### GRANT COUNTY CONSERVATION, SANITATION, & ZONING COMMITTEE MEETING

May 3, 2016 9:00 a.m. Grant County Board Room (#264) Lancaster, Wisconsin

The Grant County Conservation, Sanitation & Zoning Committee meeting was called to order on May 3, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. by John Patcle, Vice Chairman, of the County Board Supervisors in the Grant County Board Room #264, 111 S. Jefferson St., Lancaster.

Board members present: John Patcle, Mark Stead, Lester Jantzen, Dwight Nelson, Gary Northouse, Roger Guthrie, Grant Loy, and Dale Hood. Others present: Lynda Schweikert, Annette Lolwing, Kevin Lange, Joe Schmelz, Cody Nelson, Jacob Huck, and Jerry Newswanger.

#### **Certification of Open Meeting Law**

Annette Lolwing sent the agenda to Karla Schwantes and Linda Gebhard to post in the Administration Building and at the Courthouse, also sent an agenda to Bob Middendorf, WGLR, and was posted in the front of the Ag Service Center Building. Media notices were sent to Karla Schwantes, Linda Gebhard, Herald Independent, Tri County Press, Platteville Journal, and the Muscoda Progressive.

#### **Election of Officers**

John Patcle opened nominations for the Chairman position of the CSZC. Mark Stead nominated Dwight Nelson. Gary Northouse nominated Mark Stead, Mark declined his nomination. Dale Hood nominated Lester Jantzen. A raise of hands was taken for the Chairman position, 4 in favor for Dwight Nelson, 3 in favor for Lester Jantzen. Dwight Nelson will be the new Chairman of the CSZC. Motion carried.

John Patcle opened nominations for the Vice Chairman position. Dwight Nelson nominated Mark Stead. Roger Guthrie moved to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot for Mark. Voice vote was taken, all in favor that Mark Stead will be the Vice Chairman of the CSZC. Motion carried.

John Patcle opened nominations for the Secretary position of the CSZC. Roger Guthrie nominated Lester Jantzen. Dale Hood moved to close nominations and to cast a unanimous ballot for Lester. Voice vote was taken, all in favor that Lester Jantzen, will be the Secretary of CSZC. Motion carried.

John Patcle stepped aside to allow Dwight Nelson take over as the Chairman of the CSZC meeting.

#### **Approval of Agenda**

Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Grant Loy to approve the Agenda as written. Motion carried.

#### **Approval of the Minutes**

Motion by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Lester Jantzen to approve the April 5, 2016 Minutes. Motion carried.

#### **Approval of the Bills**

Motion by Lester Jantzen, seconded by Grant Loy to approve the bills. Motion carried.

**Public Comment** – None

#### Public Hearing for Comprehensive Plan Change

Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing:

#16-11 Jerry Newswanger is requesting a Comprehensive Plan Change  $\pm$  2 ac. of 014-00807-0020, from FP to C1, and  $\pm$  3.73 ac. of 014-00807-0020 from FP to A2 Zoning to allow use on the commercial part of the parcel to allow a wood/bicycle sales and repair shop and residence. Has a permit from the State Highway Dept. for one driveway.

In Favor: Ellenboro Twp. approved on April 6, 2016.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: Jerry Newswanger

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing

Motion by Roger Guthrie, to recommend approval to the County Board, seconded by Lester Jantzen. Motion

carried.

#### **Public Hearing for Rezones**

Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing:

#16-11 Jerry Newswanger is requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 014-00807-0020 of  $\pm 2$  ac. from FP to C1 and  $\pm 3.73$  ac. of PIN: 014-00807-0020 to allow a wood/bicycle sales and repair shop and a residence. Has a permit from the State Highway Dept. for one driveway.

In Favor: Ellenboro Twp. approved on April 6, 2016.

In Opposition: None

In Interest: Jerry Newswanger

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Roger Guthrie that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Lester Jantzen.

Motion carried. (See Attachment A Worksheet)

#### Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing:

#16-10 Kevin & Jean Wehrspann are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 014-00782-0020 from FP to A2 of 2.532 ac. to allow an addition to existing non-farm residence.

In Favor: Ellenboro Twp. approved on April 6, 2016. Is consistent with their comp plan.

