subdivision adopting the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment as certified.

(7) EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTIFICATION. A certification under this section takes effect on the day on which the department issues the certification, except that if the department specifies conditions under sub. (6), the certification takes effect on the day on which the department determines that the political subdivision has met the conditions.

(8) AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCES; CERTIFICATION. (a) Except as provided in par. (b), an amendment to a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance is automatically considered to be certified as part of the certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

(b) An amendment to a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance that is one of the following and that is adopted after July 1, 2009, is not automatically considered to be certified:

 An amendment that is a comprehensive revision of a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

An amendment that extends coverage of a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance to a town that was not previously covered.

3. An amendment of a type specified by the department by rule that may materially affect compliance of the certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance with the requirements under s. 91.38.

(c) The department may withdraw certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance if, as a result of an amendment adopted after July 1, 2009, the amended farmland preservation zoning ordinance fails to comply with the requirements under s. 91.38. This paragraph applies regardless of whether the farmland preservation zoning ordinance was originally certified under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., or under this section.

(d) A political subdivision shall notify the department in writing whenever the political subdivision adopts an amendment that is described in par. (b) 1. to 3. to a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance. The political subdivision shall include a copy

91.36 FARMLAND PRESERVATION

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats. 6

of the amendment in the notice. This paragraph does not apply to an amendment that rezones land out of a farmland preservation zoning district.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.38 Requirements for certification of ordinance. (1) A farmland preservation zoning ordinance does not qualify for certification under s. 91.36 unless all of the following apply:

(a) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance includes jurisdictional, organizational, and enforcement provisions that are necessary for proper administration.

(c) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance clearly designates farmland preservation zoning districts in which land uses are limited in compliance with s. 91.42.

(d) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance includes maps that clearly delineate each farmland preservation zoning district, so that a reader can easily determine whether a parcel is within a farmland preservation zoning district; that are correlated to the text under par. (e); and that comply with technical specifications that the department establishes by rule.

(e) The text of the farmland preservation zoning ordinance clearly describes the types of land uses authorized in each farmland preservation zoning district.

(f) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance is substantially consistent with a certified farmland preservation plan.

(g) Except as provided by the department by rule, land is not included in a farmland preservation zoning district unless the land is included in a farmland preservation area identified in the county certified farmland preservation plan.

(h) If an overlay district, such as an environmental corridor, is superimposed on a farmland preservation zoning district, all of the following apply:

 The farmland preservation zoning ordinance clearly identifies the overlay district as such.

 The overlay district is shown on the maps under par. (d) in a way that allows a reader to easily identify the underlying farmland preservation zoning district and its boundaries.

 The overlay district does not remove land use restrictions from the underlying farmland preservation zoning district.

(i) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance complies with any other requirements that the department specifies by rule.

(2) An amendment to a farmland preservation zoning ordinance qualifies for certification under s. 91,36 if it complies with all of the requirements in sub. (1) that are relevant to the amendment and it does not cause the farmland preservation zoning ordinance to violate any of the requirements in sub. (1).

(3) The limits on land uses in farmland preservation districts under s. 91,42 are minimum standards for certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance under s. 91,36.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.40 Applying for certification of ordinance. A political subdivision seeking certification of a farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment to a farmland preservation zoning ordinance shall submit all of the following to the department in writing, along with any other relevant information that the political subdivision chooses to provide:

 The complete farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment proposed for certification.

(2) All of the following background information:

(a) A concise summary of the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment, including key changes from any previously certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

(b) A concise summary of the process by which the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment was developed, including public hearings, notice to and involvement of other governmental units, approval by the political subdivision, and identification of any key unresolved issues with other governmental units related to the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment.

(c) A description of the relationship of the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment to the county certified farmland preservation plan, including any material inconsistencies between the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment and the county certified farmland preservation plan.

(3) A statement, signed by the county planning director or the chief elected official, certifying that the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment complies with s. 91,38 (1) (f) and (g).

(4) A statement, signed by the applicant's attorney or chief elected official, certifying that the farmland preservation zoning ordinance or amendment complies with all applicable requirements in s. 91.38.

(5) Other relevant information that the department requires by rule.

History: 2009 a. 28; 2011 u. 258.

91.42 Land use in farmland preservation zoning districts; general. A farmland preservation zoning ordinance does not qualify for certification under s. 91.36, if the farmland preservation zoning ordinance allows a land use in a farmland preservation zoning district other than the following land uses:

(1) Uses identified as permitted uses in s. 91.44.

(2) Uses identified as conditional uses in s. 91,46.

(3) Prior nonconforming uses, subject to s. 59.69 (10), 60.61
 (5), or 62.23 (7) (h).

(4) Other uses allowed by the department by rule. History: 2009 a. 28.

91.44 Permitted uses. (1) Except as provided in s. 84.01 (34), a farmland preservation zoning ordinance does not comply with s. 91.42 if the farmland preservation zoning ordinance allows as a permitted use in a farmland preservation zoning district a land use other than the following land uses:

(a) Agricultural uses.

(b) Accessory uses.

(c) Agriculture-related uses.

(d) Nonfarm residences constructed in a rural residential cluster in accordance with an approval of the cluster as a conditional use under s. 91.46 (1) (e).

(e) Undeveloped natural resource and open space areas.

(f) A transportation, utility, communication, or other use that is required under state or federal law to be located in a specific place or that is authorized to be located in a specific place under a state or federal law that preempts the requirement of a conditional use permit for that use.

(g) Other uses identified by the department by rule.

(2) The department may promulgate rules imposing additional limits on the permitted uses that may be allowed in a farmland preservation zoning district in order for a farmland preservation zoning ordinance to comply with s. 91.42. History: 2009 a.28.

91.46 Conditional uses. (1) GENERAL. Except as provided in s. 84.01 (34), a farmland preservation zoning ordinance does not comply with s. 91.42 if the farmland preservation zoning ordinance allows as a conditional use in a farmland preservation zoning district a land use other than the following land uses:

(a) Agricultural uses.

- (b) Accessory uses.
- (c) Agriculture-related uses.

(d) Nonfarm residences that qualify under sub. (2) or that meet more restrictive standards in the farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

(e) Nonfarm residential clusters that qualify under sub. (3) or that meet more restrictive standards in the farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

7 Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION 91.48

(f) Transportation, communications, pipeline, electric transmission, utility, or drainage uses that qualify under sub. (4).

(g) Governmental, institutional, religious, or nonprofit community uses, other than uses covered by par. (f), that qualify under sub. (5).

(h) Nonmetallic mineral extraction that qualifies under sub. (6).

 (i) Oil and gas exploration or production that is licensed by the department of natural resources under subch. II of ch. 295.

(j) Other uses allowed by the department by rule.

(1m) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS. The department may promulgate rules imposing additional limits on the conditional uses that may be allowed in a farmland preservation zoning district in order for a farmland preservation zoning ordinance to comply with s. 91,42.

(2) NONFARM RESIDENCES. A proposed new nonfarm residence or a proposal to convert a farm residence to a nonfarm residence through a change in occupancy qualifies for the purposes of sub. (1) (d) if the political subdivision determines that all of the following apply:

(a) The ratio of nonfarm residential acreage to farm acreage on the base farm tract on which the residence is or will be located will not be greater than 1 to 20 after the residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.

(b) There will not be more than 4 dwelling units in nonfarm residences, nor, for a new nonfarm residence, more than 5 dwelling units in residences of any kind, on the base farm tract after the residence is constructed or converted to a nonfarm residence.

(c) The location and size of the proposed nonfarm residential parcel, and, for a new nonfarm residence, the location of the nonfarm residence on that nonfarm residential parcel, will not do any of the following:

 Convert prime farmland from agricultural use or convert land previously used as cropland, other than a woodlot, from agricultural use if on the farm there is a reasonable alternative location or size for a nonfarm residential parcel or nonfarm residence.

Significantly impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.

(3) NONFARM RESIDENTIAL CLUSTER. A political subdivision may issue one conditional use permit that covers more than one nonfarm residence in a qualifying nonfarm residential cluster. A nonfarm residential cluster qualifies for the purposes of sub. (1) (e) if all of the following apply:

(a) The parcels on which the nonfarm residences would be located are contiguous.

(b) The political subdivision imposes legal restrictions on the construction of the nonfarm residences so that if all of the nonfarm residences were constructed, each would satisfy the requirements under sub. (2).

(4) TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, PIPELINE, ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION, UTILITY, OR DRAINAGE USE. A transportation, communications, pipeline, electric transmission, utility, or drainage use qualifies for the purposes of sub. (1) (f) if the political subdivision determines that all of the following apply:

(a) The use and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are consistent with the purposes of the farmland preservation zoning district.

(b) The use and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are reasonable and appropriate, considering alternative locations, or are specifically approved under state or federal law.

(c) The use is reasonably designed to minimize conversion of land, at and around the site of the use, from agricultural use or open space use.

(d) The use does not substantially impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels of land that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use. (e) Construction damage to land remaining in agricultural use is minimized and repaired, to the extent feasible.

(5) GOVERNMENTAL. INSTITUTIONAL, RELIGIOUS, OR NONPROFIT COMMUNITY USE. A governmental, institutional, religious, or nonprofit community use qualifies for the purposes of sub. (1) (g) if the political subdivision determines that all of the following apply:

(a) The use and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are consistent with the purposes of the farmland preservation zoning district.

(b) The use and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are reasonable and appropriate, considering alternative locations, or are specifically approved under state or federal law.

(c) The use is reasonably designed to minimize the conversion of land, at and around the site of the use, from agricultural use or open space use.

(d) The use does not substantially impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels of land that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use.

(e) Construction damage to land remaining in agricultural use is minimized and repaired, to the extent feasible.

(6) NONMETALLIC MINERAL EXTRACTION. Nonmetallic mineral extraction qualifies for the purposes of sub. (1) (h) if the political subdivision determines that all of the following apply:

(a) The operation complies with subch. I of ch. 295 and rules promulgated under that subchapter, with applicable provisions of the local ordinance under s. 295.13 or 295.14, and with any applicable requirements of the department of transportation concerning the restoration of nonmetallic mining sites.

(b) The operation and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are consistent with the purposes of the farmland preservation zoning district.

(c) The operation and its location in the farmland preservation zoning district are reasonable and appropriate, considering alternative locations outside the farmland preservation zoning district, or are specifically approved under state or federal law.

(d) The operation is reasonably designed to minimize the conversion of land around the extraction site from agricultural use or open space use.

(e) The operation does not substantially impair or limit the current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels of land that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use.

(f) The farmland preservation zoning ordinance requires the owner to restore the land to agricultural use, consistent with any required locally approved reclamation plan, when extraction is completed.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.48 Rezoning of land out of a farmland preservation zoning district. (1) A political subdivision with a certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance may rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district without having the rezoning certified under s. 91.36, if the political subdivision finds all of the following, after public hearing:

(a) The land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.

(b) The rezoning is consistent with any applicable comprehensive plan.

(c) The rezoning is substantially consistent with the county certified farmland preservation plan.

(d) The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of surrounding parcels of land that are zoned for or legally restricted to agricultural use.

(2) A political subdivision shall by March 1 of each year provide to the department a report of the number of acres that the political subdivision has rezoned out of a farmland preservation

91.48 FARMLAND PRESERVATION

zoning district under sub. (1) during the previous year and a map that clearly shows the location of those acres.

(3) A political subdivision that is not a county shall by March 1 of each year submit a copy of the information that it reports to the department under sub. (2) to the county in which the political subdivision is located.

(4) If a political subdivision fails to comply with sub. (2), the department may withdraw the certification granted under s. 91.06, 2007 stats., or under s. 91.36 for the political subdivision's farmland preservation zoning ordinance.

History: 2009 a. 28; 2011 a. 32; 2011 a. 257 s. 56.

91.50 Exemption from special assessments. (1) Except as provided in sub. (3), no political subdivision, special purpose district, or other local governmental entity may levy a special assessment for sanitary sewers or water against land in agricultural use, if the land is located in a farmland preservation zoning district.

(2) A political subdivision, special purpose district, or other local governmental entity may deny the use of improvements for which the special assessment is levied to land that is exempt from the assessment under sub. (1).

(3) The exemption under sub. (1) does not apply to an assessment that an owner voluntarily pays, after the assessing authority provides notice of the exemption under sub. (1).

History: 2009 a. 28.

SUBCHAPTER IV

FARMLAND PRESERVATION AGREEMENTS

91.60 Farmland preservation agreements; general. (1) AGREEMENTS AUTHORIZED. The department may enter into a farmland preservation agreement that complies with s. 91.62 with the owner of land that is eligible under sub. (2).

(2) ELIGIBLE LAND. Land is eligible if all of the following apply:

(a) The land is operated as part of a farm that produced at least \$6,000 in gross farm revenues during the taxable year preceding the year in which the owner applies for a farmland preservation agreement or a total of at least \$18,000 in gross farm revenues during the last 3 taxable years preceding the year in which the owner applies for a farmland preservation agreement.

(b) The land is located in a farmland preservation area identified in a certified farmland preservation plan.

(c) The land is in an agricultural enterprise area designated under s. 91.84.

(3) PRIOR AGREEMENTS. (a) Except as provided in par. (c) or s. 91.66, a farmland preservation agreement entered into before July 1, 2009, remains in effect for the term specified in the agreement and under the terms that were agreed upon when the agreement was last created, extended, or renewed.

(b) The department may not extend or renew a farmland preservation agreement entered into before July 1, 2009.

(c) The department and an owner of land who entered into a farmland preservation agreement before July 1, 2009, may agree to modify the farmland preservation agreement in order to allow the owner to claim the tax credit under s. 71.613 rather than the tax credit for which the owner would otherwise be eligible. History: 2009 a. 28.

mstory. 2009 a. 20.

91.62 Farmland preservation agreements; requirements. (1) CONTENTS. The department may not enter into a farmland preservation agreement unless the agreement does all of the following:

(a) Specifies a term of at least 15 years.

(b) Includes a correct legal description of the tract of land covered by the farmland preservation agreement.

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

(c) Includes provisions that restrict the tract of land to the following uses:

1. Agricultural uses and accessory uses.

2. Undeveloped natural resource and open space uses.

(2) FORM. The department shall specify a form for farmland preservation agreements that complies with s. 59.43 (2m).

(3) EFFECTIVENESS. A farmland preservation agreement takes effect when it is signed by all owners of the land covered by the farmland preservation agreement and by the department.

(4) RECORDING. The department shall provide a copy of a signed farmland preservation agreement to a person designated by the signing owners and shall promptly present the signed agreement to the register of deeds for the county in which the land is located for recording.

(5) CHANGE OF OWNERSHIP. A farmland preservation agreement is binding on a person who purchases land during the term of a farmland preservation agreement that covers the land. History: 2009 a. 28.

91.64 Applying for a farmland preservation agreement. (1) SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION. An owner who wishes to enter into a farmland preservation agreement shall submit an application signed by the owner and each person required to be identified under sub. (2) (f), on a form provided by the department, to the county clerk of the county in which the land is located.

(2) CONTENTS OF APPLICATION. A person submitting an application under sub. (1) shall include all of the following in the application:

(a) The name and address of each person who has an ownership interest in the land proposed for coverage by the agreement.

(b) The location of the land proposed for coverage, indicated by street address, global positioning system coordinates, or township, range, and section.

(c) The legal description of the land proposed for coverage.

(d) A map or aerial photograph of the land proposed for coverage, showing parcel boundaries, residences and other structures, and significant natural features.

(e) Information showing that the land proposed for coverage is eligible under s. 91.60 (2).

(f) A description of every existing mortgage, easement, and lien, other than liens on growing crops, on land proposed for coverage, including the name and address of the person holding the lien, mortgage, or easement.

(h) Any other information required by the department by rule.

(i) Any fee under sub. (2m).

(2m) COUNTY PROCESSING FEE. A county may charge a reasonable fee for processing an application for a farmland preservation agreement.

(3) COUNTY REVIEW. (a) A county shall review an application under sub. (2) to determine whether the land proposed for coverage meets the requirements under s. 91.60 (2) (b) and (c). The county shall provide its findings to the applicant in writing within 60 days after the day on which the county clerk receives a complete application.

(b) If the county finds under par. (a) that the land proposed for coverage meets the requirements under s. 91.60 (2) (b) and (c), the county shall promptly send all of the following to the department, along with any other comments that the county chooses to provide:

1. The original application, including all of the information provided with the application.

2. A copy of the county's findings.

(4) DEPARTMENT ACTION ON APPLICATION. (a) The department may prepare a farmland preservation agreement that complies with s. 91.62 and enter into the farmland preservation agreement under s. 91.60 (1) based on a complete application and on county findings under sub, (3) (b).

1:

9 Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats.

FARMLAND PRESERVATION

91.84

(b) The department may decline to enter into a farmland preservation agreement for any of the following reasons:

1. The application is incomplete.

2. The land is not eligible land under s. 91.60 (2). History: 2009 a. 28; 2013 a. 20.

91.66 Terminating a farmland preservation agreement. (1) The department may terminate a farmland preservation agreement or release land from a farmland preservation agreement at any time if all of the following apply:

(a) All of the owners of land covered by the farmland preservation agreement consent to the termination or release, in writing.

(b) The department finds that the termination or release will not impair or limit agricultural use of other protected farmland.

(c) The owners of the land pay to the department, for each acre or portion thereof released from the farmland preservation agreement, a conversion fee equal to 3 times the per acre value, for the year in which the farmland preservation agreement is terminated or the land is released, of the highest value category of tillable cropland in the city, village, or town in which the land is located, as specified by the department of revenue under s. 73.03 (2a).

(1m) All conversion fees received under sub. (1) (c) shall be deposited in the working lands fund.

(2) The department shall provide a copy of its decision to terminate a farmland preservation agreement or release land from a farmland preservation agreement to a person designated by the owners of the land and shall present a copy of the decision to the register of deeds for the county in which the land is located for recording.

History: 2009 a. 28,

91.68 Violations of farmland preservation agreements. (1) The department may bring an action in circuit court to do any of the following:

(a) Enforce a farmland preservation agreement.

(b) Restrain, by temporary or permanent injunction, a change in land use that violates a farmland preservation agreement.

(c) Seek a civil forfeiture for a change in land use that violates a farmland preservation agreement.

(2) A forfeiture under sub. (1) (c) may not exceed twice the fair market value of the land covered by the agreement at the time of the violation.

History: 2009 a. 28.

91.70 Farmland preservation agreements; exemption from special assessments. (1) Except as provided in sub. (3), no political subdivision, special purpose district, or other local governmental entity may levy a special assessment for sanitary sewers or water against land in agricultural use, if the land is covered by a farmland preservation agreement.

(2) A political subdivision, special purpose district or other local governmental entity may deny the use of improvements for which the special assessment is levied to land that is exempt from the assessment under sub. (1).

(3) The exemption under sub. (1) does not apply to an assessment that an owner voluntarily pays, after the assessing authority provides notice of the exemption under sub. (1).

History: 2009 a. 28.

SUBCHAPTER V

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

91.80 Soil and water conservation by persons claiming tax credits. An owner claiming farmland preservation tax credits under s. 71.613 shall comply with applicable land and water conservation standards promulgated by the department under ss. 92.05 (3) (c) and (k), 92.14 (8), and 281.16 (3) (b) and (c). History: 2009 a. 28.

91.82 Compliance monitoring. (1) COUNTY RESPONSIBIL-ITY. (a) A county land conservation committee shall monitor compliance with s. 91.80.

(b) For the purpose of par. (a), a county land conservation committee shall inspect each farm for which the owner claims farmland preservation tax credits under subch. IX of ch. 71 at least once every 4 years.

(c) For the purpose of par. (a), a county land conservation committee may do any of the following:

 Inspect land that is covered by a farmland preservation agreement or farmland preservation zoning and that is in agricultural use.

Require an owner to certify, not more than annually, that the owner complies with s. 91.80.

(d) At least once every 4 years, the department shall review each county land conservation committee's compliance with par. (b).

(2) NOTICE OF NONCOMPLIANCE. (a) A county land conservation committee shall issue a written notice of noncompliance to an owner if the committee finds that the owner has done any of the following:

1. Failed to comply with s. 91.80.

2. Failed to permit a reasonable inspection under sub, (1) (c)

Failed to certify compliance as required under sub. (1) (c)
 2.

(b) A county land conservation committee shall provide to the department of revenue a copy of each notice of noncompliance issued under par. (a).

(c) If a county land conservation committee determines that an owner has corrected the failure described in a notice of noncompliance under par. (a), it shall withdraw the notice of noncompliance and notify the owner and the department of revenue of the withdrawal.

(3) PROCEDURE. The department may promulgate rules prescribing procedures for the administration of this section by land conservation committees. History: 2009 a. 28.

SUBCHAPTER VI

AGRICULTURAL ENTERPRISE AREAS

91.84 Agricultural enterprise areas; general. (1) DES-IGNATION. (a) 1. The department may by order designate agricultural enterprise areas targeted for agricultural preservation and development.

The department may by order modify or terminate the designation of an agricultural enterprise area.

(b) Subject to par. (c), the department may designate agricultural enterprise areas with a combined area of not more than 1,000,000 acres of land.

(c) Before January 1, 2012, the department may designate not more than 15 agricultural enterprise areas with a combined area of not more than 200,000 acres of land.

(e) The department may not designate an area as an agricultural enterprise area unless all of the following apply:

1. The department receives a petition requesting the designation and the petition complies with s. 91.86.

 The parcels in the area are contiguous. Parcels that are only separated by a lake, stream, or transportation or utility rightof-way are contiguous for the purposes of this subdivision.

 The area is located entirely in a farmland preservation area identified in a certified farmland preservation plan.

91.84 FARMLAND PRESERVATION

Updated 11-12 Wis. Stats. 10

5. The land in the area is primarily in agricultural use.

(f) In designating agricultural areas under this subsection, the department shall give preference to areas that include at least 1,000 acres of land.

(1m) PUBLICATION OF ORDER. The department shall publish a notice of an order designating, modifying, or terminating an agricultural enterprise area, including a general description of the towns affected by the order, in the official state newspaper.

(2m) EFFECTIVENESS OF PRIOR DESIGNATIONS. A rule designating an agricultural enterprise area under s. 91.84 (2), 2009 stats., remains in effect until December 31, 2012.

(3) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION. The designation of an area under sub. (1) allows owners of eligible land within the area to enter into farmland preservation agreements with the department. If the department modifies or terminates the designation of an area under sub. (1) and that modification or termination results in land covered by a farmland preservation agreement no longer being located in a designated area, the farmland preservation agreement remains in effect for the remainder of its term, but the department may not extend or renew the farmland preservation agreement.

(4) MAP. In an order designating an agricultural enterprise area, the department shall include a map that clearly shows the boundaries of the proposed agricultural enterprise area so that a reader can easily determine whether a parcel of land is located within the agricultural enterprise area. The department shall make the map available on its Internet site.

(5) EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDERS. The designation of an agricultural enterprise area takes effect on January 1 of the calendar year following the year in which the order designating the area is published, unless the order specifies a later effective date. An order modifying or terminating the designation of an agricultural enterprise area takes effect upon publication under sub. (1m).

History: 2009 a. 28; 2011 a. 253.

Cross Reference: See also ch. ATCP 53, Wis. adm. code.

91.86 Agricultural enterprise area; petition. (1) DEFINI-TION. In this section, "eligible farm" means a farm that produced at least \$6,000 in gross farm revenues during the taxable year preceding the year in which a petition is filed requesting the department to designate an area in which the farm is located as an agricultural enterprise area or a total of at least \$18,000 in gross farm revenues during the 3 taxable years preceding the year in which a petition is filed. (2) PETITIONERS. (a) The department may consider a petition requesting that it designate an area as an agricultural enterprise area if all of the following jointly file the petition:

1. Each political subdivision in which any part of the proposed agricultural enterprise area is located.

2. Owners of at least 5 eligible farms located in the area.

(b) Each petitioner under par. (a) who is an individual shall sign the petition. For a petitioner that is not an individual, an authorized officer or representative shall sign the petition.

(3) CONTENTS OF PETITION. (a) The department may not approve a petition requesting that it designate an area as an agricultural enterprise area unless the petition contains all of the following:

 The correct legal name and principal address of each petitioner.

A summary of the petition that includes the purpose and rationale for the petition.

A map that clearly shows the boundaries of the proposed agricultural enterprise area so that a reader can easily determine whether a parcel of land is located within the proposed area.

4. Information showing that the proposed agricultural enterprise area meets the requirements under s. 91.84 (1) (e).

 A clear description of current land uses in the proposed agricultural enterprise area, including current agricultural uses, agriculture related uses, transportation, utility, energy, and communication uses, and undeveloped natural resource and open space uses.

6. A clear description of the agricultural land use and development goals for the proposed agricultural enterprise area, including proposed agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses, and relevant transportation, utility, energy, and communication uses.

 A plan for achieving the goals under subd. 6., including any planned investments, grants, development incentives, cooperative agreements, land or easement purchases, land donations, and promotion and public outreach activities.

 A description of any current or proposed land use controls in the proposed agricultural enterprise area, including farmland preservation agreements.

(b) Petitioners under sub. (2) may include in the petition the names and addresses of other persons who propose to cooperate in achieving the goals under par. (a) 6.

History: 2009 a. 28, 276.

Appendix B

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLANS FOR AMENDING THE OZAUKEE COUNTY MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND FOR THE OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN (This page intentionally left blank)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN FOR AMENDING THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY December 7, 2011

Introduction and Background

In 1999, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted a comprehensive planning law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the *Wisconsin Statutes*. On April 2, 2008, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted the *Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035*. The comprehensive plan was prepared in accordance with a public participation plan adopted by the County Board on December 1, 2004 that indicated the steps to be followed to foster public participation in the preparation of the comprehensive plan. Under Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*, future amendments to the comprehensive plan must also be carried out in accordance with adopted public participation procedures designed to promote public participation in the amendment process. Such procedures are set forth in this document.

Need for Citizen Participation

Citizens participating in government decision-making are fundamental to our system of governance. While it is true that our government officials are elected to represent citizens, it is also true that elected officials need to interact with the public on an ongoing basis if their representation is to be meaningful. Regular and continuing involvement in government decision-making is the very basis for the idea of citizenship.

Citizens and interest groups are the source of tremendous creativity, and their creativity and comments will help produce better planning decisions. Because the decisions represented by Ozaukee County's comprehensive plan and future amendments will help influence what Ozaukee County will look like for many years to come, public participation is critical.

Public Participation Methods for Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

The County will provide opportunities for the public review of materials describing all proposed amendments to the comprehensive plan, including the following:

- Printed copies of materials describing proposed plan amendments will be made available at the following locations:
 - Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department 121 West Main Street, P.O. Box 994 Port Washington, WI 53074-0994 262-238-8257
 - Public libraries serving Ozaukee County
- Printed or electronic copies of materials describing proposed amendments will be provided to all units and agencies of government and other parties listed in Section 66.1001(4)(b).
- Electronic copies of materials describing proposed amendments will be posted on the County website: <u>http://www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningParks Planning.asp</u>.

The Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board will hold a public hearing on all proposed amendments to the comprehensive plan. The hearing will include a presentation describing the proposed plan amendment and provide an opportunity for the public to comment orally or to submit written comments on the proposed amendment. The Comprehensive Planning Board will take the public testimony into account in its deliberations and actions on the proposed plan amendment.

The public hearing will be preceded by a Class 1 notice that is published at least 30 days before the hearing is held. In accordance with Section 66.1001(4)(d), the notice will include the date, time, and place of the hearing; a brief summary of the proposed comprehensive plan amendment; a person who may be contacted for additional information about the proposed plan amendment; and information regarding where and when the proposed plan amendment may be inspected before the hearing and how a copy of the proposed plan amendment may be obtained.

Provisions for Open Discussion

Ozaukee County will ensure that public meetings allow for an open discussion of the relevant issues at hand and allow for appropriate testimony. When public meetings or hearings are conducted, Ozaukee County will make every effort to ensure those who choose to participate in the planning process have the opportunity to have their opinions heard. To accomplish this, the following procedures will be followed:

- An agenda will be established that clearly defines the purpose of each public meeting or hearing, the items to be discussed, and any actions that may be taken. Agendas will be officially posted and sent to the local media.
- The scheduled date, time, and place will be convenient to encourage maximum participation by County residents and other interested parties.
- A clearly identifiable facilitator or chair will conduct the meeting or hearing in an orderly fashion to ensure that all attendees have an opportunity to offer comments, discuss issues, or provide testimony.
- The facilitator or chair will provide opening remarks that clearly outline the purpose of the meeting or hearing, describe procedures attendees should use during the meeting or hearing when offering comment, and describe how the public comment will be used.
- As appropriate, an overview of amendment document or proposal to be considered will be discussed.
- All persons attending the meeting or hearing who desire to participate should be allowed to do so. However, specific factors, such as the meeting or hearing purpose, number in attendance, time considerations, or future opportunities to participate, may require that appropriate constraints be applied. These constraints will be clearly outlined by the facilitator or chair if the need arises.
- Summaries or minutes of meetings or hearings will be prepared and made available as soon as possible following the meeting or hearing via the County's website: <u>www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/</u><u>PlanningParks/PlanningParks_FarmlandPres_Plan.asp</u> or <u>www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/minutes/Index.html</u>
- Special arrangements will be made under the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) with sufficient advance notice.

Opportunity for Written Comments

Detailed comments can sometimes be better expressed in written format. To encourage the submittal of written comments, the following procedures will be followed:

- All meeting and hearing notices will include the name, address and e-mail address (if applicable) of a person(s) to whom written comments should be sent, along with any deadlines for submitting comments.
- At public meetings or hearings, the facilitator or chair will clearly announce any deadline for submitting written comments, if such comments are allowed subsequent to the meeting or hearing.
- Persons speaking or testifying will be encouraged to concisely express their comments and/or provide specific details in written format.
- The County website will also provide residents with the opportunity to e-mail comments.

Consideration of Public Comments

The following procedures will be followed to ensure that decision-makers have the opportunity to consider public comments:

- Time will be reserved subsequent to the close of a meeting, hearing, or comment deadline and prior to the actual decision or recommendation being made to ensure that decision-makers can adequately review all relevant materials or comments.
- The record (written comments or testimony, tape recordings, or minutes) of hearings and meetings will be compiled by County staff and made available to decision makers for their review and consideration prior to a recommendation or decision being made.
- The Comprehensive Planning Board and Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors will consider public comments in making decisions in the best interest of the entire County.

Comprehensive Planning Board Recommendation

Following the public hearing, the Comprehensive Planning Board will make a recommendation to the County Board to approve, deny, or modify the proposed amendment. The Board/Committee's recommendation will be in the form of a resolution approved by a majority of the full membership of the Board/Committee.

County Board Action

Following Comprehensive Planning Board action, the County Board will consider the amendment and the Comprehensive Planning Board's recommendation and approve, deny, or refer the proposed amendment back to the Comprehensive Planning Board. If approved, County Board approval will be in the form of an ordinance adopted by a majority of the full membership of the Board.

Distribution of Plan Amendment

If approved by the County Board, printed or electronic copies of the amendment will be sent by the County Clerk to the parties listed in Section 66.1001(4)(b) of the *Statutes*. Plan amendments may be distributed by e-mail to the required parties.

Optional Procedures

The Comprehensive Planning Board, at its option, may approve additional public participation procedures or a separately-documented public participation plan to provide for public informational meetings, the formation of advisory committees, the conduct of public opinion surveys, and/or other procedures to obtain public input on a proposed plan amendment.

