Version 3 (6/1)- FLM 3- Basic Outline and Beginning Work

I. Introduction
II. Farmland Preservation History (narrative)
III. Current farmland preservation planning in the region
    a. Differences in jurisdiction types and the roles they play in agricultural preservation
    b. Methodology to determine and catalog existing farmland preservation goals, objectives, policies, and programs
    c. Major Findings: Existing Farmland Preservation goals, objectives, policies, and programs.
        i. Aimed at directly preserving farmland- example, TDR, PDR, direct statements
        ii. Aimed at directing or managing developed uses in a way that will reduce the land demand and pressure on agricultural lands
        iii. Urban Agriculture
        iv. Summary of Findings
    d. Existing proposals
IV. Farming Futures
V. Stakeholder outreach
VI. Goals, objective, policy, and program recommendations
    a. Describe regional stakeholder outreach and results from their input
    b. Regional GOPP
        i. CARPC direct action- efforts that CARPC can enforce under current limitations
        ii. CARPC indirect action- efforts that CARPC can inspire under current limitations
        iii. CARPC desired action- efforts that CARPC would like to carry-out after seeking authority from legislature to do so
    c. Recommendations for local jurisdictions
        i. Town
        ii. City/Village
        iii. Dane Co.
        iv. Collaborative
    d. Collaborative (multi-party) action
    e. Summary
VII. Next steps (this could go under each recommendation instead of own section or both- perhaps there are two types of actions based on this distinction)
        i. Identify needs for data
        ii. Major action steps
VIII. Conclusion
    a. Summary of findings (all three papers) and recommendations

I. Introduction

Wisconsin is one of the most agriculturally productive states in the nation, and Dane County, ranking third among Wisconsin counties in the amount of land dedicated to agricultural production, is a large contributor to this accomplishment. The 2007 Census of Agriculture reports that the total market value of agricultural products sold in Dane County exceeded $470 million— the highest of any county in Wisconsin.[i]

In 2000, according to the University of Wisconsin-Extension and Dane County, agriculture accounted for $3.19 billion in economic activity, or about 11% of the total economic activity in the State.[ii] Included in this total is the employment of 23,739 persons (6.8% of the total 2000 workforce). While this data is outdated, the numbers are still useful and are consistent with the land use analysis, which uses 2000 land use acreage values.

Dane County also has the fastest growing population in the state.[iii] This growth is expected to continue through 2030, adding about 50,000 persons to Dane County every 10 years.[1] If rural, suburban, and urban development needed to accommodate this projected growth is located on agricultural lands, the county's potential for continued excellence in agricultural production and environmental quality would be compromised.

Farmland Loss in Dane County, the first issue paper in this series, found that 37,000 acres of land have been converted to developed uses, much of which used to be agriculture, and 42,500 acres of land will be required if typical development patterns continue. *Farm Land and Farm Operations in Dane County*, the second paper in the series identifies features of farm land and operations across the county and provides specific information on crop types, land evaluation, land and improvement assessment values, and contiguous farm lands to name a few. This information, paired with Wisconsin's potential to be a top agricultural producer with access to good water and soil, illustrates the need to preserve and value in protecting farmland and operations. These two preceding issue papers and can be found at www.capitalarearpc.org/.

Dane County towns, villages, and cities are challenged to accommodate population growth while ensuring a productive and viable agricultural industry and the ecological services, such as ground water infiltration, these lands provide. A variety of creative solutions that address where and how land is developed for future growth will need to be developed and implemented so the county can remain a leader in agricultural production and maintain and improve its environmental assets. To best develop these solutions, an examination of the historic and current farmland preservation planning and implementation is critical.

FLM Issue Paper Series

FLM1: Farmland Loss in Dane County Publish Jan. 2010
Topic: The problem statement assessing the loss of farmland between 1980-2000.

FLM 2: Farmland and Farm Operations in Dane County (peer reviewed draft)
Topic: Land, operation, and operator characteristics that may be useful in developing regional policy.

FLM 3: Farmland Preservation in Practice (first draft)
Topic: Historic and current components of farmland preservation. Explores existing local and regional policy and recommends new approaches to regional farmland preservation that CARPC can implement or promote.

The first sections in this paper address these topics and lead into identifying potential futures of the agricultural sector in section IV. This analysis, combined with results from public participation events in section V and the findings of *Farmland Loss in Dane County* and *Farm Land and Operations in Dane County,* will provide the foundations for recommended goals, policies, and programs found in section VI that could help to ensure a vibrant and successful agricultural community as the region grows in to the future in section .