In Opposition: None In Interest: None

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Mark Stead that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Gary Northouse.

Motion carried. (See Attachment B Worksheet)

#### Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing:

#16-12 Banfield Investments LLC are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 052-00284-0000 from FP to A2 of  $\pm$  2 ac. to allow a non-farm residence.

In Favor: Potosi Twp. approved on April 4, 2016. Is consistent with their comp plan.

In Opposition: None In Interest: None

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Lester Jantzen that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Dale Hood.

Motion carried. (See Attachment C Worksheet)

#### Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing:

#16-13 Bollant Farm Partnership are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 062-00475-0000 from FP to A2 of  $\pm$  3.5 ac. to allow a non-farm residence.

In Favor: Wingville Twp. approved on April 19, 2016. Is consistent with their comp plan.

In Opposition: None In Interest: None

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Mark Stead that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Grant Loy. Motion carried. (See Attachment D Worksheet)

Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing.

#16-14 Jacob & Megan Huck are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 046-00229-0020 from FP to A2  $\pm$  2.5 ac. to construct a new non-farm residence.

In Favor: Jacob Huck and Paris Twp. approved on April 18, 2016. Is consistent with their comp plan.

In Opposition: None In Interest: None

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Lester Jantzen that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Roger Guthrie. Motion carried. (See Attachment E Worksheet)

Chairman Nelson opened the Public Hearing.

#16-15 Cody & Tamra Nelson are requesting to change the zoning classification on PIN: 024-00618-0000 from FP to A2 2.2 ac. to allow a non-farm residence.

In Favor: Cody Nelson and Hickory Grove Twp. approved on April 14, 2016. Is consistent with their comp.

In Opposition: None In Interest: None

Dwight Nelson closed the Public Hearing.

Motion by Grant Loy that the items are concurrent with all the conditions on the Farmland Preservation worksheet and to recommend approval of the rezone to the full County Board, seconded by Gary Northouse. Motion carried. (See Attachment F Worksheet)

#### **Zoning and Sanitation Report**

Lynda presented the Zoning and Sanitation report. Summarizing the months of January 1, 2015 – May 1, 2015, compared to January 1, 2016 – May 1, 2016. We are \$3,588.15 ahead of 2015. Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Roger Guthrie to accept the sanitation and zoning report. Motion carried.

#### **Appoint SAA Representative and Alternate**

Dwight Nelson opened nominations to appoint a SAA Representative. Mark Stead nominated Dale Hood. Lester Jantzen closed the nomination and to cast a unanimous ballot for Dale. Voice vote was unanimous for Dale Hood to be the SAA Representative. Motion carried.

Dwight Nelson opened nominations to appoint a SAA Alternate. Roger Guthrie nominated Lester Jantzen. Mark Stead closed the nomination and to cast a unanimous ballot for Lester. Voice vote was unanimous for Lester Jantzen to be the SAA Alternate. Motion carried.

#### **Appoint RC&D Representative and Alternate**

Dwight Nelson opened nominations to appoint a RC&D Representative. Lester Jantzen nominated Dale Hood. Mark Stead closed the nomination and to cast a unanimous ballot for Dale. Voice vote was unanimous for Dale to be the RC&D Representative. Motion carried.

Dwight Nelson opened nominations to appoint a RC&D Alternate. Mark Stead nominated Lester Jantzen. Roger closed the nomination and to cast a unanimous ballot for Lester. Voice vote was unanimous for Lester Jantzen to be the RC&D Alternate. Motion carried.

#### **Discussion and Possible Action on Changing Designated Meeting Day**

Lynda had a request from Dale Hood to see if it was possible to change the designated meeting day because he has a conflict with the Land & Water Conservation Board meeting date being on the same day as the CSZC meeting day. The LWCB meets every other first Tuesday of the Month. Lynda handed out a chart referencing the days that the committees meet on. The BOA meetings were scheduled to meet the first Thursday of the month. Gary Northouse made a motion to not change the CSZC designated meeting day. Seconded by Roger Guthrie. Motion carried.