RESOLUTION NO. 11-49

ADOPTING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES FOR AMENDING THE MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes, all units of government which enact or amend zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances must adopt a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County adopted a comprehensive plan under the authority of and procedures established by Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes on April 2, 2008; and

WHEREAS, Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the Wisconsin Statutes requires that the County Board of Supervisors adopt written procedures designed to foster public participation during the preparation or amendment of a comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted written public participation procedures for the development of the *Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County:* 2035 by Resolution 04-58 on December 1, 2004; and

WHEREAS, the revised public participation procedures for amending the *Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County* provides the Comprehensive Planning Board, at its option, to approve additional public participation procedures or a separately-documented public participation plan to provide for public informational meetings, the formation of advisory committees, the conduct of public opinion surveys, and/or other procedures to obtain public input on a proposed plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors believes that regular, meaningful public involvement in the comprehensive planning process is important to assure that the comprehensive plan reflects input from the public; and

WHEREAS, a public participation plan has been developed that includes written procedures designed to foster public participation in the comprehensive plan amendment process.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Public Participation Plan for Amending the *Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County* to fulfill the requirements of Section 66.1001(4)(a) of the *Wisconsin Statutes*.

Dated at Port Washington, Wisconsin, this 7th day of December, 2011.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

I, Julianne B. Winkelhorst, County Clerk for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 11-49, adopted by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors on December 7, 2011.

is a true and confect copy of Resolution No.	j Cymma O.
opted by the Ozaukee County Board of	Robert T. V
s on December 7, 2011.	Glenn F. St
Juliane B. Wintelhost	
7) Julianne B. Winkelhorst	
Ozaukee County Clerk	• •
Adopted Vote: Ayes - 28	
Nays - 0	

Absent - 3

COMPREHENSIVE PLANN	ING BO	DARD		
	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Thomas H. Richard				Х
Timothy F. Kaul	Х			
Alan P. Kletti	Х			
Cynthia G. Bock	Х			
Robert T. Walerstein	Х	1.124.2		
Glenn F. Stumof (alt.)	Х			



Public Participation Plan

for the

Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan

WHY DOES OZAUKEE COUNTY NEED A FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN? In 2009, the State of Wisconsin passed the Working Lands Initiative Legislation, which completely overhauled the State's farmland preservation program.

According to Chapter 91 of WI State Statutes, one of the requirements of the legislation is that all counties must complete a farmland preservation plan. Ozaukee County must complete its plan by the end of 2011. The plan will help the County develop strategies for balancing growth with agricultural land preservation.

WHY SHOULD WE BE CONCERNED WITH THE PRESERVATION OF AGRICULTURE AND FARMLAND? The Ozaukee County population continues to grow. Over the past 20 years, the County population grew by almost 19%, from 72,831 residents in 1990 to 86,395 residents in 2010. It will be important to provide food for the growing population.

Farming produces food. Agriculture also contributes to the economy of Ozaukee County. In 2002, Ozaukee County farms combined to produce agricultural products with a market value of over \$38 million.

Additionally, 57% of respondents to the 2010 Countywide Public Opinion Survey indicated that preservation of rural and small town character should be a future priority for the County.

What is a Public Participation Plan?

The public participation plan for the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan is intended to serve two purposes. First, it will help answer the most basic planning questions, "What do the citizens, agricultural producers, and landowners of Ozaukee County want their County to look like?" An effective way to identify public values within the County is to provide opportunities for public involvement throughout any planning process.

Second, this public participation plan is intended to actively engage Ozaukee County residents, agricultural producers, landowners, business owners, and interest groups in shaping the future of farmland preservation and the agriculture industry in Ozau-kee County. This is based on the premise, *"Tell me, I forget. Show me, I remember. Involve me, I understand."*

The public participation plan for the Farmland Preservation Plan must be consistent with the public participation plan developed for the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035. To view that public participation plan, please visit: www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/SmartGrowth/PublicParticipation.htm

How Can I Participate in the Planning Process?

Ongoing efforts to involve the public are proposed to take place throughout the farmland preservation planning process and include:

- Planning materials at the County Planning & Parks Department, located in the Ozaukee County Administration Center, 121 W. Main Street, Port Washington
- Press releases
- Presentations to special interest and community groups
- Meetings with local governments including plan commissions, town boards, common councils etc.
- Display booths at public events including Breakfast on the Farm and the Ozaukee County Fair
- Notice to non-metallic mining operators during the amendment to the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035
- Meetings of the Ozaukee County Land Preservation Board (LPB)
- Meetings of the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB)
- Meetings of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC)
- Multiple public forums and informational meetings on the planning process, plan inventory, and plan recommendations
- Ongoing collection of public comments through phone calls, email, or mail
- The Ozaukee County Planning & Parks Department website

For additional information on the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan, please visit our website:

www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningParks_Planning.asp

Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Public Participation Plan

Public Involvement Opportunities

Working Lands Initiative Information Meetings: March and April 2010

Three Working Lands Initiative Information Meetings will be held in March and April 2010. The first meeting, to be held jointly with Washington County on March 25, 2010 at Riveredge Nature Center, will be targeted toward local government elected officials and staff of Ozaukee and Washington Counties. The second meeting, to be held on April 1, 2010 at the Sauk-ville Town Hall, will be targeted toward Ozaukee County agricultural producers and landowners. The last meeting, a First Friday Forum to be held on April 2, 2010 at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Port Washington, will be geared toward the general public. Attendees will have the opportunity to learn about the State's new Working Lands Initiative legislation, Ozaukee County's timeline for completing its Farmland Preservation Plan, and an example of a successful land preservation effort from Dakota County, Minnesota. Each of these meetings will feature presentations by staff from the Ozaukee County Planning & Parks Department and UW-Extension. Representatives from the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection (DATCP) and a speaker from Dakota County will also present at select meetings.

Kickoff Meetings: September 2010

Two Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Kickoff Meetings will be held on September 27 and 29, 2010. The meetings will be held at two different locations in the County, the first at the Fredonia Village/Town Hall, and the second at the Ozaukee County Administration Center in Port Washington. Attendees of the kick-off meetings will learn more about the State's Working Lands Initiative, including planning, tax credits, PACE, and AEAs, and the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan timeline, process, and public participation opportunities. Staff from the Ozaukee County Planning & Parks Department, UW-Extension, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, and the Department of Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection (DATCP) will give presentations and be on hand to answer questions.

Countywide Public Opinion Survey: September 2010

A Countywide public opinion survey on farmland preservation and natural resources issues will be prepared in summer 2010. The mail-out survey will be administered to a statistically significant sample of the Ozaukee County population in September 2010. The full survey report, to be prepared by UW-River Falls Survey Research Center, will be available in December 2010. The survey is funded in part by Department of Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection (DATCP) Farmland Preservation Planning Grant.

Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee: January 2011 through Plan Completion, monthly

The Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC) will be comprised of 16 local government representatives (one from each municipality in the County) and 16 at-large citizen appointments. The FPP CAC is tasked with reviewing Plan chapters, including developing inventory recommendations and strategies for preserving farmland and agriculture in Ozaukee County. Members of the public are invited to attend meetings of the FPP CAC. The FPP CAC typically meets the fourth Tuesday of the month from 4:30-6:30 PM in the Ozaukee County Administration Center Auditorium in Port Washington. Please check the County website at *www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/Agenda/* for the most FPP CAC current meeting date, time, location and agenda.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analyses: March and April 2011

The Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC), Land Preservation Board (LPB), and Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB), will all have the opportunity to participate in a strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) analysis relating the farmland preservation and agriculture in Ozaukee County to be held on March 29, April 14, and April 20, 2011 respectively. The results of all three SWOT analyses will be taken into account during the FPP CAC efforts to develop the Farmland Preservation Plan vision statement and recommendations and the LPB and CPB efforts to refine those recommendations.



Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Public Participation Plan

Public Involvement Opportunities Continued...

Agricultural Stakeholder Focus Groups: April 2011

In April 2011, the Ozaukee County Planning & Parks Department and UW-Extension will be hosting focus groups for anyone engaged in farming and agriculture in Ozaukee County. These focus groups will be targeted both toward traditional production agriculture and niche farming. This will be one of the primary opportunities for the County's agricultural community to share their thoughts on farmland preservation efforts and the future of agriculture in Ozaukee County. The first focus group will be held at the Hawthorne Hills Golf Course Club House in Saukville on April 19, 2011 and the second focus group will be held at the Ozaukee County Administration Center Auditorium in Port Washington on April 20, 2011.

Town of Dunn Tour: May 2011

On May 13, 2011, the Land Conservation Partnership for Ozaukee County (LCPOZ) and the Gathering Waters Conservancy will sponsor a tour of the Town of Dunn, located in Dane County. The Town has a successful purchase of development rights (PDR) program that has preserved vast tracts of quality agricultural land close to the City of Madison. LCPOZ, FPP CAC, LPB, CPB, and other County Board members will be invited to attend the tour to learn more about the Town of Dunn's land preservation efforts.

Countywide Public Information Meetings: August/September 2011

The County will hold public information meetings in August/September to share the Farmland Preservation Plan inventory and the results of the Countywide public opinion survey. Times, dates, and locations to be determined. The public will have the opportunity to both learn about and comment on the Plan at these meetings.

First Friday Forum: Spring 2012

In spring 2012, the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan will be the primary topic of discussion at a First Friday Forum. The First Friday Forum series, which is typically hosted at the Milwaukee Area Technical College (MATC)-Mequon Campus, features timely presentations and discussions on current public policy issues. This Forum will be an opportunity for members of the public to learn more about the inventory, projections, and recommendations of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan and their impacts on the future of farming and agriculture in Ozaukee County.

County Plan Public Hearing: Spring / Summer 2013

The County will host a public hearing on the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan prior to County Board adoption of the Plan and the FPP as an amendment to the Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the Farmland Preservation Plan during this public hearing. Time, date, and location to be determined.

Public Comments: Ongoing

Public comments regarding the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan will be accepted throughout the entire process by:

- 1.) Calling Nicole Sidoff at 262.284.8289
- 2.) Emailing comments to nsidoff@co.ozaukee.wi.us
- 3.) Mailing written comments to:

Nicole Sidoff UW-Extension PO Box 994 Port Washington, WI 53074

4.) Visiting the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan website at: www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningParks_Planning.asp



Year	Month	Public Involvement Opportunity	Target Audience
2010	March/April	Working Lands Initiative Meetings	Elected officials, farmers, general public
2010	September	Kickoff Meetings	Farmers, general public
2010	September	Countywide Public Opinion Survey	General public
2011	March/April	SWOT Analyses	FPP CAC, LPB, CPB, general public
2011	April	Agriculture Focus Groups	Agricultural producers
2011	May	Town of Dunn Tour	LCPOZ, FPP CAC, CPB, & LPB members
2011	Aug./Sept.	Public Information Meetings	General public
2012	Spring	First Friday Forum	General public, elected officials
2013	Spring/Summer	Public Hearing	General public
Ongoing	Ongoing	Public Comment	General public
Ongoing	Monthly	FPP Citizen Advisory Committee (FPP CAC)	FPP CAC members, general public
Ongoing	Bi-Monthly	Comprehensive Planning Board (CPB) & Land Preservation Board (LPB) meetings	CPB & LPB members, general public

The general public is encouraged to participate in all public involvement opportunities and to attend all meetings related to preparation of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan.

Prepared By:



For Additional Information:

Andrew Struck	Director, Planning & Parks Department	Phone	: 262.284.8275
	Ozaukee County Administration Center		262.238.8275 (metro)
	121 W. Main Street, PO Box 994	Fax:	262.284.8269
	Port Washington, WI 53074	Email:	astruck@co.ozaukee.wi.us
	www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningPo	arks_Plan	nning.asp
Nicole Sidoff	Community Development Educator	Phone	: 262.284.8289
	UW-Extension—Ozaukee County		262.238.8289 (metro)
	Ozaukee County Administration Center	Fax:	262.284.8100
	121 W. Main Street, PO Box 944	Email:	nsidoff@co.ozaukee.wi.us
	Port Washington, WI 53074		
Rick Kania	Community Assistance Planner	Phone	: 262.5476721
	Southeastern WI Regional Planning Commission	Fax:	262.547.1103
	PO Box 1607	Email:	rkania@sewrpc.org
	Waukesha, WI 53187		

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix C

OZAUKEE COUNTY FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

SECTION 1.00 ESTABLISHMENT

The Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee was established by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors on March 3, 2010. Citizen members were recommended for appointment by the Land Preservation Board on October 6, 2010 and formally appointed by the Comprehensive Planning Board on October 12, 2010. Members were appointed to serve until adoption of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors.

SECTION 2.00 RESPONSIBILITIES

The Citizen Advisory Committee will guide preparation of the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan as defined by Wisconsin State Statutes Chapters 71 and 91 and Section 66.1001, including development of a public participation plan, review of draft plan chapters and other plan materials, and development of a recommended plan for consideration by the Land Preservation Board and Comprehensive Planning Board. The Citizen Advisory Committee is advisory to the County farmland preservation planning process and may make recommendations to the Land Preservation Board and Comprehensive Planning Board for its consideration. The Committee shall have no approval or denial authority over the County Farmland Preservation Plan.

SECTION 3.00 MEMBERSHIP

- A. <u>The Committee Shall be Comprised</u> of one representative appointed by the governing body of each city, town, and village located wholly or partially within Ozaukee County and 16 citizen members appointed by the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board.
- B. <u>Committee Members</u> who have missed two or more consecutive meetings will be so notified by the Chair of the Comprehensive Planning Board. Citizen members who have been absent for three or more consecutive meetings may be removed from the Committee by the Board. The Board may then appoint a new member to fill the vacancy. The Chair of the Board will recommend that a local government appoint a new Committee representative if the local government representative does not attend three or more consecutive Committee meetings.

SECTION 4.00 OFFICERS AND STAFF

- A. <u>A Chairperson</u> shall be elected by a majority of Committee members present and shall serve until adoption of the Farmland Preservation Plan by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors. The Chairperson shall be elected at the second meeting of the Committee. The Chairperson shall preside at the meetings of the Committee, approve meeting agendas, and decide all points of procedure unless otherwise directed by a majority of the Committee members present.
- B. <u>A Vice-Chairperson</u> shall be elected by a majority of Committee members present and shall serve until adoption of the Farmland Preservation Plan by the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors. The Vice-Chairperson shall be elected at the second meeting of the Committee. The Vice-

Chairperson shall fulfill the Chairperson's duties when the Chairperson is absent from Committee meetings.

C. <u>Staff Support</u> for the Committee shall be provided by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department (lead), UW-Extension – Ozaukee County, Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, Ozaukee County Transit, and Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission.

SECTION 5.00 MEETINGS

- A. <u>Meetings Shall Be Held Monthly</u>. The Committee will establish meeting dates at the first meeting. All meetings will begin at 4:30 p.m. and will be held in the Ozaukee County Administration Center, located at 121 West Main Street in Port Washington unless alternative arrangements are made at least 7 days prior to a scheduled meeting.
- B. <u>Special Meetings</u> may be called by the Committee Chairperson or upon the written request of seven members of the Committee to the Chairperson. Notice of special meetings shall be provided by e-mail, telephone, or U. S. Postal Service to all Committee members and public notice shall be posted at least 48 hours prior to the special meeting.
- C. <u>Public Notice</u> of all meetings shall be provided in accordance with Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
- D. All Meetings Shall be Open to the public.
- E. <u>Closed Sessions</u>. The Committee may go into closed session for the purposes enumerated in Section 19.85 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
- F. <u>A Quorum</u> shall be 10 members. If less than 10 members are present, then members of the Land Preservation Board and/or Comprehensive Planning Board may act as members of the Committee.
- G. Robert's Rules of Order shall apply to all meetings of the Committee except as modified herein.
- H. <u>The Order of Business</u> at meetings shall be substantially as follows, unless changed by consent of a majority of the members present:
 - 1. Call to order.
 - 2. Roll call and declaration of a quorum.
 - 3. Approval of minutes from the previous meeting.
 - 4. Public comment and written communications.
 - Report from the County Board, Comprehensive Planning Board, and Land Preservation Board (as necessary)
 - 6. Unfinished business.
 - 7. New business.
 - 8. Planning news.
 - 9. Other business as allowed by law.
 - 10. Adjournment.

1. Minutes of the proceedings and a record of all actions will be kept by County staff, showing the vote of the Committee upon each question and the deliberations leading up to the Committee's determination. Minutes will be a public record and will be available for review at the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department office during regular business hours. Approved minutes will also be posted on the Planning and Parks Department website (www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/PlanningParks/PlanningParks_FarmlandPres_Plan.asp) and also on the Ozaukee County website (www.co.ozaukee.wi.us/minutes/Index.html)

SECTION 6.00 WORK GROUPS AND SUBCOMMITTEES

- A. <u>Work Groups or Sub-Committees</u> may be created and members appointed by the Committee.
- B. <u>Work Group and Subcommittee Duties</u>: Each work group and subcommittee shall study, conduct investigations, and make recommendations and shall perform such other duties as the Citizen Advisory Committee directs relative to their areas of responsibility.
- C. <u>Work Group and Subcommittee Operation :</u>
 - 1. Each work group and subcommittee shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson.
 - 2. The chairperson shall set the time and place for all meetings of the workgroup or subcommittee and shall verity with staff that a meeting will not conflict with another farmland preservation planning meeting.
 - 3. The committee vice-chairperson shall act as chairperson in the absence of the chairperson.
 - 4. County staff shall keep minutes.
 - 5. A quorum shall be a majority of the members of each work group or subcommittee.
 - 6. Public notice of all meetings shall be provided in accordance with Section 19.84 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
 - 7. All meetings shall be open to the public.
 - 8. An opportunity for public comment shall be provided at each meeting.

SECTION 7.00 AMENDMENTS

These by-laws may be amended at any meeting by a two-thirds vote of Committee members present.

SECTION 8.00 CONFLICT

Whenever any conflict occurs between these by-laws and the laws of the State of Wisconsin or ordinances of the County, the State laws and the County ordinances shall prevail.

SECTION 9.00 EFFECTIVE DATE

These by-laws shall be effective upon approval by a majority of Committee members present.

n le

Chairperson, Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee

Date Adopted: February 22, 2011

Date Amended:

Appendix D

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ZONING DISTRICT MAPS AND REGULATIONS

Table D-1

CITY OF MEQUON ZONING ORDINANCE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

				Minimum / Maximum
District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size ^a	Floor Area (square feet)
A-1 Agricultural Preservation District	Agricultural crop production and livestock raising, dairy farming, single- family dwellings, and municipal utilities	Commercial hatcheries and greenhouses, kennels, parks and preserves, stables, public or private utilities, and raising of fur bearing animals	35 acres	1,400 minimum; 1,200 first floor minimum or two story
A-2 General Agricultural District	All A-1 principal uses	All A-1 conditional uses	10 acres	1,400 minimum, 1,200 first floor minimum for two story
R-1 Rural Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings not served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and schools, churches, public offices, lodges, commercial use, country inns, utilities, guest houses, wholesale greenhouses, fish hatcheries, dwelling additions, and livestock raising	5 acres	1,800 minimum
R-1B Rural Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings not served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and schools, churches, commercial use, utilities, guest houses, dwelling additions, and livestock raising	2.5 acres	1,600 minimum
R-2 Rural Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings not reasonably served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and schools, churches, lodges, commercial use, country inns, utilities, guest houses, wholesale greenhouses, fish hatcheries, dwelling additions, and livestock raising	2 acres	1,800 minimum
R-2B Suburban Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings potentially served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	All R-1B conditional uses	1.5 acres	1,400 minimum
R-3 Suburban Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings potentially served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	All R-1B conditional uses	1 acre	1,800 minimum
R-4 Suburban Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings potentially served by public sanitary sewer and certain agricultural uses	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and schools, churches, utilities, dwelling additions, and livestock raising	32,670 square feet (3/4 acre)	1,600 minimum
R-5 Suburban Residential Detached District	Single-family detached dwellings served by public sanitary sewer	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and schools, churches, and utilities	21,780 square feet (1/2 acre)	1,400 minimum
R-6 Suburban Residential Attached District	Single-family attached dwellings on lots served by public sanitary sewer ^b	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and utilities	1 acre	1,000 minimum for one bedroom dwellings; 1,200 for two bedroom dwellings; 1,400 for three bedroom dwellings
RM Multiple-Family Residential District	Multi-family dwellings, not to exceed eight dwelling units per building, on lots served by public sanitary sewer	Public or private outdoor recreation facilities and utilities	One bedroom units 6,000 square feet; Two bedroom units 7,000 square feet; Three bedroom units 10,000 square feet	900 minimum for one bedroom dwellings; 1,100 for two bedroom dwellings; 1,300 for three bedroom dwellings
B-1 Neighborhood Business District	Neighborhood level retail, office and service uses	Public institutions, restaurants, museums, public or private utilities, churches, health and child day care facilities, and satellite dishes	1.5 acres ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent

Table D-1 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size ^a	Minimum / Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
B-2 Community Business District	Community level retail, office and service uses, and health care facilities	Public institutions, restaurants, museums, public or private utilities, churches, day care facilities, churches, animal hospitals, wholesale, service stations, warehousing, vehicle sales, department stores, hotels, research facilities, light fabrication, and satellite dishes	2 acres ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
B-3 Office and Service District	Office, professional, business, and financial, and special service uses	Commercial day care, studios, residential quarters, research facilities, light assembly, satellite dishes, public or private utilities, and personal services	1.5 acres ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
B-4 Business Park District	Office and light industrial uses	Light manufacturing, wholesaling, warehousing, processing, distribution, research, printing, health clubs, salons, restaurants, bookstores, child care, florists, gift shops, pharmacies, studios, vehicle services, satellite dishes, public and private utilities, and theaters	1 acre ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
B-5 Light Industrial District	Light manufacturing, wholesaling, distribution, processing, research, printing, office, and service uses	Health clubs, salons, restaurants, bookstores, child care, florists, gift shops, pharmacies, studios, residential quarters, lumber yards, transportation terminals, vehicle services, satellite dishes, and public and private utilities	1 acre ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
B-6 Rural Industrial District	Agricultural uses	Public and private utilities and certain light industrial uses not served by public sanitary sewer	5 acres ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
B-7 Rural Business District	Offices and roadside farmers markets	Limited business uses not served by public sanitary sewer such as commercial greenhouses, specialty retail uses, restaurants but no-drive through, animal kennels, public and private utilities, horse riding stables, and religious institutions	2 acres for permitted uses ^d 5 acres for conditional uses ^d	Maximum floor area ratio of 15 percent
TC Town Center District	Certain retail and services, public and private schools, fast-food restaurants, fitness centers, farmers markets, offices, medical clinics, financial institutions, and multi-family dwellings of eight units or less in a mixed-use development	Community centers, private lodges and clubs, night clubs, elderly housing, child care facilities, convenience and grocery stores, and multi-family dwellings of 9 to 16 units in a mixed-use development	21,780 square feet (1/2 acre)	e,f
AC Arrival Corridor District	Certain retail and services, religious institutions, offices, medical clinics, financial institutions, multi-family dwellings of eight or less units in a mixed-use development, child care facilities, fitness centers, farmers markets, and restaurants	Private and public schools, private lodges and clubs, elderly housing, multi-family dwelling of four or more units, multi-family dwellings of 9 to 16 units in a mixed use development, convenience and grocery stores, and night clubs	1 acre	e, g
IPS Institutional and Public Service District	Public and private schools, churches, libraries, public offices, public utilities, and child care facilities	Mausoleums and funeral homes, crematories, communication towers, concert halls, lodges and clubs, public and private outdoor recreation facilities, restaurants and taverns, landfills, nursing homes, cemeteries, and satellite dishes	1 acre ^c	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
P-1 Park and Recreation District	Public and private recreational uses such as arboretums, flood control, recreational trails and facilities, nature reserves, and historic sites	Outdoor recreational facilities, golf courses, beaches, recreation and nature center, camps, fairs, boat access sites, amphitheaters, archery ranges, miniature golf and golf ranges, utilities, and zoos	1.5 acres	
C-1 Shoreland-Wetland Conservancy District	Recreation trails, swimming, fishing, boating, crop harvesting, silviculture, cultivation of crops, piers and docks, fencing for livestock, drainage, and repair of bridges	Road construction, construction of non-residential structures, public and private parks, and construction of utility poles and lines		
C-2 General Conservancy District	Crop harvesting, silviculture, pasturing, cultivation of crops, piers and docks, fencing for livestock, drainage, repair of bridges, and protecting shorelines	Single-family development at one unit per five acres, road and railroad construction, public and private parks, stormwater management, and construction of utility poles and lines		
FW Floodway District	Drainage, floodwater, navigation, streambank protection, water control facilities, crop harvesting, fishing, farming, impoundments, sustained forestry, fish hatcheries, preserves, open parking, open recreation, and communication towers	Navigational structures, public water control facilities, bridges, marinas, parks, parking lots, filling as approved by WDNR to permit establishment of approved bulkhead lines, open space, and public sanitary sewer facilities		

Table D-1 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size ^a	Minimum / Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
FFO Flood Fringe Overlay District	Any use of land permitted in the underlying basic zoning district and residential, commercial, and industrial structures permitted in the underlying basic zoning district ^h	None		
OA Agricultural Overlay District	Agricultural crop production and livestock raising, dairy farming, and municipal utilities	All A-1 conditional uses and landscaping businesses	10 acres	
LTD Limited Use Overlay District	Industrial, commercial, servicing, processing, and storage uses	Certain retail stores, florists, and special services	ⁱ	Maximum floor area ratio of 30 percent
PUD Planned Unit Development Overlay District	Uses permitted in the underlying basic zoning district	None	نـ _	Underlying basic zoning district minimum / maximum floor area
TDR-PDR Transfer of Development Rights- Planned Unit Development Overlay District	¹	¹	¹	

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the City of Mequon zoning ordinance and map for specific zoning information. In addition to the zoning districts summarized above, the City of Mequon has adopted an extraterritorial zoning ordinance that applies to an approximately 1,528 acre area in the Town of Grafton.

^aAll permanent structures erected or constructed after January 1, 1988, on property that is contiguous to Lake Michigan shall be set back from the top of the bluff a distance based on a slope ratio of 2.5 feet horizontal distance to every one foot vertical distance measured from the toe of the bluff. In no case shall a building be set back less than 75 feet from the top edge of the bluff at the time of construction.

^bSingle-family residential attached dwellings in building groups of at least two but no more than four dwelling units per building.

^cLots require 40 percent open space.

^dLots require 50 percent open space.

^eMinimum floor area of 1,000 square feet for dwelling units, and 1,200 square feet for commercial uses, with a maximum 10,000 square feet per commercial use, except as approved by the Planning Commission. All buildings shall be limited to a maximum floor area of 25,000 square feet, except as approved through a PUD.

^fMaximum floor area ratio is 100 percent.

^gMaximum floor area ratio is 50 percent.

^hProvided that the structures comply with the filling requirements as stated in Section 3.11(2)(c) of the City of Mequon Development Ordinance.

ⁱIn accordance with the underlying basic zoning district requirements.

¹Lot size requirements in the underlying basic zoning district may be modified, but the overall project density may be no greater than that permitted in the underlying district.

Source: City of Mequon Development Ordinance and SEWRPC.

Table D-2

TOWN OF BELGIUM ZONING ORDINANCE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

				Minimum/
District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Maximum Floor
A-1 Agricultural District	Agricultural and general farming; single family dwelling for the person(s) engaged in, and earning a substantial portion of income from, the farm operation	Airports and airstrips; colleges; medical, religious, and correctional institutions; cemeteries; bed and breakfasts; livestock yards with more than 600 head; animal hospitals and shelters; kennels; and manufacturing or processing of food, beverages, and other materials	35 contiguous acres	1,200 square foot minimum
A-2 Agricultural District	Maintain, preserve, and enhance agricultural land while allowing for conforming uses of buildings deemed nonconforming in the A-1 District	Airports and airstrips; colleges; medical, religious, and correctional institutions; cemeteries; bed and breakfasts; livestock yards with more than 600 heads; animal hospitals and shelters; kennels; and manufacturing or processing of food, beverages, and other materials	b	1,200 square foot minimum
R-1 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings	Governmental and cultural uses, offices, and services; schools; cluster/conservation developments; nursing homes; clinics and children's nurseries; clubs, home occupations, and bed and breakfasts	1.5 acres	1,200 square foot minimum
B-1 Commercial District	Community level retail and restaurants; business and professional offices; and clinics	Governmental and cultural uses, offices, and services; passenger transportation terminals; schools; various commercial uses such as banks, drive-in establishments, coin operated laundries, hotels and motels, studios, publishing offices, and department stores; vehicle sales and service, and public parking lots	1.5 acres	
M-1 Industrial District	Automotive and machinery sales, storage, and repair; painting, printing, publishing, warehousing, wholesaling, and offices; light manufacturing, fabrication, packaging, and assembly	Airports and airstrips, governmental and cultural uses, offices, and services; passenger transportation terminals, recycling stations, sewage treatment plants, and general warehousing and indoor storage	1.5 acres	
P-1 Park District	Parks, arboretums, playgrounds, wildlife preserves, general recreation, and water conservation	Governmental and cultural uses, offices, and services; schools, colleges, medical, religious, and correctional institutions; cemeteries; camping, firearm and archery facilities, outdoor sporting facilities and recreational facilities; and commercial recreational facilities		
C-1 Conservancy Overlay District	Fishing, conservation, water retention, and wildlife preserves	Drainageways, public water measurement and control, grazing, orchards, truck farming, and wildcrop harvesting		

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Belgium zoning ordinance and map for specific zoning district information.

^aUtilities are allowed as conditional uses in all districts. Communication structures are allowed as conditional uses in all districts except the *R*-1 District.

^bAccommodates existing parcels and/or buildings that may have been non-conforming in the A-1 District prior to adoption of the Town's amended zoning ordinance on June 7, 2004.

Source: Town of Belgium Zoning Ordinance and SEWRPC.