[1] This estimate is based on Census 2000 numbers. 2008 projection estimates from the WI Department of Administration show an even greater increase in population ranging from 65,000-75,000 persons added to the County per decade.

Farmland Preservation in Dane County provides this information for the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (CARPC) work group on Farmland Loss Mitigation. The workgroup is seeking ways to better fulfill the CARPC charge to develop a Regional Master Plan (pursuant to sec. 66.0309, Wis. Stats.). Additionally, CARPC is to work with local units of government to create, adopt, and implement Future Urban Development Area (FUDA) plans that consider development impact on the region's ability to "efficiently provide services to support development and farmland preservation" as stated in the local resolutions supporting the formation of CARPC. Moreover, the workgroup seeks to develop policies and criteria (Resolution CARPC No. 2008-1) that meet the CARPC goal (Resolution CARPC No. 2008-2) to "protect agricultural lands and non-farm developments in order to maintain the county as one of the nation's most productive agriculture areas" as well as numerous objectives regarding rural form, design, and development.

Analysis findings may reveal issues and opportunities that can inform changes to the existing policies and criteria and any new policies and criteria CARPC may use to protect and preserve the viability of agriculture and evaluate regional development and facilitate and support local efforts.

Key Issues

The series of issue papers proposes 'key issues' in agricultural land preservation and aims to provide as much information about these key issues to inform the policy and practice decision-making process.

This issue paper builds off of the 'key issues' presented in the first two papers in this series- *Farmland Loss in Dane County* and *Farm Land and Operations in Dane County*:

1. Quantity of agricultural land
2. Quality of agricultural land
3. Location
4. Diversity of agricultural land and operations
5. Agricultural sector needs
6. Ecological services and functions

This issue paper augments the discussion with the following 'key issues and opportunities:'

7. Historic farmland preservation planning and practice
8. Current farmland preservation planning and practice
9. Future of farming
10. Future planned development
11. Stakeholder impacts
12. Preserving farmland – recommendations for farmland preservation

Key issues and opportunities seven through eleven are summarized below and analyzed in the following sections in this paper. Understanding these issues will reveal opportunities to improve CARPC, county, and local government abilities to improve and attain their agricultural protection and preservation goals.

Historic farmland preservation planning and practice
Dane County has a strong history of farmland preservation. New policy must build on these efforts, taking into account lessons learned, successful approaches, and give credit for the progress made over the last decades.

Current farmland preservation planning and practice
Numerous efforts are underway that already build on the historic efforts to protect farm land and ensure operation viability. Policy makers can build on these efforts, and the lessons learned, without creating redundancies, identifying effective policies and promoting their expansion, and determining where current

policy may be lagging or hindered. Knowledge of these efforts can ensure that new policy is germane, implementable, effective, and widely supported by stakeholders and the community at large.

Future of farming
Regional planning and management is long-range, 20-50 years, and creates policy to guide us into and through the future. Numerous advancements and shifts in food production could greatly impact the role and viability of agriculture. Farmland preservation policy must also take these potential futures into account to support progress in the field and help farmers maintain viable operations amidst and in transition with potential changes in the agricultural sector.

Future planned development
On this same note, development trends predict continued population growth,[2] and this growth often leads to the conversion of agricultural land uses to non-agriculture developed land uses. Incorporated communities indicate their developed land growth and agricultural and conservation preservation intentions in locally adopted comprehensive plans. Future Land Use maps in these plans inform decision makers future planned development, where conflicts between planned uses exist, where preservation may be most critical, most or least effective, most needed, and can shed light on the potential long-term planning conflicts between neighboring jurisdictions that may arise in farmland preservation efforts.

Stakeholder impacts
The Commission recognizes the roles of numerous actors in preserving the vitality of the agricultural sector. All of these persons, organizations, agencies, and business will have an impact on the success of regional farmland preservation and will be impacted through agricultural preservation policies, programs, and activities. For this reason the farmland loss mitigation workgroup conducted an extensive outreach and involvement effort to learn the best practices and future visions from the greater agricultural community. Stakeholder input weighs heavily in the recommendations in this paper.

Preserving farmland – recommendations for farmland preservation
The results from analyzing these key issues and the conclusions of the key issues presented in the two preceding issue papers are a series of recommendations for preserving farmlands. The recommendations suggest policy and implementation actions that can be taken at the regional and local levels of government to facilitate existing efforts and develop new efforts. Recommendations seek to answer (1) How much land should be preserved, (2) where, and (3) who pays to preserve the land?