#### **Storage Permit Approval**

Lynda reported that Richard Junk, East Cassville Twp., has a concrete storage facility under an old hog facility that he would like to abandon. He has already paid his permit fee of \$50.00. He has received an abandonment plan from our office. Motion by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Lester Jantzen to approve the abandonment permit for Richard. Motion carried.

#### **County Cost Sharing**

Lynda presented final approval request for county cost sharing on 3 well decommissionings for Kathy Edwards, West Beetown Twp. Well #1: Field Well, \$404.06; Well #2: House Well, \$242.64; Well#3: Farm Well, \$266.91. Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Gary Northouse to approve all 3 payments. Roll Call: 7 Yes, 0 No, 0 Absent. Motion carried.

Lynda presented tentative approval request for county cost sharing on a manure storage facility for Sam Schneider, Smelser Twp., \$5,000.00. Motion by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Dale Hood to approve Sam's request. Motion carried.

Lynda presented tentative approval request for county cost sharing on a manure storage facility for Nobland Farms LLP, Dennis and Troy, Ellenboro Twp., \$5,000.00. Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Gary Northouse to approve Nobland's request. Motion carried.

Lynda presented tentative approval request for county cost sharing on a manure storage closure for Richard Junk, East Cassville Twp., \$3,750.00. Motion by Grant Loy, seconded by Dale Hood to approve Richard's request. Motion carried.

#### **SWRM Cost Sharing**

2015 DATCP Cost Sharing – None to Report

#### 2016 DATCP Cost Sharing

Lynda presented tentative approval request for 2016 DATCP cost sharing on a grade stabilization structure for Dan Reynolds, North Potosi Twp., \$7,000.00. Motion by Lester Jantzen, seconded by Roger Guthrie to approve Dan's request. Motion carried.

Lynda presented tentative approval request for 2016 DATCP cost sharing on a streambank protection project for Larry Haines, Ellenboro Twp., \$7,000.00. Motion by Lester Jantzen, seconded by Dale Hood to approve Larry's request. Motion carried.

Lynda presented tentative approval request for 2016 DATCP cost sharing on a streambank protection project for Chris Neises, Patch Grove Twp., \$9,298.00. Motion by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Mark Stead to approve Chris's request. Motion carried.

#### **CSZD Administrator Report**

Lynda reported that the (Southern Area Association) SAA Spring meeting will be held on May 4<sup>th</sup>, at the Fitchburg library. Spring elections will be taking place. Let Lynda know who plans to attend the meeting.

Lynda reported that the SAA Tour will be held on Wednesday, June 22<sup>nd</sup> in Iowa County. Need to know who plans to attend. It is Grant County's turn to host the tour in 2017.

Lynda reported that Bob Keeney wanted her to go over the updated County Board mileage policy. She handed out the policy and read it to the committee. She stated that the Conservation, Sanitation, and Zoning van is available for meetings. Must call Lynda prior to see if the van is available to use. If the van is not available, you can then receive mileage for using your own vehicle.

Lynda reported that Nancy Scott had invited Enterprise Fleet Management to come talk to the departments that have fleet vehicles, excluding the Sheriff's Department vehicles. Looking to see if contracting to lease fleet vehicles would be a cost effective item for the county. Asked them to work up a bid to see what it would cost to replace/lease our vehicles through their organization. May have more information to report at the June meeting. Erik's 2002 Ford F150 will need to be replaced this year.

Lynda reported that the Annual Report is done and will be out for distribution in the area papers.

Lynda reported last month that there was a BOA scheduled for May 12. The Scott and Debra Kraemer appeal is for the rejection of a zoning permit, the house is in the town road right of way. The appeal is in negotiations with their insurance company. BOA may be cancelled for May 12<sup>th</sup>.

### **FPP Report:** Kevin Lange

Kevin reported that he has 2 Notices of Noncompliance for Barbara Stofflet, Hickory Grove Twp. and Roger Budden, Jamestown Twp. Barbara and Roger have each signed the voluntary waiver of rights as they no longer want to participate in FPP. Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Lester Jantzen to approve the Notice of Noncompliance for Barbara Stofflet and Roger Budden. Motion carried.