Table D-3

TOWN OF CEDARBURG ZONING CODE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

District	Typical Darmittad Dringinal Llago	Typical Conditional Lloop ^a	Minimum	Minimum/ Maximum Floor
A-1 Agricultural District	Apiculture, dairying, forestry, farming, grazing, greenhouses, hatcheries, horticulture, livestock and poultry raising, nurseries, orchards, paddocks, stables, truck farming, and viticulture	Agricultural buildings and high density animal enclosures, existing non-metallic mining operations, airports and airstrips, colleges, hospitals, cemeteries, crematories, correctional institutions, animal hospitals, incinerators, farm labor housing, commercial raising of farm animals, and transportation storage	5 acres	1,200 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story apply to farm dwellings
A-2 Prime Agricultural District	All A-1 permitted principal uses	All A-1 conditional uses; one additional single-family dwelling	35 acres	1,200 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story apply to farm dwellings
E-1 Estate District	Single-family dwellings and non- commercial accessory uses	Navigational structures, public water control facilities, bridges, marinas, parks, parking lots, municipal water and sewer systems, and open space	4 acres	1,800 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
CR-A Countryside Residential A District ^c	Single-family detached dwellings in cluster subdivision developments with a maximum density of one dwelling unit per four acres and a minimum open space requirement of 50 percent	Public and private parks and schools, churches, home offices, clubs, public offices, public utility lines, and agricultural buildings	One acre; density of one dwelling unit per 4.5 acres	1,500 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
CR-B Countryside Residential B District ^c	Single-family detached dwellings in cluster subdivision developments with a maximum density of one unit per four acres and a minimum open space requirement of 50 percent	All CR-A District conditional uses; non- domesticated animals and facilities	One acre; density of one dwelling unit per 4.5 acres	1,500 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
TR Transitional Residential District	Single-family detached dwellings	All CR-A District conditional uses	1.5 acres	1,500 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
TR-2 Traditional Residential 2 District	Single-family detached dwellings	Public and private parks, churches, and public utility lines	1 acre	1,500 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
R-1 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings	Governmental and cultural uses	80,000 square feet	1,800 minimum; 1,200 first floor minimum for two story
R-2 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings	Governmental and cultural uses, public and private schools, churches, and home offices	40,000 square feet	1,500 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
R-3 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings	Governmental and cultural uses, public and private schools, churches, clubs and lodges, rest and nursing homes, home offices, and boarders and lodgers	40,000 square feet	1,200 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story
B-1 Neighborhood Business District	Drug stores, delicatessens, florists, and business and professional offices	Retail, office, and service uses; taverns; restaurants; clubs and lodges; clinics; governmental and cultural uses; and heliports and bus depots	21,780 square feet (1/2 acre)	
B-2 Planned Business District	Financial institutions, appliance stores, and furniture stores	All B-1 conditional uses; banks, hotels, printing, private schools, publishing, governmental and cultural uses, heliports and bus depots, drive-in theaters and restaurants, motels, funeral homes, drive-in banks, tourist homes, and commercial recreational facilities	1 Acre	

Table D-3 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
B-3 Business District	Professional offices and retail shops and stores	Retail and service uses, printing and publishing, warehousing, studios, transportation terminals, laundering, distributors, greenhouses, vehicle and farm equipment services, storage, laboratories, governmental and cultural uses, and heliports and bus depots	1 acre	
M-1 Industrial District	Light manufacturing, processing, and assembling uses; printing and publishing; painting; laundering; warehousing; distributors; greenhouses; vehicle and farm equipment services; storage; and laboratories	Airports and airstrips, governmental and cultural uses, heliports and bus depots, communication towers, animal hospitals, and incinerators	1 acre	
M-2 Planned Industrial and Mixed-Use District	b	All M-1 permitted principal uses; freight terminals, storage, crematories, breweries, governmental and cultural uses, heliports and bus depots, communication towers, animal hospitals, incinerators, processing chemical products, outside storage, commercial service facilities, planned industrial developments, and existing extractive and processing operations	1 acre	1,200 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for two story apply to existing residences
M-3 Quarrying District	Existing mineral extraction and concrete manufacturing	Expansion of existing mineral extraction and concrete manufacturing or new extraction and concrete operations		
P-1 Public and Private Park District	Parks and preserves, arboretums, playgrounds, fishing, wading, swimming, beaches, skating, sledding, forestry, soil and water conservation, and water control facilities	Airports and airstrips, governmental and cultural uses, public and private schools, churches, colleges, hospitals, cemeteries, crematories, correctional institutions, communication towers, archery and shooting ranges, beaches, boating, camps, driving ranges, golf courses, recreation trails, hunting, marinas, swimming pools, skating rinks, stadiums, conservatories, and zoos		
C-1 Conservancy District	Drainageways, floodways, floodplains, fishing, hunting, historic sites, fish hatcheries, soil and water conservation, forestry, streambank protection, water retention, and wildlife preserves	Water control facilities, grazing, lodges, orchards, truck farming, and wild crop harvesting		
TCOD Town Center Overlay District	^b	^d	^e	^e

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Cedarburg zoning code and map for specific zoning district information. In addition to the districts listed, the Town of Cedarburg zoning code includes residential, commercial, and industrial Planned Unit Developments (PUD) as conditional uses.

^aBed and breakfast establishments and utilities are considered conditional uses and may be permitted in any district. Landfills are also permitted as a conditional use in all districts, except the Conservancy District (C-1). Sport fields are permitted as a conditional use in all districts, except residential districts.

^bNo principal permitted uses; all uses are conditional.

^cIndividual parcels eight acres or greater in size are exempt from the clustering requirements of this district.

^dAs per underlying basic zoning district.

^eAs per underlying basic zoning district, but may be modified by the Town Plan Commission and Town Board.

Source: Town of Cedarburg Zoning Code and SEWRPC.

Table D-4

TOWN OF FREDONIA ZONING CODE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

		_	Minimum	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area
District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Lot Size	(square feet)
A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District	Agricultural and general farming uses, plant nurseries, sod farming, apiculture, viticulture, one single-family dwelling, and essential services	Housing for farm laborers, housing for seasonal workers, barns, silos, sheds and other storage structures without construction of a single-family dwelling, commercial feed lot, commercial fur farm, commercial egg production, and airstrips and landing fields	35 acres	950 minimum for farm dwelling
A-2 Agricultural/Rural Residential District	All A-1 permitted principal uses; agricultural warehousing, animal hospitals and kennels, packaging of fruits and vegetables, corn shelling services, hay baling services, threshing services, grist milling, horticultural services, poultry hatchery, and stables	Bird seed and grain preparation, drying of fruits and vegetables, fluid milk processing, livestock sales, poultry and small game packing, production of butter, production of cheese, production of sausage, recreational vehicle and boat storage, milling of corn, a second single- family home, and farm service business (not including sales)	5 acres	1,200 minimum for farm dwelling
A-3 Agricultural/ Rural Residential District	All A-2 permitted principal uses	All A-2 conditional uses	10 acres	1,200 minimum for farm dwelling
R-1 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings and essential services	Cluster and condominium development, moving of existing buildings, and conversions of single- family dwelling to two-family dwelling	3 acres	1,400 minimum
R-2 Single-Family Residential District	Single-family dwellings and home occupations	Moving of existing buildings, and conversions of single-family dwelling to two-family dwelling	1 acre	1,200 minimum
R-3 Single-Family Residential District	All R-2 permitted principal uses	All R-2 conditional uses	20,000 square feet	1,200 minimum
R-4 Single-Family Residential District	All R-2 permitted principal uses	All R-2 conditional uses	7,200 square feet	1,000 square feet
R-5 Mobile Home Park District	Mobile home parks	All R-2 conditional uses	5,000 square feet	
B-1 Urban Business District	Barber and beauty shops, grocery stores, restaurants, taverns, variety stores, and antique stores	Automotive sales and service, automotive body repair, food lockers, funeral homes, and other commercial uses not listed as a permitted or conditional use	7,200 square feet	
B-2 Highway Business District	None	Drive-in establishments, gas stations, motels, building supply and lumber yards, grocery stores, taverns and supper clubs, animal hospitals and kennels, accessory garages, and residential quarters for owner or employee of a business	1 acre	
M-1 Urban Industrial District	Automotive body repair, greenhouses, food processing, farm machinery sales and repair, food locker plants, machine shops, painting, storage and sales of equipment, warehousing, and wholesaling	Sewage treatment plants, gas stations and restaurants, truck transfer stations, meat and poultry processing, and production of dairy products	7,200 square feet	
M-2 General Industrial District	All M-1 permitted principal uses	All M-1 conditional uses; fertilizer manufacturing, stockyards, solid waste disposal sites, outside storage	1 acre	
M-3 Extractive District	None	Mining of rock, slate, gravel, sand, top soil, and other minerals; processing of extracted minerals; processing of top soil; mixing of asphalt; aggregate or ready-mix plant; manufacture of cement; manufacture of lime, gypsum, and plaster of Paris; and storage of mineral products		

Table D-4 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
P-1 Park District	Boat rental and access sites, fairgrounds, golf courses without country club facilities, historic sites, nature trails, tot lots, outdoor skating rinks, parks and playgrounds, athletic fields, sledding, tennis courts, and accessory buildings to permitted uses	Archery ranges, beaches, bathhouses, swimming pools, golf courses with country club facilities, driving ranges, trap shooting ranges, sportsman's clubs, stadiums, zoological or botanical gardens, and campgrounds	One acre; tot lot, 7,200 square feet	
P-2 Urban Institutional District	Churches, hospitals, nursing homes, clinics, libraries and museums, public administrative and service buildings, and public utility offices	Bus and motor freight terminals, electric plants and substations, water storage tanks and towers, radio and television towers, and cemeteries	7,200 square feet	
P-3 Rural Institutional District	Schools, colleges, universities, churches and public administrative and service buildings	All P-2 conditional uses, airports, landing fields, and helipads	1 acre	
C-1 Lowland Conservancy District	Agricultural uses when conducted in accordance with Ozaukee County conservation standards, fishing, hunting, preservation of scenic, historic, scientific areas, public fish hatcheries, stream bank and lakeshore preservation, and water retention and wildlife preserves	None		
C-2 Upland Conservancy District	Agricultural areas when conducted in accordance with Ozaukee County conservation standards, hunting and fishing, preservation of scenic, historic, and scientific areas; forest and game management, park and recreation areas, single-family dwellings	None	5 acres	1,600 minimum

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Fredonia zoning code and map for specific zoning district information.

^aCommunity living arrangements (CLA) including foster homes and adult living homes are permitted in all residential districts. CLA's with 9 to 15 persons are permitted in multi-family districts.

Source: Town of Fredonia Zoning Code and SEWRPC.

Table D-5

TOWN OF GRAFTON ZONING CODE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

li				
District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District	Apiculture; dairying; farming; grazing; floriculture; raising of grains, fruits, and vegetables; sod farming; livestock and poultry raising; nurseries; orchards; viticulture; existing dwellings; single-family dwelling; farm buildings, and essential services	Additional single-and two-family dwellings; commercial raising, board, or butchering of animals such as dogs, mink, rabbits, foxes, goats, pigs, and fowl; veterinary services; recreation vehicle storage; commercial and noncommercial stables; temporary storage; archery ranges; beaches; boating; camps; golf courses and ranges; stadiums and gyms; marinas; sport fields; and public swimming pools	35 acres	1,250 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi- story
A-2 Agricultural/ Rural Residential District	Apiculture, farming, floriculture, raising of fruits and vegetables, sod farming, poultry raising, nurseries, orchards, viticulture, existing dwellings, single-family dwelling, farm buildings, agricultural warehousing, and essential services	Commercial raising, recreation vehicle storage, noncommercial stables, animal hospitals, poultry services, temporary storage, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	10 acres	2,000 minimum; 1,200 first floor minimum for multi- story
R-1 Residential District	Single-family dwellings and essential services	Noncommercial stables, nursing homes, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	5 acres	3,000 minimum; 1,800 first floor minimum for multi- story
R-2 Residential District	Single-family dwellings and essential services	Noncommercial stables, nursing homes, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	3 acres	1,250 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for multi- story
R-3 Residential District	Single-family dwellings and essential services	Noncommercial stables, nursing homes, two- family dwellings, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	40,000 square feet	1,250 minimum; 1,000 first floor minimum for multi- story
B-1 Business District	Retail, office, and service uses; clinics	Temporary storage, nursing homes, drive-in restaurants, restaurants and taverns, funeral homes, service stations, apparel stores, motels, banks, parking lots, studios, residential quarters, rental apartments, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	40,000 square feet	
BP-1 Business Park District	Retail and special service uses; banks, offices; funeral homes; day care facilities	Warehousing, indoor light manufacturing, printing and publishing, antennas, information services, and any structure exceeding 20,000 square feet	40,000 square feet	Combined building and paved areas may cover a maximum of 55 percent of the lot area
BP-2 Business Park District	All BP-1 permitted principal uses	All BP-1 conditional uses	40,000 square feet	Combined building and paved areas may cover a maximum of 55 percent of the lot area
BP-3 Business Park District	Finance and insurance services; real estate services; medical offices; day care facilities; and professional, scientific and technical services	All BP-1 conditional uses, except general warehousing; includes restaurants, non-retail florists, and non-retail bakeries	40,000 square feet	Combined building and paved areas may cover a maximum of 55 percent of the lot area
PW Port Washington Road District	Retail and special service uses; banks; offices; funeral homes; day care facilities; and manufacturing and commercial uses	Residential quarters, restaurants, day care facilities, trade services, and furniture manufacturing	60,000 square feet	Combined building and paved areas may cover a maximum of 55 percent of the lot area

Table D-5 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
M-1 Light Manufacturing and Warehousing District	Light manufacturing and warehousing; greenhouses, machine shops, business offices, bakeries, and essential services	Temporary storage, transportation terminals, lumber yards, communication towers, vehicle services, machinery sales and services, laboratories, printing and publishing, trade offices, mineral extraction and processing, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses/ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	1 acre	
P-1 Public and Private Park District	Public parks and preserves, arboretums, playgrounds, community centers, fairgrounds, historic sites, picnic areas, playfields, swimming beaches, tennis courts, and playlots	Private parks, club facilities, pet exercise areas, beaches, boating, camps, marinas, halls, skating rinks, public swimming pools, archery ranges, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, and sport fields		The sum of the total floor area of buildings may not exceed 10 percent of the total lot area
C-1 Conservancy Overlay District	Agricultural uses, fishing, hunting, historic sites, forestry, streambank protection, water retention, and wildlife preserves	Water control facilities, grazing, lodges, orchards, truck farming, wild crop harvesting, archery ranges, beaches, boating, camps, golf courses and ranges, stadiums and gyms, marinas, sport fields, and public swimming pools	^b	
RCDO Residential Conservation Development Overlay District	^c	Single-family residential, two-family residential, agricultural activities, open space uses, conservation of natural features in their existing state, easements, uses in common open space, water and sanitary sewer services, utility and street rights-of-way, and parking areas for active recreation facilities	One acre for areas with an underlying R- 1 or R-2 zoning and 0.5 acres with an underlying R-3 zoning	Maximum 10 percent lot coverage
PUD Planned Unit Development Overlay District	d	d	^e	d

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Grafton zoning code and map for specific zoning district information. In addition to the zoning districts summarized above, the City of Mequon has adopted an extraterritorial zoning ordinance that applies to an approximately 1,528 acre area in the Town of Grafton.

^aGovernmental and cultural uses are allowed as conditional uses in all districts and utilities are allowed as conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any residential district lot line. Public swimming pools are allowed as a conditional use in all districts, except the Conservancy Overlay District. Public and private schools, churches, colleges, and hospitals are conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any lot line. Public passenger transportation terminals are conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any lot line. Public passenger transportation terminals are conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 100 feet from any residential district boundary. Wind and solar energy conversion systems are allowed as a conditional use in all districts.

^bNo lands located in the Conservancy Overlay District may be used to meet the lot area requirements of the underlying basic zoning district.

^cNo permitted uses. All uses are conditional.

^dAs per underlying basic zoning district requirements.

^eMinimum lot size of underlying basic zoning district may be modified, but gross density shall not exceed six dwelling units per acre.

Source: Town of Grafton Zoning Code and SEWRPC.

Table D-6

TOWN OF PORT WASHINGTON ZONING ORDINANCE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
A-1 Exclusive Agricultural District	Apiculture; dairying; farming; grazing; floriculture; raising of grains, fruits, and vegetables; sod farming; livestock and poultry raising; nurseries; orchards; paddocks; viticulture; farm buildings; and essential services	Airports and airstrips, farm labor housing, commercial raising of farm animals, veterinary services, agricultural warehousing and services, recreation vehicle storage, hatcheries, greenhouses, kennels, parks, preserves, stables, private utilities, fur and stock raising, and commercial dairy	35 acres	1,200 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
A-2 General Agricultural District	Agriculture, horticulture, and forestry uses; crop and tree farming; truck farming; gardening; nurseries; single-family dwellings, and municipal utilities	Farm labor housing, commercial raising of farm animals, veterinary services, and recreation vehicle storage	5 acres	1,600 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi- story
A-3 Agricultural Transition District	Farms and single-family dwellings, community living arrangements, essential services, and uses commonly classed as agriculture, horticulture, or forestry	Farm labor housing, commercial raising of farm animals, veterinary services, agricultural warehousing and services, recreation vehicle storage, and certain commercial agricultural uses	b	1,200 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
ACS-1 Agricultural/ Conservation Subdivision District	Farmsteads, single-family dwellings, community living arrangements, essential services, and uses commonly classed as agriculture, horticulture, or forestry	Dairy farming, grazing or pasturing, livestock raising (except commercial feed lots and fur farms)	32,670 square feet (3/4 acre)	1,200 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
R-1 Residential District	Single-family dwellings, community living arrangements, and essential services	Rest and nursing homes, private stables, boathouses, and two-family dwellings not to exceed 0.67 dwelling units per net acre	1.5 acres	2,000 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
R-2 Residential District	Single-family dwellings, community living arrangements, and essential services	Rest and nursing homes, private stables, public and private schools, churches, colleges, hospitals, cemeteries, crematories, and correctional institutions	1 acre	2,000 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
B-1 Business District	Retail, offices, and service uses; banks; restaurants (except drive in); bowling alleys; day care facilities; lodges; public buildings; water storage tanks; and public water treatment facilities	Public passenger transportation terminals, public and private schools, churches, colleges, hospitals, cemeteries, crematories, correctional institutions, drive-in restaurants, motels, funeral homes, drive-in banks, service stations, vehicles sales and services, animal hospitals, florists, and communication towers	1 acre	
B-2 Neighborhood Business District	Retail, bakeries, cafés, fitness centers, grocery stores, hardware stores, professional offices, and restaurants without drive-throughs	Bars, drive-through establishments, funeral homes, and medical offices	40,000 square feet	Not to exceed 40,000 square feet unless approved by Plan Commission
TSD Town Square District	Retail, bakeries, beauty salons, cafés, fitness centers, florists, hardware stores, and restaurants without drive-throughs	Bars, day care facilities, drive-through establishments, drug stores, and dental, medical, and professional offices	3 acres	Not to exceed 40,000 square feet unless approved by Plan Commission
BP-1 Business Park District	Retail, beauty salons, grocery stores, department stores, financial institutions, fitness centers, restaurants without drive-throughs, government offices, and professional, business, and financial services	Bars, day care facilities, dental offices, drive- through establishments, hotels, laboratories, medical offices, and certain manufacturing and storage	1.5 acre	Not to exceed 40,000 square feet unless approved by Plan Commission
BP-2 Transitional Business Park District	Retail, beauty salons, grocery stores, department stores, financial institutions, fitness centers, restaurants without drive-throughs, government offices, manufacturing, and professional, business, and financial services	Bars, day care facilities, dental offices, drive- through establishments, hotels, laboratories, medical offices, and certain manufacturing and storage, building material sales and storage, gas stations, and general warehousing	1.5 acres	Not to exceed 40,000 square feet unless approved by Plan Commission

Table D-6 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses ^a	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/ Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
M-1 Industrial District	Manufacturing, processing, and assembling uses; printing and publishing; repair shops; and studios	Airports and airstrips, public passenger transportation terminals, agricultural warehousing and services, recycling stations, sewage plants, transportation terminals, laboratories, warehousing, lumber yards, antennas, retail and services, and mineral extraction and processing	1 acre	
I-1 Institutional District	Municipal offices, government and cultural uses, golf courses, parks, and playgrounds	Airports, universities, public and private schools, cemeteries, and churches and other places of worship	40,000 square feet	Not to exceed 40,000 square feet unless approved by Plan Commission
P-1 Park and Recreation District	Parks and preserves, arboretums, boat access sites, golf courses without country club, picnic areas, playgrounds, clubs, historic sites, picnic areas, playfields, outdoor ice skating, swimming beaches, tennis courts, ski slopes, and playlots	Amphitheaters, archery and shooting ranges, arenas and stadiums, swimming pools, music and exhibit halls, conservatories, fairgrounds, golf courses with country club, driving ranges, gyms, marinas, museums, recreation centers, preserves, and zoos		Total floor area of all buildings must be 10 percent or less of total park area
PDR Planned Residential Overlay District	All R-1 and R-2 permitted principal district uses and two-family dwellings	All R-1 and R-2 conditional uses	c	2,000 minimum; 800 first floor minimum for multi-story
PUD Planned Unit Development Overlay District	d	d	e	d
KOD Knellsville Overlay Development Standards District	d	d	^e	⁰

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Port Washington zoning ordinance and map for specific zoning district information.

^aGovernmental and cultural uses are allowed as conditional uses in all districts and utilities are allowed as conditional uses in all districts provided all principal structures and uses are not less than 50 feet from any residential district lot line. Energy conservation uses are allowed as a conditional use in all districts.

^bExisting lot area of record as of December 7, 2009.

^cNo less than half the minimum lot area required in the underlying R-1 and R-2 districts.

^dAs per underlying basic zoning district requirements.

^eLot area requirements for underlying basic zoning district may be modified.

Source: Town of Port Washington Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance and SEWRPC.

Table D-7

TOWN OF SAUKVILLE ZONING ORDINANCE - SUMMARY OF DISTRICT REGULATIONS: 2010^a

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
A-1 General Agricultural District	Single-family dwelling, crop production, livestock and poultry raising, forestry, hunting, crop harvesting, essential services, historic sites, hiking and biking trails, nature areas, outdoor storage, sanctuaries, fishing, foster homes, nature trails, private parks, stables, boathouses, swimming pools, and playlots	Telecommunications facilities, veterinary services, public stables, home offices, wind energy towers, and kennels	5 acres ^a	 1,500 minimum plus 250 per each bedroom additional to three; 900 first floor minimum and 1,500 minimum total for multi story plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 250 to minimum floor area for single story; Add 200 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600; Maximum gross floor area ratio of 0.05
A-2 Exclusive Agricultural District	Single-family dwelling, crop production, livestock and poultry raising, forestry, hunting, crop harvesting, outdoor storage, fishing, and private stables	Telecommunications facilities, historic sites, hiking and nature trails, nature areas, public stables, sanctuaries, wind energy towers, essential services, foster homes, home offices, kennels, swimming pools, tennis courts, and sanctuaries	5 acres ^a	 1,500 minimum plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 200 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600; Maximum gross floor area ratio of 0.05 to 0.10
A-3 Agricultural Transition District	All A-2 permitted principal uses	All A-2 conditional uses	5 acres ^a	 1,500 minimum plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 200 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600; Maximum gross floor area ratio of 0.05 to 0.10
A-4 Rural Countryside Agricultural District	One-family detached dwellings, crop production, bike trails, boat access sites, community living arrangements with a maximum of eight persons, essential services, fishing, foster homes, hiking trails, historic sites, hunting, nature areas and trails, outdoor storage, private parks, boathouses, swimming pools, tennis courts, and sanctuaries	Farm labor housing, commercial raising of farm animals, veterinary services, recreation vehicle storage, home offices, community living arrangements for nine or more persons, kennels, and private stables	5 acres ^a	 1,500 minimum plus 250 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 250 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600;
A-5 Countryside Agricultural District	All A-4 permitted principal uses, except outdoor storage	All A-4 conditional uses and outdoor storage	Five acres; Maximum density of 0.18 dwelling units per acre	Same as A-4
R-1 Waterfront Residential Neighborhood Conservation District	All A-4 permitted principal uses, except hunting and outdoor storage	Community living arrangements with nine or more persons, home offices, and kennels	40,000 square feet	 1,500 minimum plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 150 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600; Maximum gross and net density of 1.00

Table D-7 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
R-2 Single-Family Residential Neighborhood Conservation District	All A-4 permitted principal uses, except hunting and outdoor storage	All R-1 conditional uses	40,000 square feet; Maximum density of 1.00 dwelling unit per acre	1,500 minimum plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 150 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600;
R-3 Waterfront Residential Neighborhood Conservation District	All A-4 permitted principal uses, except hunting and outdoor storage	All R-1 conditional uses	12,000 square feet; Maximum density of 4.75 dwelling units per acre	 1,500 minimum plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; 1,100 first floor minimum and 1,900 minimum total for multi-story plus 150 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 150 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600;
R-4 Transitional Urban to Suburban/ Rural Residential District	All A-4 principal uses, except hunting and outdoor storage	All R-1 conditional uses	20,000 square feet; Maximum gross density of 0.92 and net density of 1.68 dwelling units per acre	 1,600 minimum plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; 900 first floor minimum and 1,800 minimum total for multi-story plus 200 per each bedroom additional to three; Add 200 to minimum first floor area and total area for dwellings with basements under 600;
B-1 Community Business District	Retail and service uses; electronics stores, florists, office supply stores, banks, insurance services, real estate, professional and technical services, support services, electric utilities, essential services, hiking and nature trails, historic sites, and nature areas	Residential services, printing, furniture stores, meat markets, pharmacies, hardware stores, apparel stores, post offices, telecommunications facilities, restaurants and taverns, and vehicle services	New lots five acres; Existing lots 40,000 square feet	Maximum gross floor area of 0.32 and net gross floor area of 0.54
M-1 Light Manufacturing District	Manufacturing of fabricated metal, machinery, primary metal, and motor vehicle components; hiking and nature trails; historic sites; and nature areas	Textiles, software reproducing, and security services	5 acres	Maximum gross floor area of 0.40 and net gross floor area of 0.66
SG Sand and Gravel Extraction District	Crop production, livestock and poultry raising, forestry, hunting, crop harvesting, and essential services	Airports and airstrips, public passenger transportation terminals, agricultural warehousing and services, recycling stations and sewage plants, transportation terminals, warehousing, lumber yards, antennas, retail and services, existing extraction and processing, and expansion of existing extractive operations to contiguous areas	Extractive uses- 10 acres; Uses other than extraction- 20,000 square feet	Maximum gross floor area of 0.37 and net gross floor area of 0.74
I-1 Institutional District	Elementary and secondary schools, historic sites, governmental offices, assemblies less than 100 persons, churches, cemeteries, essential services, hiking and nature trails, historic sites, nature areas, and recycling facilities	Utilities, post offices, telecommunications facilities, and assemblies more than 100 persons	New lots five acres; Existing lots 40,000 square feet	Maximum gross floor area of 0.32 and net gross floor area of 0.54
Table D-7 (continued)

District	Typical Permitted Principal Uses	Typical Conditional Uses	Minimum Lot Size	Minimum/Maximum Floor Area (square feet)
P-1 Park and Recreation District	Historic sites, public parks, assemblies less than 100 persons, athletic fields, boat access sites, bike and nature trails, essential services, nature areas, picnic areas, playfields, and playgrounds	Telecommunications facilities, golf courses, recreation centers, assemblies more than 100 persons, fairgrounds, shooting ranges, private parks, private clubhouses, and equestrian trails	5 acres	Maximum gross floor area of 0.30 and net gross floor area of 0.60
CSO Conservation Subdivision Overlay District	^b	^b	c	^c

Note: This table is a summary and should not be used as a guide to answer zoning-related questions. Refer to the Town of Saukville zoning ordinance and map for specific zoning district information.

^aThe zoning ordinance was amended on January 28, 2011, to require a minimum lot area of five acres in the A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4 Districts.

^bAs per underlying basic zoning district requirements.

^cThe minimum lot area may be less than that required in the underlying basic zoning district, but no less than 20,000 square feet.

Source: Town of Saukville Zoning Ordinance and SEWRPC.



Map D-1 EXISTING ZONING IN THE CITY OF MEQUON: 2010



Source: City of Mequon and SEWRPC.

1 MILE

EXISTING ZONING IN THE TOWN OF BELGIUM: 2010



T11 N R22 E R21 E

ZONING DISTRICTS



- A-1 AGRICULTURAL
- A-2 AGRICULTURAL (NONE)
- R-1 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
- **B-1 COMMERCIAL**
- M-1 INDUSTRIAL
- P-1 PARK
- C-1 CONSERVANCY OVERLAY

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- STREET AND HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY
 - RAILWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY
 - OZAUKEE INTERURBAN TRAIL
 - 2005 WISCONSIN WETLAND INVENTORY
 - SURFACE WATER







TON R20E R21E

ZONING DISTRICTS



A-1 AGRICULTURAL

A-2 PRIME AGRICULTURAL

E-1 ESTATE

CR-A COUNTRYSIDE RESIDENTIAL - A CR-B COUNTRYSIDE RESIDENTIAL - B TR TRANSITIONAL RESIDENTIAL TR-2 TRANSITIONAL RESIDENTIAL R-1 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-2 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-3 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL B-1 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS B-2 PLANNED BUSINESS

B-3 BUSINESS

M-1 INDUSTRIAL (NONE)

M-2 PLANNED INDUSTRIAL

M-3 QUARRYING (NONE)

P-1 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK

C-1 CONSERVANCY

TOWN CENTER OVERLAY

PLANNED UNIT OVERLAY

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



STREET AND HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

RAILWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY

2005 WISCONSIN WETLAND INVENTORY

SURFACE WATER



Source: Town of Cedarburg and SEWRPC.





T11N R21E

ZONING DISTRICTS



A-1 EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL A-2 AGRICULTURAL/RURAL RESIDENTIAL A-3 AGRICULTURAL/RURAL RESIDENTIAL **R-1 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-2 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-3 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL R-4 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL** R-5 MOBILE HOME PARK (NONE) **B-1 URBAN BUSINESS B-2 HIGHWAY BUSINESS** M-1 URBAN INDUSTRIAL M-2 GENERAL INDUSTRIAL



M-3 EXTRACTIVE

P-1 PARK

P-2 URBAN INSTITUTIONAL

P-3 RURAL INSTITUTIONAL C-1 LOWLAND CONSERVANCY

C-2 UPLAND CONSERVANCY

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



STREET AND HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY RAILWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY 2005 WISCONSIN WETLAND INVENTORY SURFACE WATER



Source: Town of Fredonia and SEWRPC.

273



EXISTING ZONING IN THE TOWN OF GRAFTON: 2010

ZONING DISTRICTS



A-1 EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL A-2 AGRICULTURAL/RURAL RESIDENTIAL

R-1 RESIDENTIAL

R-2 RESIDENTIAL

R-3 RESIDENTIAL

- **B-1 BUSINESS**
- **BP-1 BUSINESS PARK**

BP-2 BUSINESS PARK (NONE)

- **BP-3 BUSINESS PARK**
- PW PORT WASHINGTON ROAD
- M-1 LIGHT MANUFACTURING AND WAREHOUSING
- P-1 PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARK

Source: Town of Grafton and SEWRPC.



RESIDENTIAL CONSERVATION DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY (RCDO) PW ZONING ALLOWED AFTER 80% OF PLANNED PW DEVELOPS PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY (PUD) (NONE)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION



STREET AND HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

RAILWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY

OZAUKEE INTERURBAN TRAIL

OZAUKEE INTERURBAN TRAIL OVERLAY OTHER TRANSPORTATION, COMMUNICATIONS, AND UTILITIES



SURFACE WATER





ZONING DISTRICTS



A-1 EXCLUSIVE AGRICULTURAL A-2 GENERAL AGRICULTURAL A-3 AGRICULTURAL TRANSITION (NONE)

ACS-1 AGRICULTURAL/CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION (NONE) R-1 RESIDENTIAL

R-2 RESIDENTIAL

B-1 BUSINESS

B-2 NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (NONE)

TSD TOWN SQUARE

BP-1 BUSINESS PARK

BP-2 TRANSITIONAL BUSINESS

M-1 INDUSTRIAL

Source: Town of Port Washington and SEWRPC.



P-1 PARK AND RECREATION

PDR PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT OVERLAY (NONE) PUD PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY (NONE) KOD KNELLSVILLE OVERLAY DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION







Appendix E

AGRICULTURAL, NATURAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCE PROGRAMS AVAILABLE IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service

The USDA Farm Service Agency (FSA) and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) have several programs to help reduce erosion, protect wildlife habitat, restore wetlands, and improve water quality. All programs involve cost-share assistance from the Federal government, provided the landowner follows the prescribed practices of each program.