These key issues culminate a comprehensive regional review of agricultural land loss, farm land and farm operation characteristics, and past, current, and future agricultural preservation factors that can inform effective region-wide policies and efforts that aim to protect agriculture in Dane County.

II. Historic Farmland Preservation Efforts

a. Methodology: Historic information was gathered through a literature review of Forward! A History of Dane: The Capital County, the 1984 Farmland Preservation Plan, and numerous interviews of individuals who have

Agricultural preservation through land use planning in Dane County has roots in the early suburbanization of towns and its impact on rural living. Discussions in the 1950's on the need to preserve prime farmland prompted the Agricultural Extension Service to publish a land use plan known as The Blueprint for Growth.

In 1968, after the formation of the Dane County Planning Department, the Dane County Regional Planning Commission formed (by County Board Decision). After a series of forums and public meetings, the RPC released the 1973 Land Use Plan. This Plan centered around the need to protect farmland, limit suburban growth, assess tax impacts on farmland as a growth measure, direct development away from prime farmlands, and establish the groundwork for voluntary rural land use controls. The Land Use Plan of 1973 was controversial in urban and rural factions

[2] DOA, Regional Trends projections

and faced a series of amendments and revisions. Still, this plan failed to be adopted by nearly all local governments, despite continued pressure from suburban development.

A 1973 Agricultural and Open Space Land Preservation Report distinguishes between partial/indirect controls and full/direct land use controls. Indirect controls, include tax policies, official mapping, subdivision regulation, zoning and utility regulation while direct controls are land acquisition, land acquisition and sale with covenants and contracts, land acquisition and lease back, and simply leasing public land to users. However, when the towns and the predominantly urban RPC first faced off, the towns clearly indicated that top-down land use control was not in their best interest, nor their desire. Therefore, land use control at the regional level became a balance between urban interests and rural needs. After the Commission rejected the towns' amendments to the first RPC Land Use Plan, towns, aided by new state monies for planning, began developing local land use plans.

Early discussions on farmland preservation revolved around the market for rural land for development. The statewide Farmland Preservation Act (FPA) brought tax relief for farmland owners and offered local control over farmland protection. Dane County has participated in the Wisconsin Farmland Preservation Program under Chapter 91, Wisconsin Statutes, since the program's inception in 1978. Twenty-nine towns adopted exclusive agricultural zoning ordinances, generating approximately $1.2 million in state income tax relief annually for participating farmers.[3] More locally, Transfer of Development Rights, a land preservation tool, was also introduced to the region at this time.

The *Dane County Farmland Preservation Plan*, based on the *Land Use and Transportation Plan* framework and adopted by the Dane County Board of Supervisors in 1981, guided the farmland preservation program administration, including eligibility for state income tax credits and criteria for zoning decisions related to exclusive agricultural zoning. Throughout most of its history, the *Dane County Farmland Preservation Plan and corresponding local town plans* served as the primary guide for rural land use decisions under Dane County Code s. 10.255.

The purpose of the *Dane County Farmland Preservation Plan*, is three-fold: (1) identify and preserve valuable agricultural land; (2) delineate and conserve natural resources; and (3) identify those areas where new urban growth should be directed. The *Farmland Preservation Plan* is divided into three major sections. Part one explains the process by which the plan was to be prepared; part two summarizes the policies and plan elements from a countywide perspective; and part three consists of the 34 town farmland preservation plans originally drafted with the RPC. After town adoption, the plans were adopted by the Regional Planning Commission, reviewed and recommended by the Dane County Agriculture, Environment and Land Records Committee, and finally adopted by the County Board. Once approved at the county level, the county and town plans were sent to the Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection for certification to enable the farmers to receive tax credits made available through the Farmland Preservation Act.

Town plans include descriptions of existing conditions, goals and objectives that outline the desired future of the community, a planned land use map illustrating the pattern of land uses, and policies that the town believes will achieve its overall goals. Changes to town plans approved by the County Board become amendments to the County Farmland Preservation Plan and are used by the County Zoning and Land Regulation Committee as criteria for zoning recommendations.