Kevin reported that he also has a cancellation of a Notice of Noncompliance for FPP for Charlotte Jinkins Irrevocable Trust, Clifton Twp. Motion by Mark Stead, seconded by Lester Jantzen to approve the cancellation of Notice of Noncompliance for Jinkins Irrevocable Trust. Motion carried.

Kevin reported that we had the tree sale a couple of weeks ago. Sold approximately 13,275 trees to approximately 150 customers. We had purchased 8,000 trees, softwoods and conifers, from Laura's Lane Nursery out of Plainfield WI, and 5,275 hardwood trees and shrubs from Schumacher's.

Kevin reported on the prices of the church litanies and the school conservation activity booklets. In the past we have purchased these items from NACD. In 2015 we were able to purchase the litanies for .085¢ per Litany, and .50¢ per conservation activity booklet. In the past we have ordered our copies right from the NACD's web-site. This year we received notice that they went paperless. Received an estimate from Grantland Graphics for 12.5¢ per litany and .88¢ per conservation activity booklet which this is what we chose to go with for 2016. Checked into the cost if we went through NACD printing service and it would cost .56¢ per litany and \$1.09 per conservation activity booklets. NACD was very costly.

Kevin and Annette delivered 1325 litanies to 10 churches, compared to 1400 litanies to 11 churches in 2015.

Kevin and Annette delivered 598 conservation activity booklets to 10 schools in 2015 and 2016. Delivered 12 Red Oak Trees to 12 schools for Arbor Day.

Kevin has been working on CREP when he receives the information from the Farm Service Agency.

#### **NRCS Report:** Joe Schmelz

❖ Joe reported that they are finishing up with EQIP contracts that were selected. They had 30 - 32 people that were accepted. Ended up with 25 contracts to date, expending \$443,000 in cost sharing.

- ❖ Joe reported that there will be another EQIP application deadline of June 10<sup>th</sup>. This is specifically for cover crops and the Monarch initiative. The Trout Unlimited Initiative funds may be pulled back to the September 2nd deadline, for FY 2017 general funds.
- ❖ A very busy CSP sign up. We have 38 new applications, the second highest in the state. Very lengthy process when they come in and go through the Conservation Measurement Tool. NRCS is 2/3 of the way through that process of the sign up.
- ❖ CRP is still a busy workload and will continue to be a busy workload. Between the CREP and HELI we have done around 135 to 140 contracts for over 5,600 acres, not quite half done,
- ❖ Joe reported that they have 48 Annual Compliance Reviews that were a combination of randomly selected by Washington, and FSA's Farm Loan participants and 2 from complaints.
- ❖ Joe mentioned Trout Unlimited is hosting a tour in Grant County this year in the area North of Highland, and Castle Rock area. Probably in late September sometime.
- ❖ Kevin mentioned the issues with the CREP easements. Learned at a meeting that CREP contracts with easements and CREP contracts that were planted to trees that were enrolled in to the MFL (Managed Forest Law) were also not eligible to be re-enrolled back into CREP program.

#### **FSA Report:** Tammy Eibey

Tammy turned in a report for Dwight to present to the committee. See Attached Report.

### RC&D/WLWCA/LWCB Report: Dale Hood

RC&D have developed several rotational grazing programs in SW WI. RC&D is also looking for small parcels of land to plant Milk Weed for the Monarch Butterflies.

The WLWCA executive committee done very well financially, they raised the base dues from \$12 to \$25.00.

Motion by Roger Guthrie, seconded by Lester Jantzen to adjourn until June 7, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted by Annette Lolwing for Lester Jantzen

# (Attachment A Worksheet) Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

| i | Date: 5/3/16 Landowner: Jerry Newswanger   |
|---|--|
| 2 | The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:   |
|   | 1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.   |
|   | Yes or No Explain: only regarding a small portion of the property along the road to Comercial the portion of the property of internationing in agriculture.  2. The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant county Board which is in effect at the time of the rezoning.  |
|   | Yes or No or N/A   |
|   | Explain: Ellenboro to unship approved whomany the Comp plan to allow the regions of the Polar  3. The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.  5.1: Non-farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development. (Yes)  No |
|   | 5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas <b>Yes No</b>  |
|   | 5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels.  No  |
|   | 5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. Yes No  |
|   | Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. Yes  |
| 6 | The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.  |
|   | 6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district 6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement 6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement 6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development  |
|   | Yes or No  |
|   | Explain:   |
| 7 | The CSZ recommends/does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors (Circle one)   |