The NRCS administers a variety of incentive programs which indirectly may help prevent nonfarm development in agricultural areas. These programs include the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), and the Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), among others. Under these programs, a landowner enters into an agreement to restore or protect lands for a 10-year or longer period in return for cash payments or assistance in making land conservation improvements.

Conservation Reserve Program

The USDA administers the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) to help provide water quality protection, reduce soil erosion, protect the Nation's ability to produce food and fiber, reduce sedimentation in streams and lakes, improve water quality, establish wildlife habitat, and enhance forest and wetland resources. The CRP is a voluntary program for agricultural landowners that provides annual rental payments and cost-share assistance to establish long-term, resource-conserving vegetative cover on eligible farmland.¹ It encourages farmers to convert highly erodible cropland or other environmentally sensitive acreage to vegetative cover, such as a prairie-compatible, noninvasive forage mix; wildlife plantings; trees; filter strips; or riparian buffers. Farmers receive an annual rental payment for the term of a multi-year contract based on the agriculture rental value of the land, and up to 50 percent Federal cost sharing is provided to establish vegetative cover. The program is administered by the FSA with technical assistance provided by NRCS. NRCS works with landowners to develop their application, and to plan, design, and install the conservation practices on the land.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program

Like CRP, CREP is administered by the FSA and contracts require a 10- to 15-year commitment to keep lands out of agricultural production. By combining CRP resources with State and private programs, CREP provides farmers and ranchers with a sound financial package for conserving and enhancing the natural resources of farms.

¹*The USDA adopted a policy in 2005 that prohibits the agency from releasing specific data regarding parcels enrolled in USDA programs, so information cannot be mapped.*

The program is intended to help protect water quality and wildlife habitat. Farmers enrolled in CREP remove land from agricultural production and plant native grasses, trees, and other vegetation to improve water quality, soil conditions, and wildlife habitat. CREP provides rental payments and other financial incentives to encourage producers to voluntarily enroll in 10- to 15-year contracts. Goals of CREP are to reduce fertilizer and sedimentation runoffs (nonpoint pollution runoff), and establish riparian buffers and grassland habitat. It can provide a viable option to supplement farm income as well. Such land usually contains poor soils for agricultural production including flood-prone areas (low-yielding land) and land along streams which usually yield less than land in the center of fields. CREP is not currently available in Ozaukee County, but eventually could be available.

Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)

The Conservation Stewardship Program, which replaced the previous Conservation Security Program, is a voluntary program that encourages agricultural and forestry producers, regardless of size or crops produced, to undertake additional conservation activities as well as improve and maintain existing conservation systems. CSP provides financial and technical assistance to help land stewards conserve and enhance soil, water, air, and related natural resources on their land. CSP pays participants for conservation performances; the higher the performance, the higher the payment. Participants enter into a five year contract and may chose between an annual payment for installing new conservation activities and maintaining existing practices or a supplemental payment for those who also adopt resource-conserving crop rotation.

Environmental Quality Incentives Program

The Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) is a voluntary conservation program that supports agriculture and environmental quality as compatible goals. Through EQIP, farmers may receive financial and technical help with structural and management conservation practices on agricultural land. EQIP offers contracts for practice implementation for periods ranging from one to 10 years, and it pays up to 50 to 75 percent of the costs of eligible conservation practices. Incentive payments and cost share payments may also be made to encourage a farmer to adopt land management practices such as nutrient management, manure management, integrated pest management, or wildlife habitat management.

Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program

The NRCS helps to keep productive farmland in agricultural use by providing assistance in purchasing development rights from farmers and placing an agricultural or conservation easement on eligible farmlands through the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP), commonly referred to as purchase of development rights (PDR). The FRPP provides State or local governments, or nonprofit organizations, with up to 50 percent of the purchase price of such perpetual voluntary easements. In order to be eligible, the farmland must be prime or of statewide importance, unique, or other productive farmland, must meet highly erodible land provisions set forth in the Food Security Act, or include important historical or archaeological sites. Additionally, the farmland must have the location, size, and existing protections, including appropriate zoning, that support long-term agricultural use.

Resource Conservation and Development

The Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) program was established by the Federal Agricultural Act of 1962. This act directs the USDA to help units of government conserve and properly utilize all resources in solving local issues. Wisconsin has seven RC&Ds, covering all Wisconsin counties. In 2005, Ozaukee County became a member of the Town and Country RC&D area which was organized to cover 13 counties in southeastern Wisconsin. The Town and Country RC&D helps to facilitate the development and coordination of existing and innovative projects, and will assist in finding funding to implement them. Town and Country RC&D has helped promote agricultural, energy, water quality, and educational projects and programs throughout the Region.

Wetlands Reserve Program

The Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) is another voluntary program designed to restore and protect wetlands on private property. It is an opportunity for landowners to receive financial incentives to restore wetlands that have been drained for agricultural purposes. Landowners who choose to participate in WRP may sell a conservation

easement or enter into a cost-share restoration agreement with NRCS to restore and protect wetlands. The landowner voluntarily limits future use of the land, yet retains private ownership. The landowner and NRCS develop a plan for the restoration and maintenance of the wetland. This program offers landowners three options; permanent easements, 30-year easements, and restoration cost-share agreements with a minimum 10-year duration.

Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program

Administered by the NCRS, the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) is a voluntary program to develop or improve wildlife habitat on private lands. It provides both technical assistance and up to 75 percent Federal cost sharing to help establish and improve wildlife habitat. Landowners agree to work with NRCS to prepare and implement a wildlife habitat development plan which describes the landowner's goals for improving wildlife habitat, includes a list of practices and a schedule for installing them, and details the steps necessary to maintain the habitat for the life of the cost-share agreement. WHIP emphasizes re-establishment of declining species and habitats, including prairie chickens, meadowlarks, sharp-tailed grouse, Karner blue butterfly, smallmouth bass, blue-winged teal, and many other species of grassland birds, reptiles, insects, and small mammals. Some of the opportunities that exist are installing in-stream structures to provide fish habitat, restore prairie and oak savannahs, and brush management and control of invasive species.

Cost-shared practices include burning, seeding, and brush management of prairies, grasslands, and savannahs; installing instream structures and bank stabilization in streams; and improving timber stands and managing brush on woodlots. Federal or State wildlife agencies or private organizations may provide additional funding or expertise to help complete a project. Contracts normally last a minimum of five years from the date the contract is signed and cost sharing does not exceed \$10,000. Eligible lands must be a minimum of five acres of agricultural or nonagricultural land, woodlots, pasture land, streambanks, and shorelands. Lands currently enrolled in other conservation programs are not eligible to participate in WHIP.

Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection

Working Lands Initiative

In 2005, the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) launched the Working Lands Initiative and established a steering committee to develop a consensus vision on managing Wisconsin's farm and forest lands. The Working Lands Initiative Steering Committee in August 2006 issued a report with a set of recommendations intended to modernize and expand policies and programs affecting Wisconsin farmlands and forests. The report recommended an update to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, established in 1976, which would include setting a flat per-acre tax credit for landowners instead of basing the credit on household income and streamlining the process of applying for the program and claiming the tax credits. Proposed changes to the Farmland Preservation Program were included in DATCP's budget request and were enacted as part of the State's 2009-2011 biennial budget. The 2011-2013 biennial budget amended the program to delete the provisions that required a conversion fee to be paid by property owners rezoning parcels out of farmland preservation zoning districts where the community has a State certified farmland preservation zoning ordinance. The present Farmland Preservation Program can be found in Chapter 91, "Farmland Preservation," of the *Wisconsin Statutes* (See Appendix A). The updated Farmland Preservation Plan documented in this report was prepared to comply with Chapter 91, as amended.

Buy Local, Buy Wisconsin Program

In accordance with Sections 93.45 and 93.48 of the *Statutes*, DATCP may award grants to individuals or organizations to fund projects that are designed to increase the sale of agricultural products grown in Wisconsin which are purchased in close proximity to where they are produced. Specific intents of the program are to create, promote, and support regional food and cultural tourism trails and to promote development of regional food systems through activities such as creating or expanding facilities for the processing or distribution of food for local consumption; creating or supporting networks of producers; and strengthening connections between retailers, institutions, and consumers with nearby producers.

Farm to School Program

DATCP administers the "farm to school program" in accordance with Section 93.49 of the *Statutes* to connect schools with nearby farms to provide children with locally produced fresh fruits and vegetables, dairy products, and other nutritious, locally produced foods in school breakfasts, lunches, and snacks; help children develop healthy eating habits; provide nutritional and agricultural education; and improve farmer's incomes and direct access to markets. DATCP provides grants under this program to school districts, in coordination with the Department of Public Instruction, and to nonprofit organizations, farmers, and any other entities for the creation and expansion of farm to school programs. DATCP will give preference to proposals that are innovative or that provide models that other school districts can adopt.

Soil and Water Resource Management Program

DATCP administers Wisconsin's soil and water resource management program (SWRM) under the provisions of Chapter 92 of the *Wisconsin Statutes* and Chapter ATCP 50 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*. The SWRM grant program was developed to support locally-led conservation efforts. Counties are awarded grant funds to pay for conservation staff and provide landowner cost-sharing to develop and implement a Land and Water Resource Management Plan (LWRMP). The current version of Chapter ATCP 50 relates specifically to agricultural programs and it establishes requirements and/or standards for:

- Soil and water conservation on farms
- County soil and water programs, including land and water resource management plans
- Grants to counties to support county conservation staff
- Cost-share grants to landowners for implementation of conservation practices
- Design certifications by soil and water professionals
- Local regulations and ordinances
- Cost-share practice eligibility and design, construction, and maintenance

Eligible projects include grade stabilization structures, livestock fencing, riparian buffers, filter strips, streambank and shoreline protection, water and sediment control basins, well abandonment, and wetland restoration.² An example of this funding is the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department receipt of a \$4,750 grant in 2011 from this program to work with a landowner on a livestock exclusion fencing project on Riverside Drive Creek.

Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)

Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Fund

The Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Fund program was established by the Wisconsin Legislature in 1989 for a tenyear period. The program has been renewed twice, most recently as part of the 2007-2009 Wisconsin State Budget for the period 2010 to 2019. The goals of the Stewardship Program are to protect and restore nature-based outdoor recreation areas and areas having scenic or ecological value.³ The Stewardship Program is financed through the

²*The USDA adopted a policy in 2005 that prohibits the agency from releasing specific data regarding parcels enrolled in USDA programs, so information cannot be mapped.*

³The WDNR defines "nature-based" outdoor recreation as activities where the primary focus or purpose is the appreciation or enjoyment of nature. Such activities include hiking, bicycling, wildlife or nature observation, camping, nature study, fishing, hunting, picnicking, cross-country skiing, canoeing, and multi-use trail activities. Playgrounds are also considered "nature-based" facilities. Support facilities such as access roads, parking, signs, utility and restroom buildings, and habitat restoration are also eligible for funding under the Stewardship program.

issuance of general obligation bonds and was authorized to distribute about \$86 million annually Statewide for the ten-year period of the program. This amount was reduced to \$60 million annually for fiscal years 2011-2012 through 2019-2020 as part of the 2011-2013 budget bill. The WDNR administers the Stewardship Program. The program is an umbrella for a number of subprograms, each with its own goals, priorities, and criteria, which are summarized below. County and local government projects submitted for grants under the Stewardship Program must be included in a locally-adopted park plan.

Aids for the Acquisition and Development of Local Parks (ADLP)

The ADLP program is a regional allocation program which provides up to 50 percent matching grants to local and county units of government and nonprofit conservation organizations (NCOs) to provide assistance for the acquisition and development of local and county parks and trails. NCOs can use these funds for the acquisition of land or easements only. County and local governments may use ADLP funds for the purchase of land and easements and the development of outdoor recreation areas for nature-based outdoor recreation purposes.

Acquisition of Development Rights

The Acquisition of Development Rights program is a Statewide program which provides up to 50 percent matching grants to local and county units of government and NCOs to acquire development rights (conservation easements) in areas where restrictions on residential, commercial, or industrial development would help protect natural, agricultural, or forestry values and enhance nature-based outdoor recreation.

Urban Green Space (UGS)

The Urban Green Space program is a Statewide program which provides up to 50 percent matching grants to local and county units of government and NCOs to acquire or protect scenic, ecological, or other natural features in urban or urbanizing areas and provide land for nature-based outdoor recreation, including noncommercial community gardening. These funds can be used for the acquisition of land only.

Urban Rivers (URGP)

The Urban Rivers grant program is a Statewide program which provides up to 50 percent matching grants to local and county units of government and NCOs to purchase land or easements, or to develop shoreline enhancements on or adjacent to rivers that flow through urban or urbanizing areas. This program is intended to preserve or restore urban rivers or riverfronts for the purpose of revitalization and nature-based outdoor recreation activities. NCOs can use these funds for the acquisition of land or easements only.

Land and Water Conservation Fund (LAWCON or LWCF) Program

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) program was established by the U.S. Congress in 1964 to provide funding for the acquisition of land for park or open space preservation purposes and the development of outdoor recreation facilities. In Wisconsin, LWCF funds are administered by the WDNR. Up to 50 percent of project costs are eligible for funding under this program. A portion of the awarded amount is available to local and county units of government for the acquisition of land and the development of parks and trails. The "nature-based facilities" restriction in the Knowles-Nelson Stewardship Program does not apply to LWCF funds.

WDNR Office of the Great Lakes Buffer Incentive Program

The WDNR Office of the Great Lakes provided \$100,000 in buffer incentive funds to Ozaukee County in an effort to encourage more landowners to install riparian buffers along Lake Michigan tributaries and to increase participation in the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). These funds were administered by the Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department and were made available to Ozaukee County landowners during the years 2006 to 2010, which resulted in 131 acres of agricultural land being converted to vegetative buffers.

River Protection Grant Program

The River Protection Grant Program, administered by the WDNR, is intended to protect or improve rivers and natural river ecosystems, including water quality, fisheries habitat, and natural beauty. The program includes the following two subprograms:

River Planning Grants

This program provides grants of up to 75 percent to county and local units of government, nonprofit conservation organizations, and qualified river management organizations. Eligible activities include river organization development, educational efforts, assessments of water quality and aquatic life, and nonpoint source evaluations. Reimbursement is limited to \$10,000 per project.

River Management Grants

This program provides grants of up to 75 percent to county and local units of government, nonprofit conservation organizations, and qualified river management organizations. Eligible activities include purchase of land or easements, development of local ordinances, and restoration of in-stream or shoreland habitat. Reimbursement is limited to \$50,000 per project.

Wisconsin Managed Forest Law Program

The Managed Forest Law (MFL) program, also called Managed Forest Land program, is an incentive program intended to encourage sustainable forestry on private woodlands in Wisconsin. Owners of at least 10 acres of contiguous wooded land that is used primarily for growing forest products are eligible to apply for the program through the WDNR. Following approval of the application, the WDNR prepares a management plan for the property, which will require some timber harvest at prescribed intervals and payment at that time of a "stumpage" tax. The program can provide significant property tax savings for participating landowners.

Under this program, lands enrolled in the "closed" category are not available to the public while "open" lands are accessible for such recreation activities as hunting, fishing, and cross-country skiing. Enrollment is by contract between the WDNR and the landowner; the landowner can choose a 25- or 50-year contract; landowners make payments in lieu of property taxes amounting to less than what the property tax would be; and must consist of at least 10 acres of contiguous forest land located in one local government. Landowners must agree to follow a forest management plan. The MFL Program was created in 1985, replacing the Wisconsin Forest Crop Law program and Wisconsin Woodland Tax Law program. Some contracts under the Forest Crop Law program remain in effect in Wisconsin; all Woodland Tax Law program contracts have expired. Lands enrolled in the MFL program in Ozaukee County are shown in Map 10 in Chapter II.

Lake-Related Programs

The following lake-related programs are administered by the WDNR.

Lake Protection Grants

The lake protection program provides grants of up to 75 percent, to a maximum of \$200,000, to protect or restore lakes and their ecosystems. Local and county units of government, tribal governments, lake and sanitary districts, nonprofit conservation organizations, and certain lake associations are eligible for this program. Eligible activities include the acquisition of land or conservation easements to protect lake water quality, the restoration of wetlands tributary to a lake, the development of ordinances to protect water quality, and lake improvement projects included in a WDNR-approved lake management plan.

Lake Planning Grants

The lake planning program provides grants of up to 75 percent, to a maximum of \$10,000, for the preparation of lake management plans and for gathering and analyzing lake-related information. Local and county units of government, lake and sanitary districts, nonprofit conservation organizations, and certain lake associations are eligible for this program.

Nonpoint Source Pollution Abatement Programs

Nonpoint source abatement programs⁴ are aimed at improving surface water quality (lakes and rivers) by abating pollution caused by stormwater runoff. WDNR may provide grants to governmental units and special purpose

⁴For the latest information regarding nonpoint source and water pollution abatement and soil conservation programs, refer to the Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau (Informational Paper 66, January 2006).

districts to assist the implementation of nonpoint source pollution abatement practices and projects, where pollution abatement cannot be achieved though the implementation of county soil and water resources activities funded under DATCP costshares. Funding is generally targeted to areas such as those listed on the State's list of impaired waters, public health threat situations, and areas considered high priority areas such as outstanding or exceptional resource waters. Programs include the following:

Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Grant Program

To help control polluted runoff from both agricultural and urban sites, TRM grants are available to address highpriority resource problems. Eligibility is limited to local units of government, special-purpose districts (i.e., school or stormwater utility districts), tribal commissions, and regional planning commissions. Governmental units may be granted 70 percent of eligible costs for various (urban or rural) best management practices (BMPs), up to a cap of \$150,000. Property purchases (from willing sellers only) granted at 50 percent of WDNR-approved appraised value can be included in the \$150,000 grant cap. Rural easements, funded at 75 percent of the WDNR-appraised value, can also be included in the \$150,000 grant cap. For rural Best Management Practices (i.e. barnyard relocation and manure storage), county land conservation departments hold contracts on behalf of county residents. Funds are disbursed on a reimbursement based on the terms of a two-year grant contract.

Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water (UNPS&SW) Planning Program

UNPS&SW grant funds are used to control polluted runoff in urban project areas. Funds are typically awarded for either planning or construction projects. The grant period is two years. Projects funded by these grants are site-specific, serve areas generally smaller in size than a subwatershed, and are targeted to address high-priority problems. An "urban project area" must meet one of these criteria:

- Have a residential population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile;
- Have a commercial or industrial land use;
- Consist of a portion of a privately owned industrial site not covered by a WPDES permit issued under Chapter NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administrative Code*; or
- Consist of a municipally-owned industrial site (regardless of Chapter NR 216 permit requirements)

Governmental units are eligible for a grant even if the governmental unit is covered by a stormwater permit under Chapter NR 216 of the *Wisconsin Administration Code*.

UNPS&SW planning grants can be used to pay for a variety of technical assistance activities. Eligible activities such as stormwater management planning, related information and education activities, ordinance and utility development and enforcement are cost shared at 70 percent. Eligible UNPS&SW construction grant costs may include such projects as stormwater detention ponds, filtration and infiltration practices, streambank stabilization, and shoreline stabilization. Those eligible costs are cost shared at 50 percent up to a maximum of \$150,000. Additional cost-share reimbursements may be available for project design, land acquisition, and permanent easement costs with approval from WDNR.

Additionally, a municipal flood control and riparian restoration program provides financial assistance for the collection and transmission of stormwater for flood control and riparian restoration under the urban nonpoint program. Grants may be used for developing flood control facilities and structures, purchasing conservation easements on land within a floodway, or flood proofing structures within the 100-year floodplain.

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Rustic Roads Program

The Rustic Roads program is used to help citizens and local governments preserve the remaining scenic country roads designated for the leisurely enjoyment of hikers, bikers, and motorists. To qualify for the Rustic Road program, the road should be located in areas with outstanding natural features, native vegetation and wildlife, and open areas or agricultural vistas. The road should be lightly traveled, and not scheduled for major improvements which would change its characteristics. Although the Wisconsin Department of Transportation pays the cost of furnishing and installing Rustic Road marking signs, officially designated rustic roads remain under local control

and are eligible for state aid the same as any other public street. Currently, there are two designated rustic roads in Ozaukee County, Hawthorne Road between Granville Road (CTH Y) and Wauwatosa Road (STH 181) in the City of Mequon, and a loop formed by Knollwood Drive, Blue Goose Road, and St. Augustine Road in the Town of Saukville, which extends into the Town of Trenton in Washington County.

Historic Preservation Programs

Historic Homeowners Income Tax Credit Program

The Wisconsin Historical Society administers a 25 percent tax credit program to assist in the repair and rehabilitation of private residences, including farm residences, that are listed on the State or National Registers of Historic Places, listed as contributing properties to a State or National Historic District, or deemed eligible for listing on the State register through the tax credit application process. To qualify, a minimum expenditure of \$10,000 must be made over a two- to five-year period, and credits for the repair and rehabilitation are limited to painting, and structural work, such as roof replacement, floor leveling, electrical wiring, plumbing, heating, and cooling.

Wisconsin Barn Preservation Program

The Wisconsin Historical Society, UW-Extension, and the Wisconsin Trust for Historic Preservation have developed the Wisconsin Barn Preservation Program called Barns N.O.W. (Barns Network of Wisconsin) to help preserve old wood frame barns and other historically significant rural structures. Because farmsteads are often converted to residential subdivisions, the program sponsors workshops to explain how such structures could be converted into homes or carefully integrated with residential lots as accessory structures that may function as a garage, storage shed, workshop, studio, den, home occupation business, or simply remain as a reminder of our agrarian heritage. Iowa and New York have programs that help pay for structural repairs of barns, including beams, sills, cabling, and roof work, through grant programs. The Wisconsin Barn Preservation Program is working to establish a similar foundation that would make direct grants for repairs if owners contribute a matching amount.

County and Local Programs

Ozaukee County Land and Water Management

The Ozaukee County Land and Water Management (LWM) Department manages most natural resource and agricultural conservation programs in Ozaukee County, including development and implementation of recommendations contained in the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan.⁵ LWM staff provides technical and engineering assistance to control soil erosion and water pollution through a variety of local programs and will conduct resource inventories, including those for soils, drainage, topography, water resources, land use, and vegetation through on-site visits or map interpretations. The staff will develop resource management recommendations and plans; complete engineering and design activities for construction projects, including site surveys, runoff and flow calculations, and preparation of construction drawings; and supervise the construction of conservation practices.

LWM staff also determines what financial assistance may be available to local landowners to help offset the costs of conservation work and assist them in obtaining those funds. Financial assistance can be in the form of tax credits, cost-sharing, conservation easements, and other incentive payments. Currently the LWM Department supports and administers several Federal financial assistance programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), and the Wetland Reserve Program (WRP), and others. The Department also administers local ordinance and program compliance requirements. This currently includes the Farmland Preservation Program, Animal Waste Storage Ordinance, Non-Metallic Mining Reclamation Ordinance, and the implementation of the Water Quality Performance Standards found in *Wisconsin Administrative Code* Chapter NR 151. In addition, LWM staff

⁵Documented in the report, Ozaukee County Land and Water Resource Management Plan, 2011-2015, *February 2011, prepared by Ozaukee County.*

conducts a variety of information and education programs in partnership with other agencies and organizations to increase awareness and encourage citizens to take action to preserve their agricultural and other natural resources, including soils and water.

Ozaukee County Tree, Shrub, and Prairie Seed Program

Since 1987, the Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department has encouraged the planting of trees, shrubs, and, more recently, prairie seeds through the Annual Tree, Shrub and Prairie Seed Sale Program. The LWM Department annually takes orders from the public for bare root trees, shrubs, and prairie seed in late fall through winter. Plants and seeds are sold at a very reasonable price since the County receives a substantial discount for ordering a large quantity, and passing the savings on to the public. Over a million plants have been sold since 1987 to encourage the public to improve and sustain the County's natural resources. The tree program also offers an opportunity to introduce the community to Ozaukee County conservation staff and programs. Trees, shrubs, and prairie seeds are also provided by privately-owned companies within Ozaukee County as well as the Region.

Ozaukee Washington Land Trust

The Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT) may purchase lands containing significant natural resources or hold conservation easements for such lands in Ozaukee and Washington Counties. This nonprofit conservation organization (NCO), established in 1992, worked exclusively in Ozaukee County between 1992 and 1997 before expanding efforts to include Washington County. OWLT holds conservation easements and monitors the conservation restrictions within these easements (see Map 15 and Table 25 in Chapter II). Land trusts help protect land and water resources and are eligible to participate in State grant programs that fund land or conservation easement acquisitions, including State Stewardship Fund programs.

Ozaukee County Land Preservation Fund

The Ozaukee County Board and Land Preservation Board (LPB) established a trust fund called the Ozaukee County Land Preservation Fund in 2009. The trust fund was created to accept private donations of money or items that can be easily converted to a cash value (i.e. stock, bonds, etc.) to purchase land, easements, development rights, or similar activities for preserving agricultural and environmentally sensitive land in Ozaukee County as recommended by the LPB and approved by the full County Board. The donation of land or easements will also be considered.

Other Programs

Great Lakes Restoration Initiative

The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative was created by 11 Federal agencies to coordinate restoration of the Great Lakes by focusing on environmental outcomes like cleaner water and sustainable fisheries. Funding may be provided for projects in Ozaukee County through the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative (GLRI) from various Federal agencies such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and others to continue to inventory, address, and implement the removal of fish and aquatic life passage impediments, and provide for stream connectivity, fish and wildlife habitat modeling for restoration prioritization, monitoring, and the on-the-ground restoration of fish and wildlife habitat, particularly in the Milwaukee River Watershed and Estuary Area of Concern (AOC). The Milwaukee Estuary AOC is one of the target areas of the GLRI.

Through the GLRI, the NRCS will also provide financial and technical resources to help farmers implement conservation practices that reduce erosion, improve water quality, and maintain agricultural productivity for three priority focus areas. The focus areas include the Lower Fox River Watershed, Manitowoc-Sheboygan Watershed, and Milwaukee River Watershed. Ozaukee County is located entirely within the latter two. In Map 9 of Chapter II, the "Manitowoc-Sheboygan Watershed" within Ozaukee County includes the Sauk Creek, Sheboygan River, and Sucker Creek Watersheds and the north half of the direct drainage area tributary to Lake Michigan. The "Milwaukee River Watershed" within Ozaukee County includes the Menomonee River and Milwaukee River Watersheds and the south half of the direct drainage area tributary to Lake Michigan shown on that Map. Wisconsin received \$1.4 million in 2011 for such agricultural conservation practices.

Wisconsin Coastal Management Program

The Wisconsin Coastal Management Program (WCMP) is administered by the Wisconsin Department of Administration as a voluntary State-Federal partnership dedicated to preserving and making accessible the natural and historic resources of Wisconsin's Great Lakes coasts. The program works with State, Federal, County, local, and tribal government agencies and nonprofit organizations in managing the ecological, economic, and aesthetic assets of the Great Lakes and their coastal communities. The WCMP provides financial and technical assistance, and awards Federal matching grants to County local governments and other entities for implementation of coastal initiatives. Its goal is to achieve a balance between natural resource protection and coastal communities' need for sustainable economic development. The Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department received a \$15,000 grant from this program in 2006 for habitat and impediment inventory and a \$29,983 grant in 2011 for development of a geographic information system (GIS) tool, utilizing a GIS-based Fish and Wildlife Decision Support Tool, to map existing and potential wetland (i.e. fish spawning habitat) and wildlife habitat areas in Ozaukee County. The WCMP also provided funding (\$404,000) to help purchase and develop the Lion's Den Gorge Nature Preserve County Park in the Town of Grafton to preserve part of the Lake Michigan shoreline in perpetuity, and to provide public access to the lake shore.

Greater Milwaukee Foundation's Fund for Lake Michigan

The Greater Milwaukee Foundation's Fund for Lake Michigan awarded the Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department \$120,000 for years 2011 and 2012 to provide incentive payments to landowners for establishing vegetative buffers and field borders on agricultural land adjacent to the main stem and tributaries of Sauk Creek and Sucker Creek. The Fund was established in conjunction with the resolution in 2008 of disputes concerning the Oak Creek Power Plant and Elm Road Generation Station in southeastern Wisconsin. The agreement establishing the fund provided for payments of \$4 million each year from 2011 through 2035 to fund projects to address, reduce, and mitigate water quality impacts to Lake Michigan. The addition of riparian buffers and field borders will reduce erosion by catching sediment and slowing the rate of runoff. Riparian buffers and field borders will also trap and absorb excess nutrients such as phosphorus, nitrogen, and *E. coli* before they reach Sauk Creek or Sucker Creek.

A landowner-friendly buffer program will be developed by the County, which will allow agricultural producers to manage and periodically harvest their grassland buffers. This buffer initiative will provide flexibility and adaptive management options, which may lead to enhanced landowner participation. Cost share assistance will be provided as an incentive for buffer establishment. The Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department will work directly with landowners to select areas in need of riparian buffers and field borders. Cropland draining directly into a ditch, tributary, or main channel of Sauk Creek and Sucker Creek will be targeted.

Partners for Fish and Wildlife

The Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program is a USFWS habitat restoration cost-sharing program for private landowners. The program was created to provide financial and technical assistance to farmers, ranchers, and other private (nonfederal and nonstate) landowners interested in restoring fish and wildlife habitat on their land, including wetland and stream bank restorations. Assistance can range from providing informal advice on the location and design of potential restoration projects, to designing a project and funding up to 50 percent of the implementation costs. An agreement is entered into between the USFWS and the landowner in which the landowner agrees to maintain the restored or improved site for a minimum of 10 years. Projects receiving the highest priority for funding are those that provide direct benefits to migratory birds, anadromous fish, and threatened and endangered species. The Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department received a \$17,990 grant from this program in 2011 to work with farmers and other landowners on improving Riveredge Creek and Trinity Creek fish passages.

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Portions of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act are administered by NOAA to conserve and protect natural resources, including restoring wildlife habitats and removing fish passage barriers. During 2009 and 2010, the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department was awarded a combined \$5,246,850 in funding from NOAA to develop, refine, and implement the Milwaukee River Watershed Fish Passage Program. The funding was used to

restore biological connectivity to existing, high quality, habitats within the Milwaukee River and its tributaries by identifying and removing impediments to aquatic organism passage. Major program elements include the construction of a fish passage at the Mequon-Thiensville Dam (Village of Thiensville and City of Mequon), removal of the Lime Kiln Dam (Village of Grafton), removal of the Newburg Dam (Village of Newburg, planned for 2012), reconstructing or modifying numerous improperly-placed culverts at road and stream crossings, and removing small-scale impediments including woody debris, invasive plants, and railroad ballast deposits.

(This page intentionally left blank)

PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY

Appendix F

(This page intentionally left blank)







Countywide Farmland Preservation and Park and Open Space Planning Public Opinion Survey of Ozaukee County Residents, December 2010

David Trechter James Janke Shelly Hadley

Survey Research Center Report 2010/22 December 2010

This survey and the preparation of this document was funded in part through a Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) Farmland Preservation Planning Grant to the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department.

Staff and students working for the Survey Research Center at UW-River Falls were instrumental in the completion of this study. We would like to thank Denise Parks, Aaron Peterson, Ted Cannady, Ashley Julka, Hannah Stuttgen, Danielle Hammer, Caleb Riedeman, and Jacki Roden. We gratefully acknowledge their hard work and dedication. The SRC would also like to thank the Southeastern Regional Planning Commission, County Land Preservation Board, County Comprehensive Planning Board, County Planning & Parks Director Andrew Struck and UW-Extension CNRED Educator Nicole Sidoff for their input and advice. Finally, we would like to thank the Ozaukee County residents who took the time to complete their questionnaires.