<u>County Plan Objectives</u>:

[3] Locate reference

- Maintain Dane County's status as one of the nation's most productive agricultural counties; and maintain agriculture as a significant economic activity with the region.
- Preserve agricultural land as a resource for the use and benefit of current and future generations.
- Support the preservation of the family farm as a viable economic unit as well as a desirable way of life.
- Maintain the rural character of the towns of Dane County (excludes the urbanized Town of Madison).
- Maintain open space provided by agricultural land to guide urban development.
- Conserve local and county energy resources.
- Encourage future urban development to be compact, adjacent to existing development, and consistent with town planning policies.

To view the policies of the *Farmland Preservation Plan* and the component town plans please visit www.countyofdance.com/PLANDEV/planning/townComponents.aspx.

In addition to participating in state and county programs to preserve farmland, many towns have maintained a strong farming community through individual actions. Some towns have requirements for exclusive agricultural zoning, such as the York township 1:75 acres build restriction. The Town of Dunn citizens approved a property increase to purchase development rights (PDR) from farmers in 1993. Local jurisdictions are also responsible for setting minimum lot size standards, road access and driveway standards, and more other policy decisions that have a direct impact on agricultural land use. In addition to these regulatory activities, some local jurisdictions have engaged in joint-planning and established shared service and/or boundary agreements aimed at providing adequate services and allowing growth while protecting vital undeveloped resources. Many of the regulatory activities and agreements are still in use today and will be discussed further under current policy and practices.

Urban villages and cities have a direct relationship with the rural expanses across the jurisdictional limits in supporting and providing the infrastructure and workforce to supply, process, store, transport, distribute, and numerous other inputs and processes to complete the farm to plate cycle. In addition, urban jurisdictions host a large consumer population that can purchase and enjoy local foods. In addition, some urban areas host grocery stores, farmers' markets, restaurants, institutions, and community gardens that provide access to locally produced food. Finally, as cities expand their boundaries farmland will inevitably be converted to more intense uses. How a city or village goes about this can have a significant impact on the rate of farmland loss and prevalence of urban agriculture communities, and the political relationship between them and their rural neighbors. Many of the regulatory activities and agreements are in use today and will be discussed further under current policy and practices.

The 1973 Agricultural and Open Space Land Preservation outlined transfer of development rights (TDR) as an approach towns could use, along with official certified mapping, zoning, subdivision regulation and other land use controls. TDR uses market based controls to establish a preservation, or sending, area and a development, or receiving, area and transfers development rights from the sending to development area.
Opinions vary as to the usefulness of TDR and many towns are still considering TDR in their jurisdictions.

Challenged in Court in Cottage Grove.

The 1973 Agricultural and Open Space Land Preservation Report described the jurisdictional and stakeholder networks involved in the land conversion process. For example, federally, the existence of subsidies and programs for farmers incentivizes agricultural production, while the FHA and VA Mortgage insurance programs, and the expansion of infrastructures such as the Federal Highway System, promote the conversion of agricultural lands. Local land use controls like zoning regulations and official mapping work at both the regionally and locally, in a town, village or city.

In addition to public and private concerns, demographic and socio-economic factors further stress the process. As was

Ag and env regulation history?

III. Current Agricultural Land Preservation Policy and Practice

State Farmland Preservation Program

The State Farmland Preservation Program still exist today. This program requires counties to create and adopt a DATCP certified Farmland Preservation Plan (FPP). The plan indicates three main types of land use areas, (1) Agricultural Preservation Areas (2) Urban Transition Areas, and (3) Rural Development Areas, and outline land use and development policies for each area. FPPs indicate exclusive agricultural zoning (A1), and in exchange, farmers with land can receive state income tax credits. This zoning standard includes other criteria addressing soil and water conservation practice, minimum lot sizes, contiguous properties/parcels, transfer of the lands, deed restrictions, and tenure policies.

The *Working Lands Initiative* also includes a statewide grant program to share costs for the Purchase of Ag Conservation Easements (PACE program). In 2010, the legislature allocated $12 million for 50% matching grants to local governments and non-profit organizations to purchase development rights from willing sellers who will restrict the future development on their land in perpetuity.
http://www.wisconsinfarmland.org/budget.php
http://www.wisconsinfarmland.org/documents/AssemblyBill75Excerpts_2_24_09.pdf

The initiative also establishes Agricultural Enterprise Areas for medium-term commitments to preservation. Neighboring farmers enter into long-term contracts to keep their land in agriculture in exchange for additional tax credits and other incentives. Lastly, this program institutes a conversion fee on all lands converted from an agricultural preservation district to any other district of approximately $1,000 an acre.