## (Attachment B Worksheet) Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

| Date: 5 3 110               | Landowner: <u>Kel</u>   | lin & Jea                              | n Wehrs                                   | pann   |                 |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|-----------------|
|                             | rd may not rezone land of the Committee finds all of the  |  | _   |  |                 |
| 1. The rezon                | ed land is better suited f  | or a use not allow                     | ed in the farmland                        | preservation zoning                          | district.       |
| Yes                         | or  | No Explain:                            | Not prin                                  | re faingro                                   | ind             |
| <ol><li>The rezon</li></ol> | eady of shing is consistent with any he time of the rezoning.   | ina resi                               | dence                                     | •  |                 |
|                             | <b>Yes</b> or   | No                                     | or  | N/A  | 1. 1.           |
| Explair                     | n: approved   | by Elle                                | aboro toi                                 | enboard                                      | . 4/6/16        |
|                             | ing is substantially consis<br>Non- farm developmer<br>soils, consistent with th                      | stent with the Gra                     | nt County farmland<br>to non-agricultural | preservation plan p<br>soils or less product | olicy.          |
| 5.2                         | Non-farm developmen<br>established farm opera   |  |   |  |                 |
| 5.3                         | Non-farm developmen farmland in farmable s  |  | ged to locate so as t                     |  | amount of       |
| 5.4                         | Non-farm residential d districts. <b>Yes</b>  | evelopment will b<br><b>No</b>         | e directed to existing                    | ng platted subdivisio                        | ns and sanitary |
| 5.5                         | Agriculturally-related dother policies set forth benefit to agriculture.                              | in this section, co                    | _   |  |                 |
| 6 The rezoning will n       | ot substantially impair o   | r limit current or                     | future agricultural ι                     | use of other protecto                        | ed farmland.    |
|                             | 6.4 Located in a Farmla<br>6.5 Covered by a Farm<br>6.6 Covered by an agri<br>6.7 Otherwise legally p | land Preservation<br>cultural conserva | Agreement cion easement                   | opment                                       |                 |
| Yes                         | s or No   |  | 1   |  |                 |
| Explain                     |   |  |   |  |                 |
| 7 The CSZC ecomme           | ends/does not recomme<br>(Circle one)   | <b>nd</b> approval to th               | e Grant County Boa                        | ard of Supervisors                           |                 |