This survey and the preparation of this document was funded in part through a Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) Farmland Preservation Planning Grant to the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	
Survey Purpose	
Survey Methods	
Profile of Respondents	
Quality of Life Factors	
Preservation of Farmland and Natural Areas	
Provision of Parks and Recreation Facilities	
Future Funding Priorities	
Environmental Improvement Priorities	
Overall Priority Actions for Ozaukee County	
Additional Comments	
Conclusions	
Appendix A – Non-Response Bias Test	
Appendix B – Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey Comments	
Appendix C - Quantitative Summary of Responses by Question	

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to gather opinions from Ozaukee County residents concerning issues related to: farmland preservation, parks, recreation, natural areas, and open space preservation issues in the County.

In September 2010, under contract with the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, the Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls mailed surveys with postage-paid return envelopes to 1,146 randomly selected Ozaukee County households. The initial mailing was followed by reminder postcards and a second mailing to non-respondents. The overall response rate was 37 percent (422 completed questionnaires). The results provided in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 4.75 percent with 95 percent confidence. Statistical tests did not indicate that "non-response bias" is a problem in this sample.

Respondents said the most important positive influence on the quality of life in Ozaukee County is the low crime rate and safe communities. The second most important quality of life factor was quality schools. Rounding out the top four choices were small town/village charm and tranquil residential areas.

Majorities said development in Ozaukee County should be concentrated around existing cities and villages (67%) and that the County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental/natural areas (65%). The level of support decreased to 48 percent when asked specifically about purchasing conservation easements for farmland preservation. A majority (54%) opposed a local tax increase to fund a dedicated County farmland preservation program. Preferred funding sources were private/conservancy trust funds and state/federal funding. Half the respondents favored the creation of an Agricultural Enterprise Area (AEA) in the County, which would allow farmers access to State tax credits and preserve farmland, while a third were neutral or wanted more information on this policy option.

Respondents favored "cluster" (conservation subdivision) design of housing developments (66%) compared to the traditional layout.

The largest portion (40%) of respondents favored or strongly favored creating a County program to purchase conservation easements for natural areas, and 22 percent were opposed or strongly opposed. A significant percentage had a neutral opinion (23%), and 15 percent wanted more information. A majority opposed a County property tax increase to fund the program. Private donations, conservancy trust funds, and state/federal funds were the preferred funding sources.

Respondents had fairly equally split opinions about expanding the County Parks System and County Recreation Facilities. The largest portion (38%) favored or strongly favored expansion; while 30 percent were opposed or strongly opposed, and a significant portion (23%) had a neutral opinion. Eleven percent said they need more information. Less than 30 percent supported a tax increase to create a fund for parks and recreational facilities. Favored funding methods were private donations and state/federal funds.

Respondents had split opinions about the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails and prefer private donations and state/federal funding sources to local taxes.

Over 70 percent of respondents said the following are high priorities for future funding: maintenance and upkeep of existing park facilities, preserving open space, and river restoration projects. Although respondents placed a high funding priority on preserving open space, majorities of respondents were opposed to raising property taxes to create programs that would preserve open space through conservation

easements on farmland and natural areas. Instead, they prefer that the County look to external funding sources. If County property taxes are used for open space preservation, respondents want funds to come from current resources.

Between half and two-thirds of respondents said the following are high priorities: protecting natural areas near County parks, preserving historic structures and archaeological sites, preservation of farmland for food, and preservation of farmland for rural character. Additional recreational facilities and expansion of parks were lower priorities.

When asked their opinions about natural resource priorities in Ozaukee County, majorities ranging from 58 percent to 63 percent said preservation of wildlife habitat, monitoring Lake Michigan water quality, preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion, and stricter water quality regulations were high priorities. About half of respondents said stricter flood control and stormwater regulations and promoting efforts to improve air quality were high priorities.

From a list of 11 overall priority actions, respondents said protection of water quality and preservation of rural and small town character were their most important priorities. Increasing the supply of affordable housing and promotion of tourism were the lowest priorities.

Survey Purpose

The purpose of this study was to gather opinions from Ozaukee County residents concerning issues related to: farmland preservation, parks, recreation, natural areas, and open space preservation issues in the County.

The Survey Research Center (SRC) at the University of Wisconsin – River Falls conducted and analyzed survey results under contract by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department. The survey questionnaire was developed collaboratively by UW-River Falls-SRC, Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, UW-Extension-Ozaukee County, Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC), the Land Preservation Board, and the Comprehensive Planning Board.

Survey Methods

In September 2010, the SRC mailed surveys with prepaid postage envelopes to 1,146 randomly selected households in Ozaukee County. The surveys were followed with reminder postcards and a second mailing to non-respondents.

The response rate was 37 percent (422 returned questionnaires). Based on the estimated number of adults (voting age) in the population of Ozaukee County $(66,121^{1})$ the results provided in this report are expected to be accurate to within plus or minus 4.75 percent with 95 percent confidence. This means that if this survey was replicated 20 times, only once would the results be expected to fall more than 4.75 percent above or below the values reported in this document.

Any survey has to be concerned with "non-response bias." Non-response bias refers to a situation in which people who do not return a questionnaire have opinions that are systematically different from the opinions of those who return their surveys. Based upon a standard statistical analysis described in Appendix A, the SRC concludes that there is little evidence that non-response bias is a concern for this sample.

In addition to the numeric responses, respondents provided additional written comments that were compiled by the SRC from the surveys. **Appendix B to this report contains the complete compilation of comments.**

Appendix C contains a copy of the survey questionnaire with a quantitative summary of responses by question.

¹Wisconsin Demographic Services Bureau, Official Population Estimate, 2010.

Profile of Respondents

Table 1 summarizes the demographic profile of the survey respondents. Where comparable data were available from the 2006-2008 Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) estimate or the State of Wisconsin Demographic Services Center, they were included to indicate the degree to which the sample represents the underlying adult population of Ozaukee County.

There were fewer people under 35 years of age in the sample than the ACS indicates should have been included and fewer renters than reported in the ACS estimate. Our experience is that younger residents and renters are less likely to participate in surveys.

The sample contained a higher proportion of respondents with graduate or professional degrees and fewer respondents with no formal education beyond high school.

Although the overall pattern of household income distribution among the respondents generally matches the ACS, there were more households with over \$100,000 annual income and fewer households with very low annual income (<\$15,000).

The most significant discrepancy between the sample and Census Bureau data was with respect to gender; there were substantially more males in the sample than would be expected. Analysis of the mean response values indicated men and women had statistically significant differences in only 17 of the 109 quantitative variables on the survey. Further examination showed the percentage differences were relatively small for 13 of the 17 variables. These questions will be noted in the text of the report. In short, while the gender imbalance is not a good thing from a statistical standpoint, the similarity of views between men and women means that the practical impact of this skewed distribution is small.

With respect to presence of children in the household and place of residence, the sample aligned particularly well with the ACS estimate.

There are no comparable Census data about length of residence. Respondent data indicated that over half of the respondents have lived in Ozaukee County for more than 20 years. Similarly, there are no comparable Census data about type of employment. The largest proportion of employed respondents worked in professional/administrative positions (28%). Another 28 percent said they are retired, which closely corresponds to the 28 percent of County households with Social Security income reported in the American Community Survey.

One percent of respondents said they work in agriculture; again, the response closely corresponds to the American Community Survey, which indicates 1.2 percent of the County workforce (age 16+) is engaged in agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting, and mining.

As we analyze the data, we will identify when various demographic groups have significantly different views.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents									
Gender	Count	Male	Femal	le					
Sample	386	67%	33%						
Wisconsin Official Est.	66,121	49%	51%						
Age 18+	Count	18 – 24	25 - 3	4 35	35 - 44		45 – 54		65+
Sample	389	1%	6% 15		5%	6 25%		25%	28%
Wisconsin Official Est.	66,121	12%	11% 17%		7%	23%		18%	18%
Households with Children	Count	0	1+		2		3		5+
Sample	393	68%	11%	1	4%	7%		<1%	<1%
Census ACS 2006-08	23,345	71%				29	9%		
Residential Status	Count	Own	Rent	;					
Sample	395	90%	10%						
Census ACS 2006-08	33,071	67%	33%	33%					
Length of Residency	Count	0 to 10 years	11 to 20 yearsOver yea		er 20 Seasonal/ ars Part time				
Sample ²	397	22%	21	%	5	6%		1%	
Employment	Count	Sales/ Service	Educ. Gov'	./ t Fa	ctory	Gen Lab	eral oor	Agric.	Professional Admin.
	374	13%	8%	,	3%	19	6	1%	28%
Sample ³		Clerical/ Office	Skille Trade Craft	d e/ Re t	tired	No Empl	ot oyed	Other	
		2%	6%	2	8%	49	6	6%	
Highest Level of Education (Age 25+)	Count	Less than High Sch.	High Sch. Dipl.	Some College Tech	e/ Co	'ech/ ollege rad.	Bacl De	helor's egree	Graduate/ Professional Degree
Sample	396	1%	13%	21%	1	10%	2	8%	28%
Census ACS 2006-08	57,831	6%	23%	22%		7%	2	8%	15%
Annual Household Income Range	Count	<\$15,000	\$15- \$24,999	\$2 \$49	25- ,999	\$50 \$74,99	99	\$75- \$99,999	\$100,000+
Sample	354	1%	6%	16	5%	21%)	18%	39%

² Census does not collect length of residence data ³ Census does not contain comparable categories

Place of Residence		Cedarburg C	Cedarburg T	Saukville T	Grafton V
	Sample	13%	9%	1%	13%
	Estimate ⁴	13%	7%	2%	13%
		Mequon	Fredonia T	Bayside	Newburg
Sample Count = 396	Sample	26%	2%	0%	0%
	Estimate ⁴	27%	2%	<1%	<1%
Population ⁴ = $86,395$		Port Wash. C	Grafton T	Belgium V	Saukville V
	Sample	13%	7%	<1%	4%
	Estimate ⁴	13%	5%	2%	5%
		Belgium T	Port Wash. T	Fredonia V	Thiensville
	Sample	2%	3%	2%	6%
	Estimate ⁴	2%	2%	2%	4%

The place of residence of the sample closely aligns with the geographic distribution of the County's population.

To aid in the analysis of the place of residence data, the SRC combined jurisdictions into two groups. Group 1 contained the cities and villages. Group 2 contained the towns. Responses from Mequon were split between the two groups according to the ZIP code of the respondents. Mequon respondents in the 53092 ZIP code were added to the cities/villages; Mequon respondents in the 53097 ZIP code were added to the town group. Eighty-one percent of the Mequon respondents were from the 54092 ZIP code, and 19 percent were from 54097. These percentages closely match the geographic distribution of the population in the two Mequon ZIP code areas as reported in the 2000 Census. In general, there was little difference between the responses from the two areas. Only two questions contained noteworthy differences, which will be noted in the text.

Quality of Life Factors

The initial section of the survey asked respondents to identify the four most positive influences on the quality of life they experience in Ozaukee County. As shown in Chart 1, two of the 15 choices stood out at the top of the list of influences. Topping the list was low crime/safe community, which was included among their top four choices by 71 percent of respondents. Coming in second place, the quality of local schools was a top influence among 57 percent of respondents and was the only other item included among their top four choices by a majority of the respondents. The third most popular quality of life factor was town/village charm, which was chosen by 38 percent of respondents. Tranquil residential areas and low taxes were in a tie for fourth place at 30 percent. Between 20 percent and 25 percent of respondents included parks and open spaces, well-maintained properties, retail shopping opportunities, and condition of roads among their top four quality of life influences. About one in six respondents said rural agricultural character and natural beauty are among their top quality of life factors. At the bottom of the list of factors were outdoor recreation opportunities, proximity to job opportunities, good pace of development, and historical features.



<u>Demographic Comparisons</u>: Perhaps not surprisingly, three-fourths of respondents with children in the household included quality schools among their top four choices compared to half of respondents without children at home. A majority of homeowners (60%) included quality schools among their top four choices compared to 44 percent of renters. A majority of renters picked small town charm (56%) compared to 38 percent of homeowners. Rural agricultural character was chosen more frequently by town respondents (35%) than by respondents from cities and villages (9%).

Preservation of Farmland and Natural Areas

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with four statements using the following scale: strongly agree, agree, neutral/no opinion, disagree, strongly disagree, or need more information. Chart 2 summarizes the results. The top bar shows the sum of the percentage of the "strongly agree" plus the "agree" responses. The second bar is the percentage of the "neutral/no opinion" responses. The combined percentages of the "disagree" plus "strongly disagree" responses are shown in the third bar. The fourth bar is the "need more info" responses

Two-thirds of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that development should be concentrated around existing cities and villages in order to minimize conflicts between urban and rural activities. Nearly as many (65%) said they agree or strongly agree that Ozaukee County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental/natural areas. We will explore opinions about the purchase of specific types of conservation easements later in the report.

When asked if the cost of farmland is making agriculture unsustainable and if there is enough farmland in Ozaukee County to support the long-term viability of agriculture, neither a majority agreed or disagreed with these statements. A plurality, approximately 40 percent, agreed or strongly agreed with both statements, but between 23 percent and 29 percent of respondents said they had no opinion or were neutral. Additionally, between 13 percent and 20 percent said they needed more information to form an opinion. The relatively high proportion of respondents with no opinion and the relatively high percentage of people who couldn't form an opinion because of a lack of information suggest the need for additional educational programming on these topics.



<u>Demographic Comparisons</u>: Women were more likely to want more information than men before offering an opinion about the sufficiency of farmland to support long-term agricultural viability in Ozaukee County and whether the County should purchase conservation easements.

As noted above, respondents indicated support for the concept of purchasing conservation easements (65%). However, when asked specifically about the creation of a County program to purchase easements for farmland preservation, Table 2 shows less enthusiasm than seen in the responses to the earlier question. Half of respondents, or 48 percent, said they favor or strongly favor a County program to purchase farmland easements. Only 23 percent were opposed to a County farmland easement program, while 19 percent chose "neutral/no opinion," and 11 percent wanted more information.

Table 2. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements from farmers in an effort to preserve agricultural land?							
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Need More Info		
14%	34%	19%	15%	8%	11%		

<u>Demographic Comparison</u>: Renters were more likely to favor or strongly favor purchasing conservation easements for farmland preservation (64%) than homeowners (46%).

In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a County program to purchase easements for farmland preservation were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 3, a majority of those who favor County purchase of farmland easements said their top funding choices were to seek monies from conservancy trust funds (such as the Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust) and grants or funds from the state or federal government. More than half of the supporters included private donations among their choices.

Use of County property tax revenue (11%) and sales tax revenue (10%) were decidedly unpopular, even among those who favor creating the program to purchase easements for farmland preservation.



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for an agricultural land preservation program. The results are shown in Chart 4. Although there was less opposition to the use of property taxes when provided specific details, over half (54%) were opposed to the proposal. The combined results of Chart 3 and Chart 4 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to fund a farmland preservation fund.



The farmland preservation programs and actions included in this section of the survey would have their largest impact on the farming community of Ozaukee County. As discussed previously, the proportion of farmers among the survey respondents was about one percent (4 respondents). Although this figure is proportional to the number of farmers in the County population, the small number of farmers in the survey precludes adequate statistical analysis of the opinions of Ozaukee County farmers. It is important for Ozaukee County officials to seek additional input from the farm community as they deliberate farmland preservation policy.
Respondents who opposed the use of government funds for the preservation of farmland were asked to indicate the reasons for their opposition. Respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Chart 5 indicates that the primary reasons behind the opposition were concerns that government funding costs too much (44%) and that farmland preservation programs interfere with private markets (41%). Nearly as many respondents said they oppose government spending on farmland preservation programs because they prefer the use of zoning regulations to manage farmland preservation (37%). Relatively few respondents (20%) said their opposition was based on a belief that the current amount of farmland is adequate.



Half of the respondents said they favor or strongly favor establishment of Agricultural Enterprise Areas (AEAs) in Ozaukee County, which allow farmland owners to claim tax credits for preserving their farmland. As shown in Table 3, relatively few respondents oppose AEAs (15%), while a third or respondents answered "neutral/no opinion" (23%) or said they needed more information (11%).

Table 3. Would you favor or oppose the establishment of a State-designated Agricultural Enterprise							
Area, which would allow farmers to claim state farmland preservation tax credits, to help							
preserv	ve farmland in Oza	aukee County?					
Strongly	Foren	Neutral/	Onnasa	Strongly	Need More		
Favor	ravor	No Opinion	Oppose	Oppose	Info		
11%	40%	23%	10%	5%	11%		

When asked if they would favor the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas, the results shown in Table 4 indicate that 40 percent would favor this proposal. The overall pattern was roughly similar to the earlier question about purchasing easements on farmland (see Table 2). Nearly equal percentages had no opinion or needed more information.

Table 4. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation							
easeme	ents on natural area	as?					
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Need More Info		
8%	32%	23%	13%	9%	15%		

Demographic Comparison: Women were more likely to have said they wanted more information.

In a follow-up question respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a County program to purchase easements on natural areas were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 6, a majority of those who favor County purchase of easements on natural areas said their top funding choices were to seek private donations, monies from conservancy trust funds (such as the Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust), and seek funds from the state or federal government. Compared to a similar question about funding the purchase of easements for farmland preservation, respondents were more likely to favor seeking private donations for easements on natural areas (See Chart 3).

Again, use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue were decidedly unpopular, even among those who favor creating the program to purchase easements for farmland preservation.



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for a natural areas preservation program. The results are shown in Chart 7. Although there was less opposition to the use of property taxes when provided specific details, a majority (63%) opposed the proposal. The combined results of Chart 6 and Chart 7 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to create a fund to purchase easements for preservation of natural areas.



Respondents who opposed the use of government funds for the preservation of natural areas were asked to indicate the reasons for their opposition. Respondents were able to choose multiple answers. Chart 8 indicates that the primary reason behind the opposition is a belief that such a program would cost too much (53%). Respondents were less likely to oppose government funding of easements on natural areas because they believe it interferes with private markets (31%), because they believe zoning should be used to manage natural areas (30%), or because they believe the current amount of open space is adequate (27%).

Compared to a similar question regarding opposition to government funding of easements for farmland preservation (see Chart 5), respondents were more likely to oppose a program for easements on natural areas due to the cost.



One method to preserve open space in housing subdivisions is the use of "cluster" (conservation subdivision) design, which has smaller individual lots and shared open space in comparison to a traditional subdivision design with large lots and no shared open space. When asked if they prefer the traditional design or the cluster design, Ozaukee County respondents prefer the cluster design by a two-to-one ratio (Figure 1). The SRC has asked this question in many other surveys with similar results.



Figure 1.

Provision of Parks and Recreation Facilities

When asked about expanding the County Parks System and County Recreation Facilities, respondents were fairly equally split between those who agree, those who disagree, and those still on the fence. As shown in Table 5, a plurality (38%) favored expansion, while 30 percent opposed. The remaining 34 percent had a neutral/no opinion response or said they need more information.

Table 5. Would you favor or oppose the expansion of the Ozaukee County Parks System and County Recreational Facilities?							
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion Oppose		Strongly Oppose	Need More Info		
7%	31%	23%	24%	6%	11%		

<u>Demographic Comparison</u>: Younger respondents (age 25-44 years) were more likely to favor or strongly favor expansion of the parks and recreation facilities (54%) compared to respondents age 45 and above (33%).

In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored creation of a dedicated fund for the County's parks and recreational facilities were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 9, a majority of those who favor a dedicated County parks and recreation fund said their top funding choices were to seek private donations and to seek state or federal government funds. Compared to similar questions about funding the purchase of easements for farmland preservation and funding easements on natural areas, respondents were less likely to favor conservancy trust funds. Again, use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue were decidedly unpopular, although greater than the percentage for farmland easements or natural area easements, even among those who favor creating a dedicated parks and recreation fund. (See Chart 3 and Chart 6).



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for County parks expansion. The results are shown in Chart 10, and indicate 71 percent were opposed to the proposed tax increase. The combined results of Chart 9 and Chart 10 indicate that the majority of County residents were opposed to increasing County property taxes to create a fund to expand parks and recreation facilities.



As shown in Table 6, respondents had split opinions about the development of a Countywide bike and pedestrian trail network. Roughly equal proportions of respondents supported, opposed, and had not decided about the expanded trail concept. While 37 percent were in favor, an equal number were in opposition. The remaining 27 percent had a neutral/no opinion response or said they need more information.

Table 6. Would you favor or oppose the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails, in addition to the Ozaukee Interurban Trail?							
Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Need More Info		
11%	26%	21%	28%	9%	6%		

<u>Demographic Comparisons</u>: Respondents with children in their housholds were more likely to support bike and pedestrian trails. Half of households with children favored or strongly favored a Countywide network of trails compared to a third of respondents from households without children.

Chart 11. Support for County Programs Favor/Strongly Favor Neutral/No Opinion Oppose/Strongly Oppose Need More Info 51% 48% 40% 38% 37% 37% 30% 23% 22% 23% 23% 23% 21% 19% 15% 15% 11% 11% 11% 6% Expansion of County Development of Purchase Agriculture Establish Agricultural Purchase Park System and Countywide Trail Conservation Enterprise Areas Conservation Easements Easements on Natural Facilities Network Areas

Chart 11 summarizes the favorability ratings presented in Table 2 through Table 6.

In a follow-up question, respondents who said they favored or strongly favored development of a Countywide trail system, were asked to indicate their preferences for funding. Six options were listed and respondents could pick as many of the funding mechanisms as applied. As shown in Chart 12, a majority of those who favor the trail system said their top funding choices were to seek private donations and to apply for grants from the state or federal government. As we have seen in earlier questions, respondents did not favor use of County property tax revenue and sales tax revenue. (See Chart 3, Chart 6, and Chart 9).



All respondents were then asked their opinion about a specific property tax increase (10 cents per \$1,000 assessed value) to create a dedicated County fund for a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails. The results are shown in Chart 13, and indicate 78 percent were opposed to the proposed tax increase. Compared to the earlier questions about a tax increases for farmland preservation (see Chart 4), the purchase of conservation easements on natural areas (see Chart 7), and a dedicated parks and recreation fund (see Chart 10), there is more opposition to a County tax increase for additional trails. Chart 14 (next page) summarizes the comparison.





Chart 15 summarizes the funding preferences by program area shown in Chart 3, Chart 6, Chart 9, and Chart 12.



Future Funding Priorities

Respondents were presented with a list of 27 projects and activities related to parks/recreation facilities and land preservation issues and were asked to rate each as a "high priority" or a "low priority." Respondents were also given a third option — "need more info." The results of the "high priority" ratings are shown in Chart 16a and 16b. Chart 16a lists projects and activities that were rated a high priority by a majority of respondents. Chart 16b lists those projects and activities that a minority of respondents rated as a high priority. The maintenance and upkeep of the County's existing park facilities and preserving open space in Ozaukee County were rated high priorities by three-fourths of respondents. Although three-fourths of respondents said that preserving open space is a high priority for funding, the results from earlier questions indicate that they did not support a property tax increase to achieve this priority, preferring external funding sources instead.

Between 65 percent and 71 percent of respondents gave high priority ratings to river restoration projects and preserving historic structures and archaeological sites. More than half of respondents said preservation of farmland for food and rural character and protecting natural areas near County parks were high priorities.



As shown in Chart 16b, projects and activities that included expansions to existing facilities/activities or new facilities/activities were more likely to be rated as low priorities by more than half of respondents. Creating a golf driving range, skateboard park, horseback trails, and developing another disc golf course were the lowest priority items.



Environmental Improvement Priorities

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of 10 actions to preserve or improve the natural environment of Ozaukee County. The results are shown in Table 7. Majorities placed a high priority on preserving wildlife habitat, monitoring the water quality of Lake Michigan beaches, preventing beach and bluff erosion along Lake Michigan, and creating stricter water quality regulations.

Half the respondents said stricter flood control/stormwater regulations and air qualtiy improvements were high priority items. Respondents had evenly split opinions about wetland regulations, with 43 percent rating it a high priority, and 43 percent rating it a low priority. Opinions were also evenly split regarding stricter regulations on areas that support groundwater recharge. Pluralities of respondents said stricter regulations on environmental corridors and non-metallic mining were low priorities.

One in four respondents said they needed more information regarding stricter regulations on development in groundwater recharge areas, environmental corridors, and non-metallic mining.

Table 7. Priorities to Preserve or Improve the Natural Environment in County						
	High	Low	Need More			
	Priority	Priority	Info			
Preservation of wildlife habitat	63%	31%	6%			
Monitoring Lake Michigan beach water quality	62%	29%	9%			
Preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion	59%	32%	9%			
Stricter water quality regulations	58%	30%	12%			
Stricter flood control and stormwater regulations	52%	34%	15%			
Promoting efforts to improve air quality	49%	39%	11%			
Stricter wetland preservation regulations	43%	43%	14%			
Stricter regulations on development on lands with high	380/	3504	2704			
groundwater recharge potential	38%	55%	21%			
Stricter environmental corridor area regulations	31%	44%	25%			
Stricter non-metallic mining regulations	23%	49%	27%			

Overall Priority Actions for Ozaukee County

Respondents were asked to identify their top four priorities for Ozaukee County government from a list of 11 options. The results are shown in Chart 17. A majority of respondents selected protection of water quality (58%) and preservation of rural and small town character (57%) among their four priority choices. Preservation of green space, road improvements, and preservation of productive agricultural land were in a statistical dead heat with slightly less than 40 percent. At the bottom of the priority list were industrial/commercial development, affordable housing, and tourism promotion.



<u>Demographic Comparisons</u>: Half of respondents under age 45 included promoting sustainable community development among their top four priorities compared to a third of respondents age 45 and older. Respondents from towns were more likely to include preservation of productive farmland among their four priorities (48%) compared to respondents from cities/villages (33%).

Additional Comments

Near the end of the survey, respondents were asked to provide any additional comments they would like to make regarding issues in the survey. The 77 comments were grouped into specific topics by the SRC and are summarized in Table 8. The complete list of responses is included in Appendix B.

Comments related to parks and recreation were in first place (27%). The SRC notes that some comments referred to municipal parks rather than Ozaukee County parks and

Table 8. Additional Comments by Topic						
Торіс	Count	%				
Parks/Recreation/Open space	21	27%				
Taxes and government spending	19	25%				
Farmland preservation	10	13%				
Preserve what we have (general)	6	8%				
Economic Development	3	4%				
Need more information	2	3%				
Miscellaneous	16	21%				
Total	77					

recreation, which were the focus of this survey. Comments about taxes and government spending were close behind with 25 percent of the total.

There was a substantial group of comments about parks and recreation that emphasized the need to focus on maintenance of existing park and recreation facilities rather than expansion and acquisition.

"Assets to be maintained but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas."

"Parks & facilities (esp. buildings) are adequate--but Oz. Co. needs to keep and maintain current parks/facilities--cannot have less."

Regarding taxes/spending, a substantial group of respondents expressed a concern about the cost of the programs and projects mentioned in the questionnaire and resulting impact on local taxes. The following quotes illustrate this concern.

"I would be in favor of gov't funding of various projects as listed above but with the present economic problems would not favor any tax increases for the general populous."

"All good things but at what cost to the taxpayers?"

Comments specifically about farmland preservation comprised 13 percent of the total, and six percent of the comments were more about preservation in general.

A small number of comments dealt with economic development issues or a concern about insufficient background information to answer some of the questions.

Conclusions

Although two-thirds of Ozaukee County survey respondents agreed with a generic statement that the County should purchase conservation easements, support declined when asked about creating and funding County programs to purchase specific types of conservation easements. At the same time, there was an increase in the percentage of respondents with no opinion or who wanted more information.

Regarding parks and recreation facilities, respondents were more likely to favor expenditures for maintenance and upkeep of existing facilities than funding expansions and new activities. When asked specifically about expanding parks and trails, a significant portion of respondents were not necessarily opposed; rather they indicated they wanted more information or had a neutral opinion.

The relatively high proportion of respondents who do not have clearly formed opinions about many of the issues covered in this survey means that education/outreach efforts could be pivotal in terms of public reaction to policy options chosen by the County Board. The percentage of respondents with neutral opinions or who want more information also suggests that there is not a high level of polarization with respect to many of these policy issues facing the County.

In addition, given the relatively weak economy prevailing when the survey was conducted, it is not surprising that many respondents expressed a reluctance to see the County enact policies/programs that are likely to increase their personal tax burden.

Appendix A – Non-Response Bias Test

Any survey has to be concerned with "non-response bias." Non-response bias refers to a situation in which people who do not return a questionnaire have opinions that are systematically different from the opinions of those who return their surveys. For example, suppose most non-respondents felt that preserving historic structures and archaeological sites is a low priority (Question 13m), whereas most of those who returned their questionnaire felt that historic preservation is a high priority. In this case, non-response bias would exist, and the raw results would overstate the opinion of the population of the residents of Ozaukee County.

The standard way to test for non-response bias is to compare the responses of those who return the first mailing of a questionnaire to those who return the second mailing. Those who return the second questionnaire are, in effect, a sample of non-respondents (to the first mailing), and we assume that they are representative of that group. In this survey, 282 people responded to the first mailing, and 140 responded to the second mailing.

We found 21 variables with statistically significant differences between the mean responses of these two groups of respondents out of 109 tested. Table A1 indicates that even when statistical differences exist, the magnitude of this difference is very small. **The Survey Research Center (SRC) concludes that there is little evidence that non-response bias is a concern for this sample.**

Table A1 – Statistically Significant Differences Between Responses of First and Second Mailings							
Variable	Statistical	Mean	Mean				
variable	Significance	First Mailing	Second Mailing				
1. Pace of development	.015	.05	.11				
2. Development should be concentrated in	020	2.25	2.67				
existing cities and villages	.030	2.55	2.07				
6. Housing design preference	.006	1.71	1.57				
8. Conservancy trust	.014	.37	.25				
8. Private donations	.038	.33	.23				
12i. New facilities in existing parks	.019	1.84	1.69				
13c. Upgrading Ozaukee Interurban Trail	.007	1.57	1.75				
13d. Expanding links with Ozaukee Interurban	003	1.61	1.80				
Trail	.005	1.01	1.00				
13m. Preserving historic structures &	013	1 38	1 55				
archaeological sites	.015	1.50	1.55				
13p. Developing more campsites and	009	1 89	1 75				
campgrounds							
15. Conservancy trust funds	.042	.31	.21				
15. Private donations	.029	.32	.21				
17. Use zoning regulations	.045	.19	.11				
22. State/Federal grants/funds	.008	.24	.13				
22. Conservancy trust funds	.009	.19	.09				
22. Private donations	.015	.29	.18				
24c. Stricter regulations for environmental	012	1 87	2.07				
corridors	.012	1.07	2.07				
24d. Stricter regulations for non-metallic mining	.001	1.95	2.21				
24e. Stricter regulations for wetland protection	.009	1.64	1.84				
24f. Stricter regulations for groundwater recharge	007	1.81	2.05				
areas	.007	1.01	2.05				
25. Improve roads	.041	.35	.45				

Appendix B – Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey Comments

Q8. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? 'Other' (8 Responses)

- All three
- Are we talking reserving or creating?
- Encourage private conservation easements.
- N/A
- No more bureaucracy.
- No program...no taxes
- Tax on new development on agricultural land.
- We are far enough in debt—let's pay that.

Q 15. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? 'Other' (5 Responses)

- All three
- None
- Private investment--no taxes
- Tax on new development on agricultural land.
- We have too much to pay for as of now.