To continue receiving tax credits through the Farmland Protection Act, Dane County must still maintain a updated and state certified *Farmland Preservation Plan* that designates rural development, agricultural preservation, and transitional areas and maintains consistency with Chapter 91 of the Wisconsin Statutes. The County is currently working to update the Farmland Preservation Plan by 2012. The *Dane County Comprehensive Plan* contains the majority of land use preservation goals related to agricultural lands and these are reflected in the FPP update.

Dane County TDR Ordinance

Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA)

The Farmland Policy Protection Act (7 CFR 658) identifies a point system that can be used to help determine the appropriateness for development of a particular site. The system has historically been used by federal agencies to help assess impacts of federal projects on an area, and it also applicable to assist Towns and Municipalities in evaluating individual developments.

Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program

This federal program keeps productive farmland in privately owned agriculture use by assisting states, tribes, local governments, or nonprofit entities with the purchase of agricultural conservation easements or development rights on productive farmland, and on farms containing significant historical or archeological resources. CRP

Other programs not directly related to agriculture, but which may apply to agricultural lands

Agricultural resource preservation is not the primary purpose of either of these funding sources. Therefore, for any farm to be considered for these funding sources the farm would have to meet very specific conditions and requirements in addition to their agricultural component.

Land and Water Legacy Fund
Farmland identified in this proposal has to be instrumental in protecting an important and previously identified land or water natural resources

Conservation Fund
Farmland identified in this proposal has to be instrumental in protecting or buffering an existing park or other natural resource protection area identified in the Parks and Open Space Plan.

Local Comprehensive and Farmland Preservation Plans

The State of WI instituted the Comprehensive planning law in 2000…..

a. Methodology: Current information was gathered from the county and each local adopted comprehensive plans. Goals, objectives, policies, and programs promoting farmland preservation were tagged, compiled, coded, and analyzed. Goals, objectives, policies, and programs promoting farmland preservation fall under three umbrella categories,
    i. Language identifying intent to prevent development on agricultural lands,
    ii. Language identifying intent to develop land more efficiently to consume less land, and
    iii. Language identifying intent to have urban agriculture. Codes often fits under more than one of the defined "umbrella" categories above and greatly depended on the context of the goal, objective, policy, or program.

For codes that required some interpretation or flexibility in labeling, additional codes were recorded to ensure completeness for this report. Statements included in this section were typically found in the land use, natural, agricultural, and cultural resources, and housing elements in the comprehensive plans and town based farmland preservation plans.

The codes used to catalog existing goals, objectives, policies, and programs:

AP **A**gricultural **P**roduction
FP **F**armland **P**rotection (general)
ED **E**conomic **D**evelopment efforts supporting agriculture, or eff dev
AC **Ac**cess to other programs
IT **I**n**t**ergenerational

GA **G**rowth **A**rea
GB **G**rowth **B**oundary
ET **E**x**t**raterritorial
IG **I**ntergovernmental **A**greement
LC **L**and **C**ap

PL **Pl**anning
NP **N**eighborhood **P**lanning
DG **D**esign **G**uidelines
RC **R**ural **C**haracter

TD **T**ransfer of **D**evelopment Rights (TDR)
PD **P**urchase of **D**evelopment Rights (PDR)
DD **D**iscourage **D**evelopment
CE **C**onservation **E**asements
OP **Op**en Land

CF **C**ommercial, **F**arm-based
CN **C**ommercial, **N**on-farm based
IU **I**ncompatible **U**ses
RF **R**ight to **F**arm
PP **P**olicy **P**rotection for farmers

PH **Ph**asing
MU **M**ixed **U**se
UA **U**rban **A**griculture
DT **D**own**t**own
EF **Ef**ficient Development
UD **U**rban **D**ensity
RD **R**ural **D**ensity
IN **In**fill
RE **Re**development/**Re**hab/**Re**vitalize
BR **Br**ownfields

IF **I**n**f**rastructure
SA **S**ervice **A**reas
CO **Co**ordination of development and infrastructure for facilities or transportation
TR **Tr**ansportation

DR **D**eed **R**estrictions
LS **L**ot **S**izes
DW **D**riveway **P**olicies
EX **Ex**clusive/prohibitive uses
TM **T**enureship **M**inimum

N/A Not Applicable

AC **Ac**cess to other programs
AP **A**gricultural **P**roduction

BR **Br**ownfields

CE **C**onservation **E**asements
CF **C**ommercial, **F**arm-based
CN **C**ommercial, **N**on-farm based
CO **Co**ordination of development and infrastructure for facilities or transportation

DD **D**iscourage **D**evelopment
DG **D**esign **G**uidelines
DR **D**eed **R**estrictions
DT **D**own**t**own
DW **D**riveway **P**olicies

ED **E**conomic **D**evelopment for ag/effic. dev
EF **Ef**ficient Development
ET **E**x**t**raterritorial
EX **Ex**clusive/prohibitive uses

FP **F**armland **P**rotection (general)

GA **G**rowth **A**rea
GB **G**rowth **B**oundary

IF **I**n**f**rastructure
IG **I**ntergovernmental **A**greement
IN **In**fill
IT **I**n**t**ergenerational
IU **I**ncompatible **U**ses

LC **L**and **C**ap
LS **L**ot **S**izes

MU **M**ixed **U**se
NP **N**eighborhood **P**lanning
OP **Op**en Land

PD **P**urchase of **D**evelopment Rights (PDR)
PH **Ph**asing
PL **Pl**anning
PP **P**olicy **P**rotection for farmers

RC **R**ural **C**haracter
RD **R**ural **D**ensity
RE **Re**development/**Re**hab/**Re**vitalize
RF **R**ight to **F**arm

SA **S**ervice **A**reas

TD **T**ransfer of **D**evelopment Rights (TDR)
TM **T**enureship **M**inimum
TR **Tr**ansportation

UA **U**rban **A**griculture
UD **U**rban **D**ensity

More specific information about which types of language was classified under each of these codes is in Appendix A.

Major Findings

Local preservation efforts

Jurisdictions with A1 Exclusive Agricultural Zoning

One dwelling unit/35 acres

Dane County
Albion
Berry
Black Earth
Blooming Grove
Blue Mounds
Christiana
Cottage Grove
Cross Plains
Dane
Deerfield
Dunn
Mazomanie
Medina
Montrose
Oregon
Perry
Pleasant Springs
Primrose
Roxbury
Rutland
Springfield
Sun Prairie (also limit to 10 u/yr)
Vermont
Verona
Westport
Windsor
York

One dwelling unit/40 acres

Dunkirk

One dwelling unit/75 acres

Vienna
York

Jurisdiction without A1 Exclusive agricultural zoning

Springdale (use 1u/17a density)
Burke
Madison
Middleton (use A1, but not exclusive)
Bristol (use A1, but not exclusive)

Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) and PACE

Dunn
Windsor

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Cottage Grove
Pleasant Springs
Dunkirk
Rutland

Land Evaluation Site Assessment (LESA)

Sun Prairie
Roxbury

USDA Prime Farmland Designation

Pleasant Springs

Boundary Agreements- Limiting annexations

T. Dunn/McFarland
T. Middleton/C. Middleton
T. Springfield/C. Middleton
T. Windsor/V. Deforest
T. Bristol/ C. Sun Prairie
T. Middleton/C. Madison

IV. Farming Futures

Information on potential farming futures was obtained through a literature review of ?, ?, ?

Farmland Information Center http://www.farmlandinfo.org/
Michael Fields Agricultural Institute http://www.michaelfields.org/
REAP / Research, Education, Action and Policy on Food Group www.reapfoodgroup.org

A. Future of farming

Wisconsin Working Lands Initiative: Report from the Steering Committee (2006)
The loss of WI farmland to development is an irreversible and accelerating trend. However, this loss is not the inevitable result of economic growth and population increases; it's the way we choose to use our lands that leads to these losses.

- Economic trends in int'l trade, forestry, and agriculture are reducing the profitability of working lands
- WI well-poised to lead the bioeconomy because of its agriculture and forestry infrastructure (e.g. biomass for fuel, electricity, chemicals and products)
- Today's bioeconomy is based on technologies and new industries turning organic matter like feedstocks or biomass into energy, fuel, and products. Processes and tech include:
    - making corn into ethanol,
    - soybeans into biodiesel, and
    - using anaerobic digesters to convert manure into biogas.
- Aging farmers → In 2002, 42% of WI farmers were over 55, need to transition to next gen
- Price of Ag land rising rapidly → converted farmland up to $7,165/ac in 2004 (from about $3,448 in 2000 and $592 in 1974)
- Econ trends:
    - Negative rate of return on assets for small farms; positive for farms w/ sales >$250,000; and about 1% for those between $250k ><$1m
    - # of small farms declining and concentration of farms increasing
    - Int'l competition driving commodity prices down, reducing profitability
    - "impermanence syndrome": farmers stop making long-term investments when they see development inevitable → self fulfilling prophecy?
- WI's continued reputation as a source of diverse, high-quality foods cannot be taken for granted in the future → this depends on citizens/leaders understanding the need for ag preservation