Q 19. If you favor or strongly favor, how to you think the program should be funded? 'Other' (9 Responses)

- User fees (i.e., county park sticker, county driving range) (3x)
- No taxes (2x)
- None
- Parks are actually adequate, facilities more than adequate.
- Tax on new construction
- Unsure

Q 22. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? 'Other' (5 Responses)

- N/A(3x)
- Lottery
- Private investment user fees

Q 26. Do you have any additional comments regarding farmland preservation and/or park and open space issues in Ozaukee County? 'Other' (77 Responses)

Parks & Recreation/Open Spaces (21 Responses)

- Assets to be maintained, but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas.
- Beautiful parks and natural areas.
- I believe we are already sufficiently green-space/wetland/conservation/parkland conscious enough. Between state and city-town restrictions, we have enough political footballs without creating more.
- I live near the Ozaukee Interurban Trail and I rarely see any bicyclists stop for the road, many rolling stops, and more going at a pretty good speed than those who stop. Visibility at the road crossing is not the best. Was the interurban bridge built because bicyclists don't like to obey traffic laws?
- I think the more rural and green with trails, the better. But you need a waste plan so it fits and flows. This is good for property values and fast resale.

- Invest in Cedar Creek Park. The band shell, landscaping, some flowers would be nice. So many people use that park, it should look much better.
- Issue Ozaukee county park use stickers at \$2.00/year charge now resident for park use.
- It is critical to maintain open space through zoning and maintaining large lots (3 acres). This requires much less government funding.
- Let private people--to handle park & rec. developments in county.
- Maintaining what is already in place needs to be a priority over any expansion. Roads, maintaining existing trails, and balanced budgets to support all.
- Old paved areas, run down, non-usual warehouse parking lots should be piped/torn out to make natural areas and/or large lots of residential areas.
- Open more areas to public hunting!
- Our parks are a nice area to visit. Fees to enter parks could help fund these parks.
- Our son was in the baseball program. Played at tournaments in neighboring communities, Mequon's facilities are by far the worst we saw.
- Ozaukee has a good amount of park and natural space. The Interurban Trail accommodates biking. These are all to be maintained, but do not feel further expansion is needed. There is no over crowding of these areas.
- Parks & facilities (esp. buildings) are adequate--but Oz. Co. needs to keep and maintain current parks/facilities--cannot have less.
- Preserve and take care of what we have. Open spaces are important. Later, when times get better, we can improve on those spaces and add trails etc.-unless you get grants.
- Preserve spaces; don't enlarge government by expanding county park system. Oz/Wash Land Trust should be your partner!
- The Interurban Trail is a wonderful asset to Ozaukee County as is Lion's Den Gorge and the Mequon Nature Preserve. It has been fantastic to see the development of these areas. An enclosed off-leash dog park with running areas for large and small dogs as well as trails to walk would be another asset to our county. While we have at least 2 dog parks in the Mequon area, one patterned after Minooka in Waukesha would be very helpful in exercising dogs, especially ones that do need a lot of running space.
- There is always a lot of talk about bike paths and recreational areas but no one talks about the cost to maintain them. What is the break-even point considering volume of usage vs. maintenance costs?
- You don't want to lose too much open spaces. You also don't want to grow to fast if you would lose farmland.

Taxes and Government Spending (19 Responses)

- No taxes (2x).
- All good things but at what cost to the taxpayers? There must be other ways besides private donation. (No increases taxes and fees).
- Conservation groups need to pay taxes on the land they purchase.
- Do not put any more people on payrolls--ask for volunteers to monitor rec. lands/areas.
- Farmers using pesticides, inorganic fertilizers that pollute water table and rivers and lakes should be taxed for their externalities, same with growing genetically modified (GM) crops. County should be careful raising general taxes during this fragile economy. County should have provided more information related to its current financial condition along with this survey.
- I am opposed to any project that would increase taxes; we pay far too much in taxes now. I would like to see more commercial and industrial development to increase our taxes.
- I strongly oppose any type of property tax increase to support the purchase of easements.

- I would be in favor of gov't funding of various projects as listed above, but with the present economic problems would not favor any tax increases for the general populous.
- Keep farmland taxes low.
- Please do not keep increasing our taxes.
- Right now with the poor economic situation, we can't have everything added to the tax base. It adds up bit by bit.
- Stop federal, state and county government from spending money on more land. Improve our roads, increase involvement in police and fire protection and maintain our existing parks etc. Stop finding ways to spend more and increase our taxes!
- Tax dollars should not be used for this.
- Taxes are too high already!
- The economy couldn't get much worse and you want me to consider a skateboard park? Or an outdoor ice rink? Or a water trail for a gosh darn kayak? By the time things get better, your survey will be outdated and you'll waste more time and money working up a new one. Don't bother me. Find someone else.
- We have enough--there is no need to use tax dollars for this purpose.
- We need to use the funding we have.
- You don't get it--Stop spending money.

Farmland Preservation (10 Responses)

- Current agricultural land is sufficient. No less.
- Don't know how you would choose farmland preservation there are good farmers out there that would want to keep farming and then not so good farmers that would jump on this to waste our tax dollars for their benefit.
- Farmer using organic farming methods should be incented through the farmland preservation initiative.
- I am opposed to farmland preservation by the government. This is a free market issue.
- I don't feel strongly about farmland preservation because I am not informed on the issue and because I am more concerned about preserving open spaces and the environment in general. These are not the same thing.
- I think it's very important that Mequon starts preservation of farmland. I have lived here for 29 of my 30 years and constantly see new condos and subdivisions being built on the old farmland. This is making the animals that used to call these places home have to search for new places to live. Now because of the recent building behind our homes where deer and coyotes used to live, the deer population decreased and the coyotes are now moving into our backyard and golf course and killing family pets.
- Preserving farmland is very important as farms that sell their produce, such as Barthel Fruit Farm and Witte's Farm attract people to our area and hopefully would lead them to also spend their dollars in our towns like Cedarburg and Port Washington. We need to promote the many benefits of visiting Ozaukee County as we have much to offer--tourism promotion--more of it would be great!
- Purchasing conservation easements on farmland is fine, as long as it is done by private organizations that are motivated to do so. It should not be the County's business.
- Too many people treat farm fields like privately owned public land. Why is the only farmland that gets development rights purchase to have some form of water or woods? Why can't good farmland be purchased because it is good farmland? Or would stop some urban sprawl and its purchase would protect a lot more farm land?
- We consider the current level of farmland preservation and the number/size/condition of parks as sufficient.

Preservation (general comments) (6 Responses)

- Be careful to protect the rural nature because development and expansion (even in a bad economy) is easy. Preservation is difficult.
- Better zoning to protect land and water. Encourage rebuild or update rather than new build. Please do something about invasive Buckthorn—I see it killing a lot of old trees.
- If we spend all our time and money preserving everything that exists, and encroach on more, how do we continue to attract younger families to live here so there is a sustainable tax base to support it? Take care of the youth needs, they will come. Make it impossible to get in, they will not. Putting all development in existing urban areas then puts control of their expansion in their hands and the politics will continue to be ridiculous.
- Keep up what we have.
- Preservation of farmland/park/open spaces is very important. However, we already pay way too much in taxes and if the county bought this land, who determines access? Will the public have access? Would hunting and fishing be allowed? I would much rather see the county encourage private property owners and farmers to preserve land and wetlands without government ownership of these lands. Existing programs like CRP, WRP, and others work and should be supported, not the transfer of land to the county gov't. This is not how our tax dollars should be spent.
- Yes- rural development should be cut to one acre lots in rural areas like the state of Illinois--nothing bigger.

Business/Economic Development (3 Responses)

- No more big box stores!
- Please no more gas stations or car washes north side of Port.
- Promote private enterprise, promote private jobs, promote manufacturing

Need more information (2 Responses)

- Much of this needs further information especially the above.
- This survey did not provide enough specifics regarding the study of money and other questions.

Miscellaneous (16 Responses)

- None (4x)
- Do not remove any existing dams on the Milwaukee River/Cedar Creek system. Limit snow dumping into areas near waterways--use lake Michigan.
- I am opposed to county telling a private property owner what they can or cannot do with their property.
- Inform everyone what you offer and fund all with donations. Don't over kill this idea.
- My family and I enjoy living in this county, and did this survey as a family discussion. Please provide a result of this survey when available. We are glad when government business is done like this rather than with ad campaigns. We consider this survey as "money well spent"!
- Questions 2-5 are screwed up.
- Some funding from county residents is going to have to be assessed, that I realize, but it has to be used frugally with little demographic B.S...try and try for federal if its there, simply because they are going to spend it anyway. I personally would have to educate myself on some of the issues listed. Put it out there people have to know and this is a good start. Thanks
- Stay out of it!
- Stop creating & duplicating jobs. Let the State do it.

- The greater number of generations the less amounts the results will be.
- This whole survey is total liberal garbage if I ever saw one!
- Use some common sense. Don't listen to all the high interest groups.
- What the heck are you doing with the roads? Every year. Do you not consider that people have to travel in and out of Mequon/Thiensville? And you tear them up and redo the same projects over and over again. What is this costing us? Green Bay Avenue--2 summers in a row--tore up the same work this summer that was done last summer. Road looks awful and terrible design with the weird bump outs. Huge waste of money that could have been spent on something more worthwhile. Don't waste any more of our money.

Q 29. Which of the following best describes the type of work you do? 'Other' (19 Responses)

- Business owner(2x)
- Executive(2x)
- Homemaker(2x)
- IT(2x)
- Mom(2x)
- Artist
- Construction
- Engineering
- Healthcare
- Law enforcement
- Nurse/social worker
- Own machine shop
- Retired
- Supervisor

Appendix C - Quantitative Summary of Responses by Question

Ozaukee County Natural Resources Survey – 2010

Please return by October 6, 2010

Using blue or black ink, please fill the circle that most closely matches your response on the following:

Like this: 🌑 Not like this: 🕢 🛞 🕖

Please fill the circle:

1. From the following list, which <u>FOUR</u> have the most positive influence on the quality of life in Ozaukee County? (*Please mark* • *only FOUR*)

30% Tranquil residential areas	57% Quality schools	22%	Adequate availability of shopping/retail services
25% Parks and open spaces	71% Low crime rate/safe community	23%	Well-maintained properties
11% Outdoor recreation opportunities	30% Low taxes	17%	Rural agricultural character
22% Condition of roads	16% Natural beauty	38%	Small town/village charm
11% Proximity to job opportunities	7% Good pace of development	6% I	Historical features

Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements:

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral/ No Opinion	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Need More Info
2.	Development should be concentrated in existing cities & villages to minimize conflicts between urban and rural uses	25%	42%	15%	3%	11%	5%
3.	There is enough farmland in Ozaukee County to support the long-term economic viability of agriculture in the County	6%	34%	23%	8%	16%	13%
4.	The cost of farmland is making agriculture unsustainable in Ozaukee County	12%	29%	29%	2%	7%	20%
5.	Ozaukee County should purchase conservation easements to preserve farmland, maintain open space, or protect important environmental areas	27%	39%	12%	6%	10%	7%

6. Would you prefer housing built in a <u>traditional design (Option A)</u> with larger individual lots and no shared open space or a <u>cluster design (Option B)</u> with smaller individual lots and shared open space? Please fill the circle for either Option A or Option B below to indicate your preference.



7. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements from farmers in an effort to preserve agricultural land?

Strongly	Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppo	se Need More Information
14%		34%	19%	15%	8%	11%
8. <u>If you fa</u>	vor or stro	ongly favor, h	now do you think the progr	am should be fur	ided? (Please mark	$x \bullet all that apply)$
11% County	property t	ax revenue	61% Conservancy trust fur Land Trust)	nds (e.g. Ozaukee/	Washington 5	4% Private donations
58% State/F	ederal gran	its/funds	42% Dedicated farmland p	reservation fund	1	0% Sales taxes
2% Other ((specify) Se	e Appendix	В			
9. Would y for a \$25 Yes 46%	ou be willi 50,000 hom No 54%	ng to suppor le) to create a	t a property tax increase o and sustain a dedicated fun	f \$0.10 per \$1,000 nd for an agricult) of assessed valua ural land preserva	ition (\$25.00 annually ition program?

10. <u>If you do not</u> support using government funds for the preservation of farmland, why not? (*Please mark* • all that apply)
37% It should be managed through zoning regulations 44%. Too costly.

01 /0	It should be managed through zonnig regulations		Too costry
20%	Current farmland is adequate	41%	Interferes with private markets

11. Would you favor or oppose the establishment of a State-designated Agricultural Enterprise Area, which would allow farmers to claim state farmland preservation tax credits, to help preserve farmland in Ozaukee County?

S	Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly	oppose	Need I Inform	More ation
	11%	40%	23%	10%	5%	þ	11%	
12.	What would be you	ır relative priori	ties for future funding	and projects?		High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Info
a.	Acquiring parkland for	or passive uses (tra	ails, nature study, picnick	ting, etc.)		38%	52%	11%
b.	Acquiring parkland for	or active uses (pla	ygrounds, ball fields, san	d volleyball courts,	etc.)	21%	72%	8%
c.	. Preserving open space, protecting natural resources and wildlife habitat						21%	5%
d.	. River restoration projects to improve flood control, water quality, and wildlife habitat						20%	9%
e.	Maintenance and upk	eep of existing pa	rk facilities			76%	19%	5%
f.	Security/ranger patro	ls/rules enforceme	ent			26%	63%	12%
g.	Outdoor education pr	ograms in parks/n	atural areas			23%	67%	9%
h.	Establishing greenwa	iys/parkways alon;	g rivers			41%	50%	10%
i.	New facilities in exis	ting parks (playgr	ound equipment, flush toi	ilets, etc.)		31%	59%	10%
j.	Preservation of farml	and to maintain th	e feeling of rural characte	er		52%	40%	8%
k.	Preservation of farml	and for food				57%	30%	13%

13.	What would be your relative priorities for future funding and projects?	High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Info
a.	Creating mountain bike trails	13%	82%	5%
b.	Developing horseback riding trails	6%	88%	6%
c.	Upgrading the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (additional paved, off-road sections, trailheads, signage)	44%	49%	7%
d.	Expanding links with the Ozaukee Interurban Trail (to County parks, communities west of Trail)	41%	50%	9%
e.	Grooming cross country skiing trails in County parks	18%	76%	7%
f.	Creating an off-leash dog park	19%	76%	7%
g.	Establishing water trails for canoes and kayaks (on rivers and Lake Michigan)	28%	63%	9%
h.	Developing additional public access to Lake Michigan	48%	46%	6%
i.	Protecting natural areas adjacent to existing County parks	55%	40%	5%
j.	Developing a golf driving range	9%	86%	5%
k.	Establishing community gardens	27%	64%	9%
1.	Creating another disc golf course	5%	90%	5%
m.	Preserving historic structures and archaeological sites	65%	27%	9%
n.	Building a skateboard park	9%	86%	6%
0.	Creating an outdoor ice-skating/hockey rink	23%	69%	7%
p.	Developing more campsites and campgrounds	22%	72%	7%

14. Would you favor or oppose the creation of a County program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppos	se Need More Information			
8%	32%	23%	13%	9%	15%			
15. If you favor or strongly favor, how do you think the program should be funded? (Please mark • all that apply)								
17% County property tax revenue63%Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust)64% Private								
53% State/Federal grants/funds36% Dedicated natural area fund11% Sales taxe								
1% Other (specify) See Appendix B								

- 16. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for a program to purchase conservation easements on natural areas?
 - Yes
 No

 37%
 63%

17. <u>If you do not</u> support using government funds for the preservation of natural areas, why not? (*Please mark* • *all that apply*)

- **30%** It should be managed through zoning regulations **53%** Too costly
- 27% Current natural areas and open spaces are adequate 31% Interferes with private markets

18. Would you favor or oppose the expansion of the Ozaukee County Parks System and County Recreational Facilities?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly oppose	Need More Information
7%	31%	23%	24%	6%	11%
19. <u>If you favor or stro</u>	ongly favor, h	ow do you think the progr	am should be fu	nded? (Please mark • all	that apply)
23% County property t	ax revenue	45% Conservancy trust fur Land Trust)	nds (e.g. Ozaukee/	Washington 58% I	Private donations
53% State/Federal gran	ts/funds	50% Dedicated park and re	ecreation fund	14% \$	Sales taxes
10/ 0/ / / / / / / /					

4% Other (specify) See Appendix B

20. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for Ozaukee County's parks and recreational facilities?

Yes	No
29%	71%

21. Would you favor or oppose the development of a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails, in addition to the Ozaukee Interurban Trail?

Strongly Favor	Favor	Neutral/ No Opinion	Oppose	Strongly op	pose Need More Information			
11%	26%	21%	28%	9%	6%			
22. <u>If you favor or stro</u>	<u>ngly favor,</u> he	ow do you think the progr	am should be fu	nded? (Please ma	urk • all that apply)			
20% County property tax revenue 41% Conservancy trust funds (e.g. Ozaukee/Washington Land Trust) 64% Private donation								
52% State/Federal gran	ts/funds	51% Dedicated bike and p	edestrian trail fund	1	10% Sales taxes			
2% Other (specify) See Appendix B								

23. Would you be willing to support a property tax increase of \$0.10 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation (\$25.00 annually for a \$250,000 home) to create and sustain a dedicated fund for a Countywide network of bike and pedestrian trails? Yes No

22%	78%

24. Please indicate how high a priority you would place on the following actions to preserve or improve the natural environment in Ozaukee County.

		High Priority	Low Priority	Need More Information
a.	Creating stricter regulations to improve water quality (streams, rivers, lakes)	58%	30%	12%
b.	Creating stricter regulations for flood control and stormwater	52%	34%	15%
c.	Creating stricter regulations for environmental corridor areas	31%	44%	25%
d.	Creating stricter regulations of non-metallic mining	23%	49%	27%
e.	Creating stricter regulations for wetland protection	43%	43%	14%
f.	Creating stricter regulations for development on lands with high groundwater recharge potential	38%	35%	27%
g.	Preventing Lake Michigan beach and bluff erosion	59%	32%	9%
h.	Preservation of wildlife habitat	63%	31%	6%
i.	Monitoring Lake Michigan beach water quality	62%	29%	9%
j.	Promoting efforts to improve air quality	49%	39%	11%

25. From the following list, please mark the <u>FOUR</u> most important actions you think the County should pursue. (*Please mark* ● *only FOUR*)

30%	Procomic groop space	18% Increase industrial	28% I	Promote sustainable community
3970	Fieselve green space	park/commercial development	develo	opment
27%	Promote development in existing	13% Increase affordable housing	30%	Promote renewable energy production
ur	ban areas	supply		
58%	Protect water quality	38% Improve roads	57%	Preserve rural and small town character
37%	Preserve productive agricultural	10% Promote tourism		
la	nd			

26. Do you have any additional comments regarding farmland preservation and/or park and open space issues in Ozaukee County? See Appendix B

DEMOGRAPHICS

		Male	Female				
27.	Gender	67%	33%				
•		Under 25	25 - 34	35 - 44	45 - 54	55 - 64	65+
28.	Age	1%	6%	15%	25%	25%	28%
29	Which of the	Sales/ Services	Education/ Government	Factory	General Labor	Agriculture/ Farming	Professional/ Administrative
<i>27</i> ,	following best describes the type of work you do?	13%	8%	3%	1%	1%	28%
		Clerical/ Office	Skilled Trade/ Craft	Retired	Not Employed	Other Se	ee Appendix B
	jou uoi	2%	6%	28%	4%		6%

30.	Number of	()	1		2	3		4			5+
	children (under 18) in household	68	8%	11%	14	4%	7%		19	6		1%
31.	Highest level of	Less than high school		High school diploma	So colleg	ome ge/tech	Tech colleg gradua	n ge ate	Bache degi	lor's :ee	G profe	raduate or ssional degree
	Education	19	%	13%	13% 21% 10% 2		28	%		28%		
22		O	wn	Rent								
32.	Residential Status	90	9%	10%								
33.	If a year-round resident, how many years have	0 to 10 years		11 to 20 years	20 Over 20 5 years		Not applicable (seasonal/part-time resident)					
	You lived in Ozaukee County?	22	%	21%	56%	6	1	%				
34.	Annual Household	Less \$15,	than ,000	\$15,000 - \$24,999	\$25,00 \$49,9)0 - 99	\$50,000 - \$74,999	\$75,000 - \$99,999		\$100,000 or more		
	Income Range	19	%	6%	16%	6	21%	18	3%	399	%	
		13%	City of	of Cedarburg	9%	Tow Ceda	n of arburg	1%	Town Sauky	of ville	13%	Village of Grafton
35.	Please indicate	26%	City of	of Mequon	2%	Tow Fred	n of onia	0%	Villag Baysi	ge of de	0%	Village of Newburg
	which you live	13%	City o Wash	of Port ington	7%	Tow Graf	n of ton	1%	Villag Belgi	ge of um	4%	Village of Saukville
		2%	Town	of Belgium	3%	Tow Was	n of Port hington	2%	Villag Fredo	ge of mia	\$100,000 or more 39% of 13% C of 0% N of 4% S of 4% S of 6% 7	Village of Thiensville

Appendix G

RESULTS OF FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS ON FARMLAND PRESERVATION IN OZAUKEE COUNTY

(This page intentionally left blank)

Agenda and Questions for Focus Group Meetings

The following is a copy of an agenda used for one of the focus group meetings and the typical questions used for two separate focus group meetings held on April 19 and 20, 2011. A summary of the results follows.



The following are responses from the first focus group for Questions 2 a and b of the agenda:

- Ken Albinger Town of Fredonia Cash Crop
- Darwin Kison Town of Cedarburg Dairy, Custom Heifers
- Pat Wilbourn City of Port Washington Niche, Yellow Perch, products
- Brian Kligora Village of Belgium Kettle Lakes Co-op
- Meet others interested in farmland preservation/farming
- Understand issues affecting farm community
- On CAC, gathering information for the plan
- Communications between city and towns
- Find out what is happening with farmland preservation planning in Ozaukee County
- Has sufficient land for their type of agriculture

The following are responses to Questions 3 a through f of the agenda:

- Smaller family farms still exist in the County
- Reach out to urban persons to meet jointly with farmers for Focus Group workshops, etc.
- More focus groups... more educational workshops to discuss farming/agriculture
- Lakeside Foods/food processing/Belgium area
- Dairy and crop production Kettle Lakes Co-op, United Co-op, West Bend Elevator (Supplies)
- Lake Michigan transportation is good, delivery
- Communications with neighbors and Town/County government
- Hwy 57 and I 43 for transportation
- Close to markets Milwaukee, Co-ops, Cedar Valley Cheese Factory
- Have some small family farms
- Development and housing one farmer completely surrounded by housing development
- Weather
- Neighbors
- Absence of local communities in terms of the interest of farmers
- Town of Saukville change to 5 acre lot sizes/zoning in agricultural area
- Village/City annexation
- Economic times
- Input costs very high
- Large corporate farming developing in the area... perception that larger farms are bad
- Lack of government support
- Lack of education
- Keep property taxes on farmland low
- Land rents for agriculture land rents are getting too high (Rents \$45 \$225 per acre)
- Farms getting bigger/need more land
- Corn and beans are high value right now
- Manure hauling... make it more available
- More land... availability of land ... less housing development
- Adequate zoning to restrict development... denser development patterns... increase density for housing
- Communication between the farm community and city/villages... perception... urban dwellers
- Have claimed tax credits in the past... of some value... has some impact to operations
- Another set of rules and regulations to follow
- Decrease tax credits, increase dollars for commodities
- North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area... easements for farm use, not recreation use.
- Tax credits provide more funding in the long term than easements
- Concern about buying easements

- Preference for no programs, get enough dollars for product
- What is the value of 40 acre easement in 1000 acres of farmland?
- Communication between towns/farmers and cities/villages
- Not familiar with Town zoning
- Restricting access for driveway, development access... conflict with farming equipment... restrict access for travel through ag areas, county roads/town roads/State highways
- Traffic is big problem
- Signage, flashing signs
- Work with Sherriff on enforcement
- Teach in drivers education
- DNR close off town roads at certain times of the year to allow manure haulers sole access
- Easier access, less traffic, get job done quicker
- Agricultural Enterprise Areas... Town of Port Washington, Town of Belgium and Town of Fredonia... larger farms... contiguous farms/parcels – AEA locations
- County could provide education on benefits/costs of AEA
- Transfer to son... remain in an agricultural land use... have the ability to have land remain in agriculture... sell to another farmer or family member
- Keep the northern part of the County in agriculture... primarily... most of the farmers, better land, contiguous lands.
- Moving away from commodities and toward organics
- Northern part of the County will remain in agriculture
- More vegetable growers/truck farmers... not necessarily only organics... local sellers
- More farmers markets
- More specialty farms/niche farms
- Rent garden plots out/community gardens
- Global market area
- Input costs going up... no till conservation practices... supply and demand... lessen input costs
- Improvement/changes in yield, crop genetics
- More genetically modified crops org.
- Changes in technology... digesters, biomass
- Processing facilities will remain similar distance away
- Increasingly difficult to find younger generation to farm
- Successful family farms will continue, grow bigger
- More competition for skilled workers... for farming

Results from Second Focus Group

The following are responses from the second focus group for Questions 2 a and b of the agenda:

- Kate Smallish Supervisor Town of Saukville Tree Farm, Niche Farming, Large-scale Gardening, Member of Farm Bureau – Serves on Plan Commission. Concern about extraterritorial zoning... annexations for subdivisions. Concerned that it is too late.
- Barb Jobs Town Chairman, Town of Saukville Farm Raise Hay, 70 acres, Large-scale Gardening, Eggs, Small Farmers, Worked in Government, Promotion, 30 persons in FPP in the past... 1983 program until now... Town is positive for farmland. Keep farmland in the Town. Exclusive Ag in Town. The 1983 FPP did not work. Concerns about 35 acre zoning. Person that owned land is retirement age. Lots
- Harold Schoessow City of Mequon, west of Thiensville 300 Farmed acres, beef cattle, corn, soybeans, hay and silage.
- Karin Manley Town of Grafton Horse Farm, 100 acres, Wetland Restoration, Horses and Hay
- Don Hamm Town of Fredonia 600 acres, 100s of Dairy Cows, Corn and hay silage, Dairy cows, President State NGO, Worked on WLI with Secretary

- Bob Roden Town of Trenton, Saukville, Fredonia Dairy, cash crops, Concern about farming in Ozaukee County – too late? Complaints with manure, hauling, etc. Long hours for planting. He would like to keep farming and have son farm in the future. Family Farming. Large farms are of concern. Paulus Farm – a fight to allow for this type of farming. Small farms will not work for dairy. Niche agricultural may be viable. Agriculture is in a different mode for the future. Discussed the trends and use of large equipment.
- Pat Wilbourn City of Port Washington, Niche Farmer, Fish and Produce, Interest in Farmland Preservation. Part of the Citizen Advisory Committee meeting. Communication between suburban and rural. Moratorium on development. Zoning to implement the moratorium. Is it practical to put a moratorium on extension of services into rural areas, stop urban sprawl. City and village expansion.
- Ed Miller Towns of Cedarburg and Saukville FPP CAC and builder by trade... here to learn and participate. The President of the Metropolitan Builders Association. Interest of industry. President of MBA. Represent the builders. Learn from people and farmers in the room. Development needs control. Not a lot of foresight in planning development from building industry. National Association of Builders. Building in Ozaukee County...increase in subdivisions, empty housing... large swing. Reaction of local government...make land available for development. Permitting increased 30% in first two months, decrease in third month (March).
- Dan O'Neil Agricultural Agent since 1982, Town of Saukville, Fredonia. Trends... middle 50's. Changes occurring similar to Bob Roden... Public want family farms. Receives a lot of complaints... banning lights on tractors, complaints about farming after dark, machinery on road increasing, farm vs. traffic, accidents. First Farmland Preservation Plan... 1983... optional, chose to participate. Choice about what to do with land. Sell land for purposes that they want. Less rules and regulations desired. Vegetable farmers... sell to Madison and Oconomowoc. Direct marketing options. Decrease interest in Farmland Preservation. Part of attempts for specialty animal farming. Increase in consumer awareness. Hop growing. Ozaukee County is a large ginseng grower in the past... largest in Ozaukee County. Corn and soybeans.

The following are responses to Questions 3 a through f of the agenda:

- Development needs control.
- Is it practical to put a moratorium on extension of services into rural areas, stop urban sprawl.
- Lots of farmers working rented are landowners interested in Farmland Preservation.
- Development of reserve program around Villages Lower amount of money, for shorter period of time for PDR, Could re-enlist.
- Sees a negative government attitude, lack of confidence.
- Retrain the way people think a lot living on a 35 acre parcel.
- Attitude in Town of Saukville... 35 acre parcels not working... 5 acre development. Still have 30 acres to farm. Live on 5 acre lots. Citizen attitudes are disconnected from reality.
- Accommodate growth, but on non-farmable land... not prime farmland. Have people with 70 acres that don't farm. Use value is proven to save farmland. Smaller lots, don't eat up 35 acres farmable tracts.
- Pay residential taxes on 35 acres, even when house is in the middle of 35 acres. Own septic and water. Smaller lots in urban setting. Pre-existing conditions.
- Concerned about water runoff, farm equipment on roads, etc.
- No respect when passing farm machinery on roads. Town roads are limited... no room. CTH I is busy. Opitz and Paulus tractors... worried about accidents.
- Newsletter Education of residents
- Educate law enforcements
- Can't tell landowner that they can't sell land.... Zoning? Respect for development and agricultural land. European restrictions are not the solution.
- Shouldn't be able to tell farmers they cannot sell their land
- Rezoning in the Town of Saukville to allow for 5 acre parcels. Sell acreage to continue farming. Hobby farms... restrict to large lots. Educate to the point that 35 acres does not work. Small parcels will allow
to save larger tracts of land. Allow people to sell off smaller pieces of land to preserve larger tracts of farmland. Purchase only non- prime ag.