Ag future summary:

- Land use
    - (-) Farmland loss to development is accelerating, and at least likely to continue
    - (-) Price of Ag land rising rapidly
    - (+) Non-Ag development trends – smaller households. Increasing density, market trends toward smaller lots & homes, "smart growth"?
- Economic

    - (-) economic trends currently reducing the profitability of working lands (more info on commodity prices, global competition and market trends)
    - (+) bioeconomy – potential to improve profitability, if promoted (get more info)
    - (+/-) constrained municipal budgets – governments looking to save on infrastructure & environmental remediation costs, also less money to spend on ag preservation (at least near future, longer term unclear)
- Demographic
    - (-) aging farmers and the need to transition sector to new generation
    - (+/-) More single HHs, 20-somethings and empty-nesters in general
- Regulatory
    - Newest Farm Bill and its effects
    - How current state and local regulation might matter to the trends above
        - County Farmland Preservation Plan (in the works)

B. Conflicts with Future Planned Development

Each local jurisdiction indicates, in their adopted comprehensive plan, where development is intended to occur into the future. The future land maps indicate these intentions and can reveal conflicts between jurisdictions and land uses. For the purposes of this paper, only conflicts with agriculture and agricultural preservation will be examined.

A conflict is determined to exist based on the following criteria:
Planned development on agricultural lands designated as an agricultural preservation area in a state, county, or town plan.
Planned development on agricultural lands designated as Class I, II, III for agricultural production
Planned development on agricultural lands containing large investment in agricultural improvements.

Another method to determine such conflicts is to determine how much land currently being used for agriculture is owned by developers and leased out to farmers. This can be determined by examining parcel ownership. If a known developer owns the land, it is likely the land will only remain in agricultural uses until development occurs. Parcel owner data was tagged as farmer owned, developer owned, or other based on the name on the title. As a check, some names were verified in an Internet search before tagged developer owned or other.

V. Outreach
Cultivating Collaboration series for developing solutions

VI. Recommendations

EXISTING PROPOSALS
Exclusive Agricultural Zoning- Small Lot Agricultural District (A-4)
- 5 acre minimum, 35 acre maximum
- The County is working with the state Department of Ag, Trade & Consumer Protection to have the A-4 (and A-1[ex] and possibly the A-B districts) certified as "Farmland Preservation Zoning Ordinances" under the newly revised Chapter 91, Wis. Stats. Target date 12/31/2010.
- Evaluate if the county should increase the WLI "conversion fee" for lands rezoned out of farmland preservation districts to support TDR education and implementation activities.
- FUDA

Regional GOPP
1. CARPC Direct action- efforts that CARPC can enforce under current limitations
    a.
2. CARPC indirect action- efforts that CARPC can inspire and inform under current limitations

a. Determine the best fitting land use categories for agricultural lands for the 2010 Land Use Inventory.
b. Preservation Portal
c. Collect farm operation type and practices data that expands upon the USDA agricultural census.

3. CARPC desired action- efforts that CARPC would like to carry-out after seeking authority from legislature to do so
    a. Submit to the legislature a proposal for increased authority for the RPC that could prevent the development of productive agricultural lands from town, village, and city development. Urban Service Area expansion criteria could be expanded to include farmland preservation or other land use criteria beyond water quality. Towns would have to be included also, as they do not have urban service areas typically.
4. CARPC collaborative action- efforts where CARPC teams up with another government or agency to develop policy or program
    a. Preservation Portal