- Cedarburg development... railroad, post office... Granville Road, Freistadt Post Office.
- Preserve farmland through high grain prices... won't have a reason to sell farms. Profit driven. Can buy additional land and reinvest. Is it too late... larger and larger farms... winners and losers?
- Use value assessment... developers buy it and hold it... but is still works. This is the key for protecting land. This is why we are still here. Biggest player.
- Create Incentives to rent farmland out to farmers rather than selling the land.
- Concerns about implementing in perpetuity. 5–20 year increment is better. Maybe 15-20 years instead of forever. Protected forever. Annexations.... trip out east... fragmented
- Land preserved in middle of city, became a mess because of "forever" preservation
- Use assessment taxes stayed the same... tax credits not valuable.
- Current anti-government viewpoint makes it difficult for any group to ask for tax credits.
- Rents are higher... the tax credit does not matter... percentage, FP credits were large a percentage toward income in the past. Now approaching insignificant.
- More bang for buck... tax credits for more people... winners and losers... right place, right time... PACE = more losers and winners.
- PACE going to the same winners as other dollars resources
- Not enough money toward incentives from the State... to make it effective.
- Things have changed... More niche farming, locally grown crops. Location between expressways and small towns and villages... market for produce. More of a future in niche or mega farms.
- More mega-farms... mixture between niche and extremely large
- Mid-sized operations are most at risk... most vulnerable. Can't reinvest in farm. Equipment for these midsized farms are not available.
- Belgium, Fredonia, Saukville Family operations getting larger
- South of Hwy 33... more niche farmers... a few larger lots in City of Mequon on west side.
- County logistics business... schools, hospitals, specific demand, specific product... niche farmers through a co-op to address need for the larger institutions. County to organize the logistics would be necessary. One stop shopping. County would identify demand and provision of products... identifying who provides what. Coordinate.
- Ozaukee County, leadership... pay attention to west side of State... information and educational programs. Agricultural activities. Educational activities.
- East side of State Fredonia and Belgium up to .. Dairy leaders nationwide.
- Regional markets... with viable, full-time farming businesses. County did not control who grew what, just coordinated the outlet. Smaller incomes.
- Outlets for product is important.... Established market system. Specialty crops have to develop the market system. Identify buyers... Milwaukee, West Bend, City of Mequon /Thiensville.
- Farmers Markets... West Bend market... diversity of products... smaller quantities.
- Globalization... be specific if you are to survive. Diversify investments.
- Are there younger, smaller producers that will want to work hard enough to be part of local co-op... what about revenue? Must generate enough revenue to support families. Must purchase lands.
- Value of existing farms. Larger farms can buy tracts of land at a premium price more easily.
- Easier for existing large farms to finance... finance side is important. Lending for new / younger farmers is very difficult to obtain.
- Economy causing many people to learn how to garden. Well spring gardening... enthusiasm.
- Projected populations.
- Where will the development go? Comprehensive Plan. Price of fuel, where they desire to live, aging population, shopping.
- Sell idea of increased density.... Benefit developers. Decrease dependency on cars and increase transit.
- Increase awareness of where food is coming from... locally grown.
- County have a registry/list of land available for farmers to rent.

- Destroy historical values... high density... high quality... convert with demographics.
- Infill locations... developers... Make it easier to develop infill lots. Look at infill opportunities.
- Municipalities have different needs, different desires... working toward a common goal... County to supervise. Communities to be on same page. County could coordinate.
- Balance of desires.
- Demand for larger lots... ability to expand... farmers will buy up farmland. Certainty is very important. If farmers know there is opportunity to remain in ag long-term, they will purchase adjacent parcels to expand farm.
- Countywide zoning... has not been historical. County support? Preserve farmland.
- Lack of support from County Board to preserve farmland.
- County Board reference to "those towns people"... concern about relationship.
- Good mechanics for farm equipment in local area.
- Good interaction... smaller groups.
- FPP CAC SWOT was productive.

Appendix H

OZAUKEE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix H-1

RESOLUTION NO. 13-28

ADOPTION OF A FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: 2035

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County adopted a farmland preservation plan in 1983 to comply with the requirements of the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program, which was first enacted in 1976; and

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Legislature enacted a comprehensive update to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program in 2009, set forth in Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes, which requires that the Ozaukee County farmland preservation plan be updated and re-certified by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) to continue County participation in the State's farmland preservation program; and

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County received a grant from DATCP to defray a portion of the cost for updating the farmland preservation plan; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, in cooperation with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, UW-Extension, all the local communities, particularly the City of Mequon, and the Towns of Belgium, Cedarburg, Fredonia, Grafton, Port Washington, and Saukville, has developed an updated farmland preservation plan that meets the requirements set forth in Chapter 91 of the Statutes; and

WHEREAS, oversight of the planning process and plan development was provided by the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, Land Preservation Board, and Comprehensive Planning Board; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Sections 59.69 and 66.1001(4)(b) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted the County comprehensive plan embodied in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 285, *A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* on April 2, 2008 and subsequent Amendments 2009-01 on May 6, 2009 and 2013-01 on May 1, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the new farmland preservation plan was prepared within the framework of the *Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* and will refine and detail the farmland preservation-related recommendations of the County comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County has solicited public input consistent with the Public Participation Plan adopted in 2011 to ensure the public had ample opportunity for involvement in the development of the farmland preservation plan at all stages of the planning process; and

WHEREAS, copies of the farmland preservation plan report were available for public review in the County Clerk's office, the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department office, at public libraries, and on the County website; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Farmland Preservation Plan was developed through a multi-jurisdictional planning process in cooperation with ten participating and cooperating local governments while also inviting the remaining incorporated communities in the County to attend and participate in farmland preservation plan committee meetings during the planning process; and WHEREAS, Ozaukee County has duly noticed a public hearing on the farmland preservation plan, and the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board held the public hearing on June 11, 2013; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board at its meeting on June 11, 2013, acted to recommend to the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adoption of *A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* as set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 87 (2nd Edition).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors, acting on the recommendation of the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board, hereby adopts *A Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* as set forth in SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 87 (2nd Edition).

Dated at Port Washington, Wisconsin, this 3rd day of July 2013.

	Yes	No	Abstain	Absent
Thomas H. Richart	X			
Cynthia G. Bock				X
Barbara J. Jobs	X			
Irena Macek		-	1	X
Glenn F. Stumpf				X
Donald Korinek (Alt.)	X	1		1

4

TO WHOM IT MA	AY CONCERN:	
I, Julianne B. Wir that the foregoing Ozaukee County F	kelhorst, County Cler is a true and correct board of Supervisors of	k for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, hereby certify t copy of Resolution No. 13-28, adopted by the n July 3, 2013.
(SEAL) (Julianne	B. Winkelhorst
	Julianne B. Winke Ozaukee County C	elhorst Clerk
	A durated Wester	Aves - 25

Appendix H-2

RESOLUTION RES. 13-61

ADOPTING AMENDMENT 2013-02 TO A MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY

WHEREAS, Wisconsin's comprehensive planning law, set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes, requires County and local governments that enforce general zoning, shoreland zoning, subdivision, or official mapping ordinances to adopt a comprehensive plan by January 1, 2010; and

WHEREAS, in 2004 Ozaukee County and fourteen participating communities within Ozaukee County, in whole or part, received a grant from the Wisconsin Department of Administration to defray a portion of the cost of the initial development of the multijurisdictional comprehensive plan; and

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County, in cooperation with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, UW-Extension, and participating local governments, developed a comprehensive plan that meets the requirements set forth in Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Plan contains all nine elements required by State Statute and addresses all 14 of the State of Wisconsin Comprehensive Planning Goals that were required under the grant contract with the State of Wisconsin; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035 (Resolution 07-72) and enacted ordinance 07-8 (Chapter 13 of the County Code of Ordinances) on April 2, 2008; and

WHEREAS, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors adopted Amendments 2009-01 and 2013-01 to *A Multi-jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* (Resolution 09-10 and 13-16) and enacted ordinance 09-3 and 13-01 (Chapter 13 of the County Code of Ordinances) on May 6, 2009 and May 1, 2013 respectively; and

WHEREAS, Ozaukee County, in cooperation with the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, has developed an amendment 2013-02 to the adopted *A Multijurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* that reflects changes as a result of the recently adopted *Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035* (adopted July 2013); and

WHEREAS, copies of the plan amendment 2013-02 report were available for public review in the County Clerk's office and the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department office, at public libraries, and on the County website; and

WHEREAS, throughout the development of the plan amendment 2013-02 Ozaukee County has solicited public input consistent with the adopted Public Participation Plan to ensure the public had ample opportunity for involvement in the development of the comprehensive plan amendment; and

WHEREAS, the County has duly noticed a public hearing on the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Plan Amendment 2013-02 and the Comprehensive Planning Board held the public hearing on November 19, 2013, in accordance with Section 66.1001(4)(d) of the Statutes; and

WHEREAS, following the public hearing, the Comprehensive Planning Board recommended approval of amendment 2013-02 and its adoption by ordinance of the County Board of Supervisors.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Sections 59.69, 66.1001(4)(b) and 91.10(2) of the Wisconsin Statutes, the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors hereby adopts the Comprehensive Plan Amendment 2013-02 to A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035.

Dated at Port Washington, Wisconsin, this 4th day of December, 2013.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARD

RESULT:	APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Glenn F. Stumpf, Supervisor District 11
SECONDER:	Barbara J. Jobs, Supervisor District 3
AYES:	Richart, Macek, Jobs, Stumpf, Korinek
	A C. M. L. MARTER, M.

 Julianne B. Winkelhorst, County hereby certify that the foregoing is a 13-61, adopted by the Ozaukee Cour 2013. 	Clerk for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin true and correct copy of Resolution No ity Board of Supervisors on December 4
Julianne B. Wink Ozaukee County	relhorst Clerk
Adopted Vote:	Ayes – 24 Nays – 1 Abstain – 1

348

Appendix H-3

ORDINANCE ORD. 13-7

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY - AMENDMENT 2013-02

An Ordinance amending Chapter 13 (Sections 13.03-13.08) of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances pertaining to Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County.

The County Board of Supervisors of the County of Ozaukee does ordain that Chapter 13 (Sections 13.03-13.08) of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances be amended as follows:

- 13.03 <u>PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN</u>. The County Board of Supervisors of Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, has adopted written procedures designed to foster public participation in every stage of the preparation of a comprehensive plan and subsequent amendments to this Plan as required by Section 66.1001 (4) (a) of the Wisconsin Statutes.
- 13.04 <u>PUBLIC NOTICE AND HEARING</u>. Ozaukee County has duly noticed a public hearing on the comprehensive plan and subsequent amendments to this Plan and the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors or the Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board held the public hearing, in accordance with Section 66.1001(4)(d) of the Statutes.
- 13.05 <u>RECOMMENDING RESOLUTION</u>. The Ozaukee County Comprehensive Planning Board, by a majority vote of the entire committee, has adopted a resolution recommending to the County Board of Supervisors the adoption of the document entitled, "SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 285, A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035" and <u>Amendments</u> 2009-01, 2013-01, <u>and 2013-02 thereto</u>.
- 13.06 <u>ADOPTING RESOLUTION</u>. The Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors has adopted 2007 Resolution 07-72, approving. "A Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035" and Resolutions No. 09-10, 13-16 and 13-61 regarding Amendment 2009-01, 2013-01 and 2013-02 respectively to this Plan.
- 13.07 <u>COMPREHENSIVE PLAN</u>. The Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors does, by the enactment of this ordinance, formally adopt the document entitled, "SEWRPC Community Assistance Planning Report No. 285, À Multi-Jurisdictional Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County: 2035" and <u>Amendments</u> 2009-01, 2013-01 and 2013-02 thereto as its Comprehensive Plan for Ozaukee County consistent with and addressing the requirements pursuant to Section 66.1001 of the Wisconsin Statutes.
- 13.08 <u>EFFECTIVE DATE</u>. This ordinance shall take effect upon passage by a majority vote of the members-elect of the Ozaukee County Board of Supervisors and publication as required by law.

Dated at Port Washington, Wisconsin, this 4th day of December, 2013.

(Certification on Back)

This Ordinance shall take effect upon enactment and publication.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING BOARDRESULT:APPROVED [UNANIMOUS]MOVER:Donald Korinek, Supervisor District 13SECONDER:Glenn F. Stumpf, Supervisor District 11AYES:Richart, Macek, Jobs, Stumpf, Korinek

s/ Lee Schlenvogt

Lee Schlenvogt CHAIRPERSON - COUNTY BOARD

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:	
I, Julianne B. Winkelhorst, County certify that the foregoing is a true an by the Ozaukee County Board of Sur	Clerk for Ozaukee County, Wisconsin, hereby d correct copy of Ordinance No. 13-7, adopted pervisors on December 4, 2013.
(SEAL) Julianne B	. Winkelhost
Julianne B. Wink	telhorst
- Ozaukee County	Clerk
Adopted Vote:	Ayes - 24
CHARACTER AND	Nays - 1
	Abstain - 1
	Absent - 0

Appendix I

PROGRAM PRIORITY RESULTS

(This page intentionally left blank)

Table I-1

PRIORITIZATION SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: APRIL 2012

Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Rank
13	Assign agricultural use to parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or higher on the Ozaukee County Planned Land Use Map: 2035 (Map 24 in Chapter II), if also designated for agricultural use on the applicable local overnment adopted planned land use map.	1.79	1
15	Develop a County agricultural conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program or a County agricultural conservation easement program to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis.	1.54	2
14	Study and develop a County land division ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect agricultural resource areas identified on Map 6 in Chapter II.	1.45	3
47	Continue to support farmland preservation educational efforts by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, and UW-Extension to assist landowners and the public, including distribution of WDNR and DATCP educational materials to local landowners on farmland preservation, through the County newsletter and website, public informational meetings, and individual contacts with landowners.	1.43	4
17	Work with the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT), the Land Conservation Partnership of Ozaukee County, and other land trusts to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis through agricultural conservation easements and/or land purchases.	1.43	5
32	Establish an Agricultural Enterprise Area(s) containing contiguous lands devoted primarily to agricultural use. An AEA would be part of a broader strategy to protect farmland and promote agriculture and agriculturally-related development.	1.40	6
25	Continue to update as needed the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County based on the LESA analysis and any revisions made to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program. Continue to encourage local governments to participate in future updates to the County Farmland Preservation Plan.	1.39	7
30	Encourage County and local programs to protect farmland through education and the development of programs to support farmland protection. The County should also provide technical assistance to towns for town farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural (or farmland preservation) zoning.	1.39	8
11	Continue to support and to implement recommendations in the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan to protect land and water resources, including farmland.	1.36	9
18	Develop and adopt a County right-to-farm ordinance that defines agricultural operations, normal agricultural practices, and the specific farmland that is affected by the ordinance; a reference to the State Statute that protects farmers from nuisance law suits; and a grievance procedure that outlines how complaints against agricultural operations will be resolved.	1.35	10
35	Implement programs recommended under the Farmland Protection Recommendations to preserve agricultural activity in Ozaukee County, including those in the Wisconsin Working Lands law (Chapter 91 of the <i>Statutes</i>) and study a County property tax deduction on agricultural uses.	1.34	11
16	Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural areas.	1.32	12
24	Continue to pursue Federal and State farmland protection grant funds available to County governments, and use the LESA analysis to prioritize areas.	1.29	13
45	Continue to promote allowing produce stands, bed-and-breakfast establishments, "commercial kitchens," and other types of home occupations or "home-based" businesses on farms to help supplement farming incomes.	1.23	14
36	Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for beginning farmers. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies as part of program implementation.	1.21	15
41	Develop a program to market and link Ozaukee County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants, stores, schools, hospitals, and group residential facilities (nursing homes, for example) in Ozaukee County and surrounding areas.	1.21	16
27	Implement the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) and ensure compliance of farms with FPP rules.	1.19	17
3	Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and Best Management Practices (BMP) resources and grants available through State agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in State agency assistance and State agencies as part of program implementation	1 18	18
46	Publicize and furnish information on alternative specialized or niche farming operations, including "urban," "aquaponics," "hydroponics," aquaculture, organic, herb (including herbology, use of herbs as natural remedies), apiculture (beekeeping), equestrian, and "bioenergy" (sustainable biomass and biofuel production) farming.	1.17	19

Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Rank
1	Develop an educational program and distribute educational materials regarding farming techniques that promote soil conservation such as conservation tillage (where crops are grown with minimal or reduced cultivation of the soil), no till and zone tilling farming, contour stripping, grass waterways, terracing, crop rotation, and nutrient management through soil sampling. The educational program focus should include local governments and individual farmers. Information and application assistance for Federal and State programs to implement farming practices that promote soil conservation should be provided to farmers	1 15	20
2	Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and BMP resources and grants available through the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other Federal agencies. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal agency assistance and Federal agencies as part of program implementation.	1.15	20
19	Support Wisconsin's Working Lands Initiative recommendations.	1.14	22
23	Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of farming, including economic impacts, and the need to protect enough farmland in Ozaukee County for farming to remain viable in the future.	1.14	23
40	Identify and consider establishing AEAs to include areas with an agricultural economic cluster of farming operations and appropriate agri-businesses on lands designated for agricultural use on the County Planned Land Use Map for 2035.	1.13	24
10	Promote the removal of highly erodible land from agricultural use through implementing the County Soil and Water Resource Management Program.	1.10	25
12	Continue to identify croplands that do not have a conservation plan and help develop these plans. Also, continue to assist in updating existing conservation plans.	1.10	26
44	Work with UW-Extension to provide information to farmers on succession planning to help ensure farming activity continues into the future.	1.09	27
21	Develop a cost/revenue model comparing the cost of County and local government services to various types of land use compared to agricultural land uses.	1.07	28
20	Study the feasibility of providing a tax break or incentive on the County portion of the property tax for agricultural parcels, including those donating conservation easements.	1.04	29
9	Enforce the land and water management standards required of participants in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program.	1.04	30
26	Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation to protect farmland, including the use of boundary agreements.	1.03	31
31	Provide technical assistance to the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area including maps, tile locations, soils information, and conservation plans to the WDNR and OWLT on parcels of interest. County representatives should also continue to participate on the Heritage Area technical and advisory committees.	1.03	32
5	Continue to pursue Federal and State soil resource conservation grant funds available to county governments.	1.01	33
42	Establish a program to promote agri-tourism in Ozaukee County through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms. The program could include an educational component for farmers regarding possible agri-tourism enterprises.	1.00	34
6	Develop methods to ensure nutrient management plans required by Section NR 151.07 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> are implemented in the County.	0.98	35
33	Continue to publicize and furnish information on sustainable and alternative agricultural practices.	0.92	36
38	Study the potential development of health care purchasing programs for farmers in Ozaukee County, similar to the program being developed by the Wisconsin Health Care Cooperative established under Section 185.99 of the <i>Statutes</i> , to allow self-employed farmers or small businesses to purchase affordable health insurance.	0.92	37
8	Continue to promote the use of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) in Ozaukee County.	0.91	38
28	Encourage the use of the WDNR Managed Forest Law/Land program in the County and update the geographic information system (GIS) database.	0.91	39
4	Work with the UW-Discovery Farms and Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship Initiative programs to promote an increased understanding of agricultural impacts on soil quality and how to implement BMPs among farmers and government officials in Ozaukee County.	0.90	40
43	Work with UW-Extension and local high schools and colleges to promote agribusiness education programs.	0.90	41
29	Promote the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) and assist communities, non-government organizations, and the WDNR in identifying appropriate areas to apply for FRPP grants.	0.88	42

Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Rank
39	Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.	0.86	43
100	Identify sustainable lands to be retained in long-term agricultural use in consultation with local governments, and using the results of the LESA analysis. (N=17)	0.83	44
37	Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for youth programs, including 4-H Clubs and Future Farmers of America (FFA). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies as part of program implementation.	0.82	45
98	Preserve groundwater recharge areas identified on Map 11 in Chapter II through the County subdivision review process and encourage local governments to preserve groundwater recharge areas through local comprehensive plans and consistent implementation of land use control ordinances, such as the zoning ordinance. (N=17)	0.82	46
88	The cities, villages, and towns in the County will continue to administer and enforce their respective community zoning and land division ordinances in accordance with the recommendations of the adopted community comprehensive plan, and amend zoning and land division ordinances and zoning maps as necessary to implement the local comprehensive plan. Such amendments may include the creation of new zoning districts or regulations in order to implement the local comprehensive plan. (N=17)	0.79	47
87	Continue to incorporate city, village, and town land use plans into the County land use plan for areas within their respective municipal boundaries, in accordance with the procedure for plan amendments described in Part 2 of Chapter XIV in the County comprehensive plan. Ozaukee County will continue to work with communities to prepare necessary plan amendments for inclusion in the County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan. (N=17)	0.77	48
22	Develop a fact sheet outlining the impact of agricultural land conversion in Ozaukee County.	0.77	49
34	Assist, where requested, local governments in preparing a Livestock Facility Siting Ordinance under Section 93.90 of the <i>Wisconsin Statutes</i> .	0.77	50
83	Preserve and maintain structures with significant historical and archaeological value in the County. (N=17)	0.74	51
99	Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses on the County land use plan map to encourage sustainable development of land for business use. Guide these land uses away from lands delineated on Maps 16 and 17 in Chapter II, unless otherwise delineated on local government land use plan maps. (N=17)	0.72	52
91	Allocate residential land in existing urban (sewer) service areas to urban densities if recommended by the concerned local government land use plan map. (N=17)	0.70	53
93	Encourage infill housing development. (N=17)	0.68	54
95	Allocate a mix of residential land use categories, including urban density and multi-family/high density residential uses, to the residential areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems. (N=11)	0.68	55
97	Allocate an adequate amount of land on the County land use map and to incorporate the programs recommended in Chapter XI, Utilities and Community Facilities Element, of the County comprehensive plan, including accommodating necessary expansion of utilities and community facilities where warranted. (N=17)	0.68	56
49	Develop the County conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program to protect natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17.	0.67	57
96	Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses to the business areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems. (N=17)	0.67	58
60	Continue to support the Southeastern Wisconsin Invasive Species Consortium (SEWISC), Inc., which functions as the Southeastern Wisconsin Cooperative Weed Management Area, covering the Milwaukee River watershed and surrounding counties, along with other government agencies and nonprofit organizations. (N=17)	0.65	59
7	Update the land and water resource management plan every five years.	0.65	60
85	Observe Section 66.1111 of the <i>Wisconsin Statutes</i> , which requires local governments, including counties, to consider how a project may affect historic properties and archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or State Register of Historic Places. (N=17)	0.63	61
67	Support and, where applicable, implement sanitary sewer, water supply, and stormwater management standards recommended in the regional water supply plan and regional water quality management plan (RWQMP) update. (N=17)	0.62	62

Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Rank
56	Promote model conservation subdivision ordinances, such as the Rural Cluster Development Guide, to local governments. Assist local governments in interpreting and implementing conservation subdivision ordinances, including requiring stewardship plans to ensure proper management of common open space	0.04	
77	which may also contain farmstead features. (N=17) Ensure compliance with Chapter NR 216 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> through plat and shoreland zoning reviews, including construction site pollutant control (including plan review and compliance	0.61	63
	inspections) and post-construction stormwater management (including plan review and compliance inspections). (N=17)	0.61	64
52	Encourage the adoption of lowland conservancy and upland conservancy zoning districts that are based on Table 96, <i>Guidelines for Development Considered Compatible with Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas</i> , in Chapter VII of the County comprehensive plan for use in local government zoning ordinances. (N=17)	0.60	65
94	Work to implement the recommendations of the Ozaukee County Jurisdictional Highway System Plan and the Regional Transportation System Plan. (N=17)	0.60	66
68	Continue to administer and enforce the Ozaukee County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance in accordance with State and Federal requirements. (N=17)	0.60	67
90	A full range of housing structure types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwelling units, should be planned for in existing urban (sewer) service areas in accordance with adopted County and local land use plan maps to provide affordable housing options for households of all income levels, ages, and special needs projected for Ozaukee County in 2035, (N=17)	0.59	68
59	Work with nongovernmental organizations to support implementation of methods to control invasive species, with a focus along major transportation routes and corridors through the County such as IH 43 and the Milwaukee River. (N=17)	0.59	69
76	Develop and adopt a countywide Stormwater and Construction Site Erosion Control Ordinance that includes an illicit discharge detection, elimination, and enforcement component. (N=17)	0.58	70
84	Develop model historic and archaeological preservation ordinances for towns under the provisions of Section 60.04 of the <i>Statutes</i> and for cities and villages based on Section 62.23(7)(em) of the <i>Statutes</i> (consult the State Historical Society Division of Historic Preservation model ordinance). The archaeological model ordinance would be similar to a historic preservation ordinance; however, its focus is preservation of archaeological sites (N=17)	0.58	71
55	Study and develop a County Land Division Ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect identified natural resource areas. (N=17)	0.57	72
86	Develop and distribute educational materials to local governments, historical societies and the public regarding agencies, such as the State Historical Society Office of Local History, and funding sources that may support the work and facilities of local historical societies in Ozaukee County. (N=17)	0.57	73
48	Develop an education program and distribute educational materials regarding techniques that promote land use patterns that are sensitive to natural resource conservation such as overlay zoning, incentive zoning, planned unit development (PUD), conservation subdivisions, and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs. The educational program focus should include local governments and developers. (N=17)	0.56	74
54	Protect natural areas and critical species habitat and aquatic sites identified in the Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan. (N=17)	0.56	75
73	Enforce the recommendations for management of animal waste storage facilities and utilization of waste set forth in Standard 590 of the USDA-NRCS Technical Guide and conduct yearly follow-up inspections. (N=17)	0.56	76
72	Enforce farm compliance with Chapter 12, Animal Waste Storage, of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances. (N=17)	0.56	77
65	Require vegetation management plans for land divisions in the County through a revision to the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance. (N=17)	0.55	78
103	Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County. (N=17)	0.54	79
63	Implement noxious weed ordinances in County parks and local parks by working cooperatively with local governments. (N=17)	0.54	80
92	Encourage the use of conservation subdivision design for residential developments outside of urban (sewer) service areas. (N=17)	0.54	81
61	Develop model public/private landscaping construction and facilities maintenance guidelines to ensure transported soil, fill, and rock do not contain invasive plants or seeds, and use the guidelines for County projects. (N=17)	0.54	82

Program			
Number"	Program	Score	Rank
82	Support and, where applicable, establish and utilize an adaptive watershed management option as a strategy to meet the phosphorus water quality criteria set forth in Section NR 102.06 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> in an economically efficient manner while considering the contributions of phosphorus from point and		
	nonpoint sources in a watershed. (N=17)	0.54	83
51	Develop a model zoning ordinance for local government use that provides for protection of natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17. (N=17)	0.53	84
66	Follow the provisions of Chapter NR 40, Invasive Species Identification, Classification and Control, of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> . (N=17)	0.53	85
62	Study and incorporate invasive plant species control and management requirements into the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance. (N=17)	0.52	86
81	Maintain, update, and implement recommendations set forth in the Ozaukee County flood mitigation plan, including acquisition of properties in the floodplain without "buildable" areas. (N=17)	0.52	87
50	Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of natural resource areas. (N=17)	0.51	88
58	Develop a public educational program to discourage the use of invasive plant species in landscaping. (N=17)	0.51	89
57	Develop a model landscaping ordinance for local government use that restricts landscaping with invasive plant species. (N=17)	0.50	90
74	Develop methods to reduce the amount of winter spread manure on 50 percent of the critical areas in 303(d) list waters and waters within the Great Lakes Watershed. (N=17)	0.50	91
101	Study the administration of additional partnerships and educational opportunities designed to develop the job skills sought by employers and potential employers in Ozaukee County. (N=17)	0.50	92
89	Communities may establish urban and rural design guidelines for which compliance may be mandatory (regulatory approach by converting guidelines into ordinance regulations) or voluntary (nonregulatory approach by encouraging developers to follow a design manual). (N=17)	0.49	93
70	Develop public educational programs and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of natural resources and the need to protect them from degradation; floodplain and wetlands including statutory requirements and authorities related to these features; limitations of saturated soils for development; projects homeowners can implement to reduce nonpoint source pollution, such as rain gardens, replacing lawn areas with native landscaping, and reducing impervious surfaces; well water safety information and well monitoring; and importance of bluff setback requirements and the bluff erosion process. The education programs focus should include local governments, developers, and the public. (N=17)	0.49	94
64	Provide for an invasive plant education and outreach program in Ozaukee County through a partnership with the Invasive Plant Association of Wisconsin, SEWISC, and other partners. (N=17)	0.49	95
80	Use the Milwaukee River Basin Plan and Sheboygan River Basin Plan to target priority farms by identifying sediment delivery fields, and phosphorus runoff sites in 303(d) list waters areas. (N=17)	0.48	96
102	Develop telecommunications and technology strategies for the County to ensure access to wireless voice and data communications networks for County businesses and residents, including residents who telecommute or operate a home-based business. (N=17)	0.47	97
71	Work to install buffers along all watercourses in Ozaukee County. (N=17)	0.44	98
53	Protect environmental corridors through the County plat review process. (N=17)	0.42	99
79	Work collaboratively with MMSD and SEWRPC to implement and update the RWQMP. (N=17)	0.41	100
104	Study the use of County funding to support staffing for the Ozaukee County Tourism Council. (N=17)	0.36	101
78	Assist other government agencies with implementation of the RWQMP. (N=17)	0.33	102
69	Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding nonpoint and point source pollution. (N=17)	0.32	103
75	Develop methods to collaborate with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the WDNR to remove PCB's in 303(d) listed waters. This effort should include a public education component. (N=17)	0.31	104
	Range Maximum	1.79	
	Minimum	0.31	

NOTE: Contains a total of 104 Programs. N=19 unless indicated otherwise (N means number of responses or sample size). Top 20 Percent = 1.15 or higher score Top 25 Percent = 1.09 or higher score Top 30 Percent = 1.03 or higher score Top 40 Percent = 0.87 or higher score Top 50 Percent = 0.71 or higher score

^aProgram number was assigned as sequentially listed in Chapter VI.

Source: Ozaukee County, UW-Extension, and SEWRPC.

Table I-2

SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE AGRICULTURAL-RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: APRIL 2012

Goals	Weight
Preserve soils suitable for agricultural production in Ozaukee County.	1.89
Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remains viable in Ozaukee County.	2.28
Protect farms and farming in Ozaukee County.	2.00

GOAL:	Preserve soils suitable for agricultural production in Ozaukee County.		-			
Program Number ^a	Program	Average	Weight	Score⁵	Sub-Rank (1=High)	Overall Rank
1	Develop an educational program and distribute educational materials regarding farming techniques that promote soil conservation such as conservation tillage (where crops are grown with minimal or reduced cultivation of the soil), no till and zone tilling farming, contour stripping, grass waterways, terracing, crop rotation, and nutrient management through soil sampling. The educational program focus should include local governments and individual farmers. Information and application assistance for Federal and State programs to implement farming practices that promote soil conservation should be provided to farmers through the County educational program.	0.61	1.89	1.15	3	20
2	Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and Best Management Practices (BMP) resources and grants available through the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and other Federal agencies. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal agency assistance and Federal agencies as part of program implementation.	0.61	1.89	1.15	3	21
3	Develop an educational/technical assistance program specifically outlining the soil conservation and BMP resources and grants available through State agencies such as the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection (DATCP) and the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in State agency assistance and State agencies as part of program implementation.	0.63	1.89	1.18	2	18
4	Work with the UW-Discovery Farms and Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship Initiative programs to promote an increased understanding of agricultural impacts on soil quality and how to implement BMPs among farmers and government officials in Ozaukee County.	0.48	1.89	0.90	11	40
5	Continue to pursue Federal and State soil resource conservation grant funds available to County governments.	0.54	1.89	1.01	8	33
6	Develop methods to ensure nutrient management plans required by Section NR 151.07 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> are implemented in the County.	0.52	1.89	0.98	9	35
7	Update the land and water resource management plan every five years.	0.34	1.89	0.65	12	60
8	Continue to promote the use of the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) in Ozaukee County.	0.48	1.89	0.91	10	38
9	Enforce the land and water management standards required of participants in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program.	0.55	1.89	1.04	7	30
10	Promote the removal of highly erodible land from agricultural use through implementing the County Soil and Water Resource Management Program.	0.58	1.89	1.10	5	25
11	Continue to support and to implement recommendations in the County Land and Water Resource Management Plan to protect land and water resources, including farmland.	0.72	1.89	1.36	1	9
12	Continue to identify croplands that do not have a conservation plan and help develop these plans. Also, continue to assist in updating existing conservation plans.	0.58	1.89	1.10	5	26

GOAL:	Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming rema	ins viable in Oz	aukee County.			
Program Number ^a	Program	Average	Weight	Score ^b	Sub-Rank (1=High)	Overall Rank
13	Assign agricultural use to parcels receiving a LESA score of 6.4 or higher on the Ozaukee County Planned Land Use Map: 2035 (Map 24 in Chapter II), if also designated for agricultural use on the applicable local government adopted planned land use map.	0.78	2.28	1.79	1	1
14	Study and develop a County land division ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect agricultural resource areas identified on Map 6 in Chapter II.	0.64	2.28	1.45	3	3
15	Develop a County agricultural conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program or a County agricultural conservation easement program to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis.	0.68	2.28	1.54	2	2
16	Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of agricultural areas.	0.58	2.28	1.32	9	12
17	Work with the Ozaukee Washington Land Trust (OWLT), the Land Conservation Partnership of Ozaukee County, and other land trusts to protect agricultural parcels identified as high priority by the LESA analysis through agricultural conservation easements and/or land purchases.	0.63	2.28	1.43	4	5
18	Develop and adopt a County right-to-farm ordinance that defines agricultural operations, normal agricultural practices, and the specific farmland that is affected by the ordinance; a reference to the State Statute that protects farmers from nuisance law suits; and a grievance procedure that outlines how complaints against agricultural operations will be resolved.	0.59	2.28	1.35	8	10
19	Support Wisconsin's Working Lands Initiative recommendations.	0.50	2.28	1.14	12	22
20	Study the feasibility of providing a tax break or incentive on the County portion of the property tax for agricultural parcels, including those donating conservation easements.	0.46	2.28	1.04	15	29
21	Develop a cost/revenue model comparing the cost of County and local government services to various types of land use compared to agricultural land uses.	0.47	2.28	1.07	14	28
22	Develop a fact sheet outlining the impact of agricultural land conversion in Ozaukee County.	0.34	2.28	0.77	21	49
23	Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of farming, including economic impacts, and the need to protect enough farmland in Ozaukee County for farming to remain viable in the future.	0.50	2.28	1.14	13	23
24	Continue to pursue Federal and State farmland protection grant funds available to County governments, and use the LESA analysis to prioritize areas.	0.57	2.28	1.29	10	13
25	Continue to update as needed the Farmland Preservation Plan for Ozaukee County based on the LESA analysis and any revisions made to the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program. Continue to encourage local governments to participate in future updates to the County Farmland Preservation Plan.	0.61	2.28	1.39	6	7
26	Continue to encourage intergovernmental cooperation to protect farmland, including the use of boundary agreements.	0.45	2.28	1.03	16	31
27	Implement the Farmland Preservation Program (FPP) and ensure compliance of farms with FPP rules.	0.52	2.28	1.19	11	17
28	Encourage the use of the WDNR Managed Forest Law/Land program in the County and update the geographic information system (GIS) database.	0.40	2.28	0.91	19	39
29	Promote the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP) and assist communities, non-government organizations, and the WDNR in identifying appropriate areas to apply for FRPP grants.	0.39	2.28	0.88	20	42
30	Encourage County and local programs to protect farmland through education and the development of programs to support farmland protection. The County should also provide technical assistance to towns for town farmland protection programs, such as transfer of development rights and exclusive agricultural (or farmland preservation) zoning.	0.61	2.28	1.39	6	8

GOAL:	Preserve a sufficient amount of agricultural land to ensure farming remain	ins viable in Oz	aukee County (continued).	1	
Program Number ^a	Program	Average	Weight	Score ^b	Sub-Rank (1=High)	Overall Rank
31	Provide technical assistance to the North Branch Milwaukee River Wildlife and Farming Heritage Area including maps, title locations, soils information, and conservation plans to the WDNR and OWLT on parcels of interest. County representatives should also continue to participate on the Heritage Area technical and advisory committees.	0.45	2.28	1.03	17	32
32	Establish an Agricultural Enterprise Area(s) containing contiguous lands devoted primarily to agricultural use. An AEA would be part of a broader strategy to protect farmland and promote agriculture and agriculturally-related development.	0.61	2 28	1 40	5	6
33	Continue to publicize and furnish information on sustainable and alternative agricultural practices.	0.40	2.28	0.92	18	36
34	Assist, where requested, local governments in preparing a Livestock Facility Siting Ordinance under Section 93.90 of the <i>Wisconsin</i> <i>Statutes</i> .	0.34	2.28	0.77	21	50
COAL	Protect forms and forming in Ozaukoa County					
Program					Sub-Rank	Overall
Number ^a	Program	Average	Weight	Score ^b	(1=High)	Rank
35	Implement programs recommended under the Farmland Protection Recommendations to preserve agricultural activity in Ozaukee County, including those included in the Wisconsin Working Lands law (Chapter 91 of the <i>Statutes</i>) and study a County property tax deduction on agricultural uses.	0.67	2.00	1.34	2	11
36	Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for beginning farmers. The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies as part of program implementation.	0.61	2.00	1.21	4	15
37	Develop an educational program outlining grants and loans available through Federal and State agencies for youth programs, including 4-H Clubs and Future Farmers of America (FFA). The County should act as a liaison between those interested in Federal and State agency assistance and Federal and State agencies as part of program implementation.	0.41	2.00	0.82	13	45
38	Study the potential development of health care purchasing programs for farmers in Ozaukee County, similar to the program being developed by the Wisconsin Health Care Cooperative established under Section 185.99 of the <i>Statutes</i> , to allow self-employed farmers or small businesses to purchase affordable health insurance.	0.46	2.00	0.91	10	37
39	Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.	0.43	2.00	0.86	12	43
40	Identify and consider establishing AEAs to include areas with an agricultural economic cluster of farming operations and appropriate agri-businesses on lands designated for agricultural use on the County Planned Land Use Map for 2035.	0.56	2.00	1.13	7	24
41	Develop a program to market and link Ozaukee County agricultural products, including organic products, to restaurants, stores, schools, hospitals, and group residential facilities (nursing homes, for example) in Ozaukee County and surrounding areas.	0.60	2.00	1.21	5	16
42	Establish a program to promote agri-tourism in Ozaukee County through agricultural-related special events. Events could include farm breakfasts, farm tours, corn mazes, and u-pick farms. The program could include an educational component for farmers regarding possible agri-tourism enterprises.	0.50	2.00	1.00	9	34
43	Work with UW-Extension and local high schools and colleges to promote agribusiness education programs.	0.45	2.00	0.90	11	41
44	Work with UW-Extension to provide information to farmers on succession planning to help ensure farming activity continues into the future	0.54	2.00	1.09	8	27

GOAL:	GOAL: Protect farms and farming in Ozaukee County (continued).					
Program Number ^a	Program	Average	Weight	Score ^b	Sub-Rank (1=High)	Overall Rank
45	Continue to promote allowing produce stands, bed-and-breakfast establishments, "commercial kitchens," and other types of home occupations or "home-based" businesses on farms to help supplement farming incomes.	0.62	2.00	1.23	3	14
46	Publicize and furnish information on alternative specialized or niche farming operations, including "urban," "aquaponics," "hydroponics," aquaculture, organic, herb (including herbology, use of herbs as natural remedies), apiculture (beekeeping), equestrian, and "bioenergy" (sustainable biomass and biofuel production) farming.	0.58	2.00	1.17	6	19
47	Continue to support farmland preservation educational efforts by the Ozaukee County Planning and Parks Department, Ozaukee County Land and Water Management Department, and UW- Extension to assist landowners and the public, including distribution of WDNR and DATCP educational materials to local landowners on farmland preservation, through the County newsletter and website, public informational meetings, and individual contacts with landowners.	0.72	2.00	1.43	1	4

NOTE: N=19 (N means number of responses or sample size).

^aProgram number was assigned as sequentially listed in Chapter VI.

^bThe score was determined by multiplying the "average" rating by the "weight" (preceding two columns). Scores ranged from a high of 1.79 to a low of 0.65.

Source: Ozaukee County, UW-Extension, and SEWRPC.

Table I-3

SURVEY RESULTS FOR RELATED RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN FOR OZAUKEE COUNTY: APRIL 2012

GOAL: Ens	ure the protection, wise use, and enhancement of the natural resource base in Ozaukee County.		
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
48	Develop an education program and distribute educational materials regarding techniques that promote land use patterns that are sensitive to natural resource conservation such as overlay zoning, incentive zoning, planned unit development (PUD), conservation subdivisions, and transfer of development rights (TDR) programs The educational program focus should include local governments and developers.	0.56	74
49	Develop the County conservation easement program or purchase of development rights (PDR) program to protect natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17.	0.67	57
50	Develop a model transfer of development rights (TDR) program for local government use that focuses on the protection of natural resource areas.	0.51	88
51	Develop a model zoning ordinance for local government use that provides for protection of natural resource areas identified on Maps 16 and 17.	0.53	84
52	Encourage the adoption of lowland conservancy and upland conservancy zoning districts that are based on Table 96, <i>Guidelines for Development Considered Compatible with Environmental Corridors and Isolated Natural Resource Areas</i> , in Chapter VII of the County comprehensive plan for use in local government zoning ordinances.	0.60	65
53	Protect environmental corridors through the County plat review process.	0.42	99
54	Protect natural areas and critical species habitat and aquatic sites identified in the Ozaukee County Park and Open Space Plan.	0.56	75
55	Study and develop a County Land Division Ordinance that could be used countywide to help protect identified natural resource areas.	0.57	72
56	Promote model conservation subdivision ordinances, such as the <i>Rural Cluster Development Guide</i> , to local governments. Assist local governments in interpreting and implementing conservation subdivision ordinances, including requiring stewardship plans to ensure proper management of common open space which may also contain farmstead features.	0.61	63

GOAL: Pro	tect Ozaukee County's naturally occurring bio-diversity.		
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
57	Develop a model landscaping ordinance for local government use that restricts landscaping with invasive plant species.	0.50	90
58	Develop a public educational program to discourage the use of invasive plant species in landscaping.	0.51	89
59	Work with nongovernmental organizations to support implementation of methods to control invasive species, with a focus along major transportation routes and corridors through the County such as IH 43 and the Milwaukee River.	0.59	69
60	Continue to support the Southeastern Wisconsin Invasive Species Consortium (SEWISC), Inc., which functions as the Southeastern Wisconsin Cooperative Weed Management Area, covering the Milwaukee River watershed and surrounding counties, along with other government agencies and nonprofit organizations.	0.65	59
61	Develop model public/private landscaping construction and facilities maintenance guidelines to ensure transported soil, fill, and rock do not contain invasive plants or seeds, and use the guidelines for County projects.	0.54	82
62	Study and incorporate invasive plant species control and management requirements into the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance.	0.52	86
63	Implement noxious weed ordinances in County parks and local parks by working cooperatively with local governments.	0.54	80
64	Provide for an invasive plant education and outreach program in Ozaukee County through a partnership with the Invasive Plant Association of Wisconsin, SEWISC, and other partners.	0.49	95
65	Require vegetation management plans for land divisions in the County through a revision to the County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance.	0.55	78
66	Follow the provisions of Chapter NR 40, Invasive Species Identification, Classification and Control, of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> .	0.53	85

GOALS: Encourage integrated water resource management of surface water, groundwater, and water dependent natural resources.				
Pro	tect and enhance surface and groundwater quality and quantity, floodplains, wetlands, and Lake Michigar	n shorelines	and bluffs.	
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank	
67	Support and, where applicable, implement sanitary sewer, water supply, and stormwater management standards recommended in the regional water supply plan and regional water quality management plan (RWQMP) update.	0.62	62	
68	Continue to administer and enforce the Ozaukee County Shoreland and Floodplain Zoning Ordinance in accordance with State and Federal requirements.	0.60	67	
69	Develop a public educational program and distribute educational materials to the public regarding nonpoint and point source pollution.	0.32	103	
70	Develop public educational programs and distribute educational materials to the public regarding the benefits of natural resources and the need to protect them from degradation; floodplain and wetlands including statutory requirements and authorities related to these features; limitations of saturated soils for development; projects homeowners can implement to reduce nonpoint source pollution, such as rain gardens, replacing lawn areas with native landscaping, and reducing impervious surfaces; well water safety information and well monitoring; and importance of bluff setback requirements and the bluff erosion process. The education programs focus should include local governments, developers, and the public.	0.49	94	
71	Work to install buffers along all watercourses in Ozaukee County.	0.44	98	
72	Enforce farm compliance with Section 9.101, Manure Storage, of Chapter 9 of the Ozaukee County Code of Ordinances.	0.56	77	
73	Enforce the recommendations for management of animal waste storage facilities and utilization of waste set forth in Standard 590 of the USDA-NRCS Technical Guide and conduct yearly follow-up inspections.	0.56	76	
74	Develop methods to reduce the amount of winter spread manure on 50 percent of the critical areas in 303(d) list waters and waters within the Great Lakes Watershed.	0.50	91	
75	Develop methods to collaborate with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the WDNR to remove PCB's in 303(d) listed waters. This effort should include a public education component.	0.31	104	
76	Develop and adopt a countywide Stormwater and Construction Site Erosion Control Ordinance that includes an illicit discharge detection, elimination, and enforcement component.	0.58	70	
77	Ensure compliance with Chapter NR 216 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> through plat and shoreland zoning reviews, including construction site pollutant control (including plan review and compliance inspections) and post-construction stormwater management (including plan review and compliance inspections).	0.61	64	
78	Assist other government agencies with implementation of the RWQMP.	0.33	102	
79	Work collaboratively with MMSD and SEWRPC to implement and update the RWQMP.	0.41	100	
80	Use the Milwaukee River Basin Plan and Sheboygan River Basin Plan to target priority farms by identifying sediment delivery fields, and phosphorus runoff sites in 303(d) list waters areas.	0.48	96	
81	Maintain, update, and implement recommendations set forth in the Ozaukee County flood mitigation plan, including acquisition of properties in the floodplain without "buildable" areas.	0.52	87	
82	Support and, where applicable, establish and utilize an adaptive watershed management option as a strategy to meet the phosphorus water quality criteria set forth in Section NR 102.06 of the <i>Wisconsin Administrative Code</i> in an economically efficient manner while considering the contributions of phosphorus from point and nonpoint sources in a watershed.	0.54	83	

GOALS:	Preserve the rural and small town character of Ozaukee County.		
	Preserve and enhance the historical, cultural, and archaeological resources that contribute to Ozaukee Cou	nty's heritag	ge.
	Promote cultural resource and heritage related tourism in the County.		
Progran Number	Program	Score	Overall Rank
83	Preserve and maintain structures with significant historical and archaeological value in the County.	0.74	51
84	Develop model historic and archaeological preservation ordinances for towns under the provisions of Section 60.04 of the <i>Statutes</i> and for cities and villages based on Section 62.23(7)(em) of the <i>Statutes</i> (consult the State Historical Society Division of Historic Preservation model ordinance). The archaeological model ordinance would be similar to a historic preservation ordinance; however, its focus is preservation of archaeological sites	0.58	71
85	Observe Section 66.1111 of the <i>Wisconsin Statutes</i> , which requires local governments, including counties, to consider how a project may affect historic properties and archaeological sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or State Register of Historic Places.	0.63	61
86	Develop and distribute educational materials to local governments, historical societies and the public regarding agencies, such as the State Historical Society Office of Local History, and funding sources that may support the work and facilities of local historical societies in Ozaukee County.	0.57	73

GOAL: Guide projected growth in a manner that protects Ozaukee County's agricultural and natural resource base and the character of local communities and neighborhoods, including those communities that wish to retain an agricultural economy and rural character.			
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
87	Continue to incorporate city, village, and town land use plans into the County land use plan for areas within their respective municipal boundaries, in accordance with the procedure for plan amendments described in Part 2 of Chapter XIV in the County comprehensive plan. Ozaukee County will continue to work with communities to prepare necessary plan amendments for inclusion in the County multi-jurisdictional comprehensive plan.	0.77	48
88	The cities, villages, and towns in the County will continue to administer and enforce their respective community zoning and land division ordinances in accordance with the recommendations of the adopted community comprehensive plan, and amend zoning and land division ordinances and zoning maps as necessary to implement the local comprehensive plan. Such amendments may include the creation of new zoning districts or regulations in order to implement the local comprehensive plan.	0.79	47
89	Communities may establish urban and rural design guidelines for which compliance may be mandatory (regulatory approach by converting guidelines into ordinance regulations) or voluntary (nonregulatory approach by encouraging developers to follow a design manual).	0.49	93

GOAL: Pro der	mote the addition of an adequate number of housing units to the current housing stock in Ozaukee C nand through 2035.	ounty to me	et housing
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
90	A full range of housing structure types and sizes, including single-family, two-family, and multi- family dwelling units, should be planned for in existing urban (sewer) service areas in accordance with adopted County and local land use plan maps to provide affordable housing options for households of all income levels, ages, and special needs projected for Ozaukee County in 2035.	0.59	68
91	Allocate residential land in existing urban (sewer) service areas to urban densities if recommended by the concerned local government land use plan map.	0.70	53
92	Encourage the use of conservation subdivision design for residential developments outside of urban (sewer) service areas.	0.54	81
93	Encourage infill housing development.	0.68	54

GOALS: Improve transportation infrastructure and land use design to support a range of transportation choices for all citizens and businesses.

Provide an integrated, efficient, and economical transportation system that affords mobility, convenience, and safety and that meets the needs of all businesses and citizens, including transit-dependent residents, persons with disabilities, and the elderly.

Maintain a street and highway system and public transportation system that efficiently serve the anticipated land use development pattern set forth on the County land use plan map.

Provide region-, nation-, and world-wide transportation access to Ozaukee County for passengers and freight.

Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
94	Work to implement the recommendations of the Ozaukee County Jurisdictional Highway System Plan and the Regional Transportation System Plan.	0.60	66
95	Allocate a mix of residential land use categories, including urban density and multi-family/high density residential uses, to the residential areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems.	0.68	55
96	Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses to the business areas identified on the County land use plan map to develop a land use pattern that can be efficiently served by public transportation and alternative transportation systems.	0.67	58

GOALS: Er bu	OALS: Ensure provision of utilities and community facilities to efficiently and adequately serve County residents, workers, and businesses.					
Ei ar	Encourage land uses and densities that promote efficient development patterns and relatively low municipal, State government, and utility costs.					
M	Maintain and enhance the existing level of public services in Ozaukee County, including the use of renewable energy and "green" infrastructure, when possible.					
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank			
97	Allocate an adequate amount of land on the County land use map and to incorporate the programs recommended in Chapter XI, <i>Utilities and Community Facilities Element</i> , of the County comprehensive plan, including accommodating necessary expansion of utilities and community facilities where warranted.	0.68	56			
98	Preserve groundwater recharge areas identified on Map 11 in Chapter II through the County subdivision review process and encourage local governments to preserve groundwater recharge areas through local comprehensive plans and consistent implementation of land use control ordinances, such as the zoning ordinance.	0.82	46			
GOALS: Promote an adequate number of sites for business retention, expansion, and attraction in Ozaukee County through 2035.						
Provide for diversified, balanced, environmentally compatible business development that will offer a variety of goods and services through conveniently located, well-designed business clusters while providing needed services for County residents and businesses						

bus	sinesses.	,	
Program Number ^a	Program	Score	Overall Rank
99	Allocate an appropriate mix of commercial and industrial land uses on the County land use plan map to encourage sustainable development of land for business use. Guide these land uses away from lands delineated on Maps 16 and 17 in Chapter II, unless otherwise delineated on local government land use plan maps.	0.72	52
100	Identify sustainable lands to be retained in long-term agricultural use in consultation with local governments, and using the results of the LESA analysis.	0.83	44
101	Study the administration of additional partnerships and educational opportunities designed to develop the job skills sought by employers and potential employers in Ozaukee County.	0.50	92
102	Develop telecommunications and technology strategies for the County to ensure access to wireless voice and data communications networks for County businesses and residents, including residents who telecommute or operate a home-based business.	0.47	97
103	Study the use of State and Federal bio-energy grants to promote agriculture and associated agricultural industries in Ozaukee County.	0.54	79
104	Study the use of County funding to support staffing for the Ozaukee County Tourism Council.	0.36	101
	Range Maximum	0.83	
	Minimum	0.31	

NOTE: N=17 (N means number of responses or sample size).

^aProgram number was assigned as sequentially listed in Chapter VI.

Source: Ozaukee County, UW-Extension, and SEWRPC.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Appendix J

THE CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN PROCESS

Conservation subdivisions, sometimes called cluster developments, maintain a significant portion of a development site in common open space by minimizing individual lot sizes, while maintaining the overall density of development specified by a local comprehensive plan or zoning ordinance. Conservation subdivisions should be designed around the area proposed to be preserved in open space; that is, the areas for open space preservation should be set aside before the streets and lots are laid out. The design process for conservation subdivisions should follow three basic steps while taking into consideration applicable local regulations, such as zoning, official mapping, and land division control provisions; and pertinent adopted planning recommendations, such as recommended streets, parks, greenways, and recreational trails. The recommended three-step process is:

- 1. Identification and analysis of existing conditions, or site analysis;
- 2. Delineation of preservation areas; and
- 3. Layout of dwelling locations and street and lot pattern.

STEP ONE: SITE ANALYSIS

The design of a conservation subdivision around the area to be preserved first requires a proper site analysis. The analysis should identify existing features that determine the landscape character of a site and analyze those features to determine the desirability of preserving them. A site analysis should also identify features that present obstacles that must be considered and overcome in the design.

The inventory of existing conditions should include all natural and human-made features of a site. Some of these will be natural areas protected by law, such as floodplains, wetlands, shoreland areas, and water bodies. Other areas that are developable, but contain certain features that may lend character to the rural landscape (see Figures J-1 and J-2), should also be identified. Such areas could include hedgerows along an abutting road or dividing two fields; a healthy stand of trees atop a rise in terrain; diverse woodlands; wildflower meadows; fallow farm fields; wildlife habitats; areas that afford good views; historic buildings or ruins; fencerows; and even lone specimen trees. Other site features that must be accommodated in the design may include power line rights-of-way, transmission towers, utility easements, and drainage ways.

It should be noted that a site analysis completed for the sketch-plan layout of a conservation subdivision is not usually as technically comprehensive as those required for engineered preliminary plats. Although the engineering constraints on a site should be generally considered, the site analysis for the purposes of designing a sketch plan for conservation subdivision layout is intended primarily to identify landscape character, preservation areas, and building areas. While some of the elements required for sketch plans and typical preliminary plats will be the same (topography, for instance), the level of detail and accuracy required for documenting conditions for engineering purposes is not needed at the sketch plan level. The elements of a site analysis for the purposes of conservation subdivision design would supplement and precede the site information normally required for conventional subdivision design. When the approval process moves on to the preliminary plat stage, complete documentation and analysis oriented toward proper engineering practices would then be needed. The conservation subdivision layout would then be adjusted, if necessary, to accommodate engineering considerations.







Woodlands, hedgerows, and large single trees are important landscape elements to identify in a site analysis and to preserve in a final design.

Ruins, such as this old stone silo, are strong rural landscape elements which may be worthy of preservation.

Source: SEWRPC.

A good site analysis done for the purpose of conservation subdivision sketch-plan layout will include field investigations and should, at a minimum, consist of a map, or set of maps, showing the following:

- 1. A topographic analysis identifying slopes over 12 percent and under 2 percent. The topographic map should have a scale of one inch equals 100 feet or more, with a vertical contour interval of two feet or less. Hilltops and ridge lines should be highlighted.
- 2. An analysis of drainage patterns. The management of stormwater runoff from a site depends largely upon the existing drainage patterns which, for greatest economy and site preservation, generally should not be altered. Onsite drainage patterns are part of a larger drainage network and connect to the drainage patterns of adjacent sites. The role a particular site plays in the overall watershed should be recognized.
- 3. A vegetation analysis, identifying woodlands, hedgerows, specimen trees, meadows, prairie remnants, pastures, and active or fallow farm fields. Vegetation should be identified as evergreen or deciduous. The health and condition of each vegetative type should be identified. Predominant species in hedgerows and woodlands should be identified. Specimen trees should be identified by species, size, and health. Unique or endangered plant species should be noted.
- 4. A delineation of soil types and identification of selected soil characteristics, as provided by the information in the regional soil survey completed for the Regional Planning Commission by the U. S. Natural Resources Conservation Service. Such characteristics would include, for example, suitability of soils for crops, pasture, woodland, wildlife habitat, and recreation, as well as for building foundations, roadways, and onsite sewage-disposal systems. Prime agricultural soils and alluvial floodplain soils should be noted.
- 5. Shoreland protection areas, including any required building setbacks from the ordinary high-water mark of navigable waters, the 100-year recurrence interval floodplain boundaries, and lakes, ponds, streams, and wetlands. Significant groundwater recharge or well-head protection areas should also be noted.

- 6. Boundaries and characteristics of primary and secondary environmental corridors, and isolated natural resource areas, as identified in adopted regional plans or local comprehensive plans.
- 7. Wildlife habitat, whether in fields, wetlands, or woodlands. Predominant species of birds, mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and fish should be identified when possible. The presence of rare or endangered species should be noted, along with the boundaries of natural areas and critical species habitat sites.
- 8. Historic or cultural features, including ruins and stone fencerows.
- 9. Other existing buildings and structures. All buildings in a farm complex should be located and identified as to their use, as well as the locations of existing wells and private onsite wastewater treatment systems (POWTS).
- 10. Scenic vistas, both into the site from adjacent roads, trails, and hilltops and outward from the site.
- 11. Classifications of existing streets and highways adjacent to the development parcel as well as desirable or undesirable points of entry into the parcel. Street connections required by the local official map should be noted.
- 12. Existing physical conditions surrounding the development parcel within 200 feet. These might include such notes as "adjacent residential homes," "connection to county trail," or "view to historic barn." The size and extent of existing adjacent open space areas should be noted, as well as any further open space connections these spaces may have.
- 13. Future areawide plans that may affect the physical layout of the site should also be taken into account. These could include, among others, plans for future parks; open space, trail, and bikeway systems; farmland preservation areas; arterial and other street networks; stormwater management facilities and other utilities; and general land use plans.

Figure J-3 is an example of a typical site analysis. This is often accompanied by a written narrative that further explains the existing conditions on the site.

STEP TWO: DELINEATION OF PRESERVATION AREAS

After determining the existing conditions on a site, the next step is to determine which areas should be preserved, as shown in Figure J-4. Areas of first and second priority for preservation should be identified.

Areas of first priority will include two types of areas: those protected through State and Federal regulations, such as floodplains, wetlands, and shorelands, and those connecting to larger municipal, county, or regional park and greenway systems, such as primary environmental corridors. The more open space areas are connected, the more valuable they become. The concept of connectedness is very important when trying to preserve meaningful open space. Fragmented open space areas lead to disrupted wildlife migration paths, nonfunctional wildlife corridors,

CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN: STEP 1

INVENTORY AND ANALYSIS OF LANDSCAPE CHARACTER



A site analysis for the purpose of conservation subdivision design would supplement and precede the engineering information normally required for a conventional subdivision. When the approval process moves to the preliminary plat stage, the conservation subdivision layout would then be adjusted to accommodate engineering considerations.

Source: SEWRPC.

inefficient farming operations, and piecemeal trail systems. Areas of disconnected open space preserved on a variety of development parcels, while valuable to some degree, cannot have the same impact on preservation of landscape character as continuous open space does. When areas of open space in conservation subdivision developments on adjacent parcels abut each other, the impact on landscape character is greater than if they are separated by visible development.

The goal of connectedness in open space should always be kept in mind, not only in terms of the importance of connecting onsite open space with offsite open space, but also in terms of connecting all onsite open space as much as possible. While the opportunity to connect areas of onsite open space with adjacent offsite areas is not always available, areas of open space within the site can and should be connected. In this way, it may even be





PRESERVED AREAS PLAN

Source: SEWRPC.

possible to restore key gaps between presettlement vegetation relicts, which were separated by agricultural operations. Zoning ordinance regulations should require that acceptable open space parcels be of a specified minimum size and that areas of open space be connected as much as is practicable.

After designating first priority areas for preservation, regulated environmentally constrained areas, and areas that provide connections to offsite open space, areas of second priority are added. These would include other developable areas with natural features that have been identified as contributing to the particular rural landscape character of the site, as seen from adjacent roads and other public ways, as well as from within the site. Some judgments may have to be made at this stage as to the desirability of preserving certain areas of marginal value. For example, a hedgerow with weak-wooded or diseased trees may not be desirable for preservation, while retaining open areas to eventually be landscaped to screen new homes is desirable.

Not all the open space will be environmentally constrained land, nor should it be. On parcels that have a great deal of environmentally constrained land, not all of it may be accepted as meeting the open space requirement of the zoning ordinance. In part, this is because development may be precluded anyway, such as in floodways; and, in part, the fact that such open space may not be considered publicly usable, such as with certain wetlands. On parcels with few constraints, much of the open space will be in well-drained upland areas that would be considered buildable. Decisions would have to be made as to which portions of these areas should be used for lots and which should be saved for open space. These decisions should be based on the overriding objective of preserving rural landscape character.

Areas of first and second priority for preservation should be identified and preservation areas should be connected.

CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN: STEP 3



STREET AND LOT LAYOUT

Source: SEWRPC.

In the process of determining the preservation areas, the areas available for buildings, streets and lots are, by default, also identified. These are the "left over" areas. This process is the opposite of that often used in the design of a conventional subdivision, where the leftover areas are the areas considered unsuitable for building. Often the areas with the most attractive natural amenities in a conventional subdivision are set aside first to be included in a few prime lots that can be sold at a premium price. By contrast, all of the lots within a conservation subdivision may become more valuable, leveraged upward by the presence of open space amenities.

STEP THREE: CONCEPTUAL DELINEATION OF STREET AND LOT LAYOUT (SKETCH PLAN)

When preservation areas are set aside, their outlines give shape to the building areas. On many development parcels, the areas available for building will be larger than the area needed to accommodate the permitted number of lots. Thus, the third step in the conservation subdivision design process is to determine more specifically the preferred locations of building lots and how best to provide access to them with streets (see Figure J-5).

After areas for preservation are identified, specific locations for building lots and streets are determined.

The street and lot layout at this stage in the design process is conceptual only. Because of the large variety of street layouts that are possible through the flexibility permitted by conservation subdivision regulations, agreement on the general acceptability of a plan should be reached before the plan is more precisely detailed. While general municipal engineering principles should be followed, no detailed site engineering is done at this stage, although all zoning and subdivision regulations should be consulted to determine achievability of the proposed development concepts. It is beneficial for both the developer and the municipality to reach a consensus on a conceptual sketch plan before the developer incurs the costs of preliminary engineering. During review of the sketch plan, design changes can be made at little cost to the developer, lesser review time by the municipality, and with frustrations minimized. Thus, before the preparation of a preliminary plat is initiated, both the developer and the municipality should have agreed upon a conceptual layout.

The result of this process will be that streets and houses blend into the landscape in a natural way that protects the character of the site as seen within the site and from adjacent streets. This is again the opposite of houses being forced onto the landscape in a form determined by rigid lot sizes and the configuration of parcel boundaries, as is often the case in conventional subdivision design and development.

EXAMPLES OF CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGNS

Hypothetical examples of conservation subdivision designs, contrasted with conventional designs for the same site, are presented in Figure J-6. Additional examples of conservation subdivision designs, along with means for implementing the conservation subdivision design concept, are presented in SEWRPC Planning Guide No. 7, *Rural Cluster Development*, December 1996 (see www.sewrpc.org/ca/conservationsubdivision for more information).



Through a reduction in lot size, open space can be created without losing density.

B-1. CONVENTIONAL SUBDIVISION DESIGN



B-2. CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN



Conservation subdivision development can help preserve farming activities.

Figure J-6 (continued)



C-2. CONSERVATION SUBDIVISION DESIGN



Conservation subdivisions can preserve environmental features and views.

Source: SEWRPC.