Recommendations for local jurisdictions

5. Town
6. City/Village
7. Dane Co.
    a. Establish and implement a county-wide tracking system for A-1/A-4 Exclusive Agriculture, CO-1 Conservancy, and RE-1 Recreational zoning changes and land annexation from towns and communicate these changes and data with relevant agencies and governments.
    b. County-wide ArcGIS web-server
        - Emphasize a customer service based approach to current and non current GIS users for the Land Information Office.
        - Establish a user-friendly ArcGIS web server that provides local jurisdictions with the capabilities to create or change geographic data and create maps and reports.
        - Data could/would be connected to the county-wide system where many types of data for towns, cities, and villages could be stored, accessed, and utilized to create and improve land use decisions and zoning changes tracking.
        - Implications and uses for the web-based server can be utilized for agricultural land use tracking, inventory of operation types, as well as provide information to farmers about nearby services and facilities, all of which will help to develop and implement farm land and operation preservation measures.
        - The web-based server could also have far reaching benefits for other aspects of urban and rural operations including emergency services, community facilities, and identifying areas that could be improved with up-to-date access to geographic information.
        - Technology for this type of system is available (DCI Map) and is being integrated into the county IM system (ArcGIS server). ArcGIS Server long-term costs could be minimal as urban and rural communities could assist in financial support. Initial application development, start-up and training costs will be more considerable; however, long-term benefit of improved county-wide decision-making and intergovernmental relations and collaboration is high, while costs are comparatively low (maintenance, monitoring, troubleshooting, and software savings for communities interested in deploying a GIS system.
        - Developing this capacity can overlap and be utilized for the preservation portal application development.
        - Collaborative

1. Zoning for agricultural land as preservation/conservation area. (Risk of this option is potential lack of permanence). (Kefer)

2. Transfer of Development Rights – Work within the framework of the Dane County TDR program or develop a community specific program. Consideration given for town authority when establishing ratio for agricultural preservation acreage to development acreage (aka., splits). (Kefer)

3. Developer directly purchases a conservation easement(s) and transfers title to state, community or land trust. Acreage is equal or close to that which is consumed by development. High priority areas for preservation would be determined by community(ies) affected. (Kefer)

4. Developer (or community based?) acquisition of development rights on agricultural acres with enforcement of the contract residing with the community, state or land trust. (Kefer)

5. Allow for an "equitable" financial, material or other contribution by the developer toward implementation of a non-point source mitigation project on farmland within the watershed where farmland is being lost. This may include contribution toward manure management, tillage equipment or practices, restoration of agricultural wetlands and forests, etc. (idea needs further development.) (Kefer)

6. COMMENT: *The following may not reflect a developer sponsored mitigation effort since Intergovernmental or Boundary agreements are required of communities in the Comprehensive Planning Law. However these agreements may be timely relative to consideration of large development proposals in that they would include long term or permanent protection of agricultural land:*

    a. Communities enter into intergovernmental agreements to, in part, designate long term or permanent preservation of agricultural lands. Such an agreement would draw on decision-makers and residents identifying priority agricultural preservation areas and potential agricultural enterprise areas, future annexation limits, etc. (Kefer)

7. Community develops an assessment of vulnerable agricultural areas where Wisconsin's changing climate is causing highly erosive situations, flooding, safety issues relative to impacts to land and water. Community and developer preselect a problem area relative to size of lost agricultural lands (to development) to either fully remediate or contribute to. (Kefer)

8. For all the above, CARPC might consider a mitigation bank approach which may encompass practice needs at given locations to gradually work toward larger changes in the watershed. (Kefer)

Some agricultural areas may be better suited for reforestation for a greater impact on improving water quality and quantity. Properly targeted, a reforestation project can replace row crops with a tree farm where resources may be sensitive to more intensive agricultural uses.

New groundwater recharge maps can identify high recharge areas that can be maintained for groundwater replenishment in line with the Groundwater Protection Plan (part of the *Dane County Water Quality Plan*) policies concerning surface activities including herbicide and pesticide application. Similarly, targeting stream buffer areas to hay for feed or grass fiber for energy production for production can benefit the farmer and the resource simultaneously. Further, some areas are best removed from agricultural production and restored to historic wetlands to reclaim filtration and floodwater storage. Restoration areas can apply to historic woodlands (in high recharge areas) and prairie grasslands.

Sauk Co. and Jefferson Co. Programs (Slavney)

Targeted Runoff Management Grant Programs

VII. Conclusions

[i] *2007 Census of Agriculture State and County Data, Wisconsin*. USDA Agricultural Census. http://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2007/Online_Highlights/County_Profiles/Wisconsin/cp55025.pdf

[ii] *Dane County Agriculture: Value and economic impact*. University of Wisconsin-Extension, Cooperative Extension, Dane County, Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board, 2004. http://www.uwex.edu/ces/ag/wisag

[iii] *Final Population Projections for Wisconsin Counties by Components of Change: 2000 – 2030*. Department of Administration: Demographic Services. January 2004. http://www.doa.state.wi.us/docview.asp?locid=9&docid=2065