# (Atlachment C Worksheet) Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

| D  | ate: <u>5</u> | 3/16                             | Land                      | owner:_                 | Ban                    | fiel              | d Inv  | est            | ment           | 5 L       | <u> </u> |         |             | _               |
|----|---------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|--|----------------|----------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| Zo |               | County Bo<br>d Sanitation<br>ng: |                           |                         |                        |                   |  |                |                |           |          |         |             |                 |
|    | 1.            | The rezor                        | ned land is               | better s                | uited fo               | r a use           | not allowe   | d in t         | the farmla     | nd pres   | ervatior | n zonin | g district. |                 |
|    |               | Yes                              |                           | or                      |                        | No                | Explain:   | C              | ompl           | etel      | 4 4      | ) o o   | ded S       | ite             |
|    | 2.            | The rezor<br>effect at t         | ning is con<br>the time o |                         |                        | compre            | ehensive p   | lan, a         | dopted b       | y the Gr  | ant Cou  | nty Bo  | ard which i | s in            |
|    |               |                                  | Yes                       |                         | or                     |                   | No   |                | or             |           | N/A      |         |             |                 |
|    |               | Explai                           | in: Oep                   | pro                     | rd                     | by                | Poto   | 3i             | tou            | سله       | ard      | •       | 4/4/1       | ę               |
|    | 3.            | The rezon                        | Non- fa                   | rm deve                 | lopment                | will be           | h the Gran<br>e directed to<br>s of the de               | o no           | n-agricult     | ural soil |          |         |             | ultural         |
|    |               | 5.2                              |                           |                         |                        |                   | directed to  |                |                |           |          |         | _           | of<br><b>No</b> |
|    |               | 5.3                              |                           | m develo<br>d in farm   |                        |                   | encourage<br>els. (Y                                     | ed to          | locate so      | as to lea | ave a ma | aximur  | n amount (  | of              |
|    |               | 5.4                              | Non-far<br>districts      |                         | ntial de<br><b>Yes</b> | velopm            | nent will be   | dire           | cted to ex     | isting p  | atted s  | ubdivis | ions and s  | anitary         |
|    |               | 5.5                              | other po                  |                         | t forth i              | n this s          | nent, while<br>ection, cor<br>N                          |                |                |           |          |         |             |                 |
| 6  | The rezo      | oning will r                     | ot substa                 | ntially in              | pair or                | limit cı          | ırrent or fu   | ıture          | agricultu      | ral use o | f other  | protec  | ted farmla  | nd.             |
|    |               | (                                | 6.5 Cov<br>6.6 Cov        | ered by a               | Farmla<br>an agrici    | nd Pre<br>ultural | ervation zo<br>servation A<br>conservation<br>d from non | Agree<br>on ea | ment<br>sement | velopm    | ent      |         |             |                 |
|    |               | Yé                               | Š                         | or I                    | No                     |                   |  |                | . •            | Ť         |          |         |             |                 |
|    |               | Explair                          | ):                        |                         |                        |                   |  |                |                |           |          |         |             |                 |
| 7  | The CSZO      | recomme                          | ,                         | not rec<br>(Circle one) | ommen                  | <b>d</b> appro    | oval to the  | Gran           | it County      |           | •        |         | ale         |                 |
|    |               |                                  |                           |                         |                        |                   |  |                |                | . (       | heste    | (   10  | W           |                 |

## 

Date: 5/3/16 Landowner: Bollant Farm Partnership

|             | anitation   |                                 | ezone land out of the formal state of the state |  |                                | _                                    |                |                      |
|-------------|-------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 1. 7        | he rezon    | ed land is be                   | tter suited for a   | use not allowe                         | d in the farmlar               | nd preservation                      | zoning distri  | ct.                  |
|             | Yes         | or                              | N   | o Explain:                             | Existing in pla                | g buil                               | olingo         | alread               |
|             |             | ing is consist<br>ne time of th | ent with any co   |  |                                |                                      |                |                      |
|             | (           | Yes                             | or  | No.                                    | or                             | N/A                                  |                |                      |
|             | Explair     | : app                           | roved b   | y Wingo                                | , lle tour                     | board                                | 4/19/          | 14                   |
| 3. T        |             | ng is substar<br>Non- farm      | ntially consisten<br>development w<br>stent with the n  | t with the Grant<br>ill be directed to | County farmla<br>non-agricultu | nd preservation<br>ral soils or less | n plan policy. |                      |
|             | 5.2         |                                 | development wi<br>I farm operation  |  |                                |                                      |                | tion of<br><b>No</b> |
|             | 5.3         |                                 | development wi<br>n farmable size p   |  | ~                              | s to leave a ma<br><b>No</b>         | iximum amou    | unt of               |
|             | 5.4         | Non-farm r<br>districts.        | esidential devel<br><b>Yes</b>  | opment will be                         | directed to exis               | sting platted su                     | ıbdivisions an | nd sanitary          |
|             | 5.5         | other polici                    | lly-related deve<br>ies set forth in t<br>agriculture. <b>Ye</b>  | his section, con                       |                                |                                      |                |                      |
| 6 The rezon | ing will no | ot substantia                   | ally impair or lim  | nit current or fu                      | ture agricultura               | l use of other                       | protected far  | mland.               |
|             |             | 6.5 Covered                     | d in a Farmland<br>d by a Farmland<br>d by an agricult<br>rise legally prote  | Preservation A<br>ural conservation    | greement<br>on easement        | elopment                             |                |                      |
|             | Yes         | or                              | No  | •                                      |                                | Ì                                    |                |                      |
|             | Explain:    | ;                               |   |  |                                |                                      |                |                      |
| 7 The CSZC  | ecomme      |                                 | ot recommend a<br>le one)   | pproval to the                         |                                |                                      |                |                      |
|             |             |                                 |   |  | . C                            | Mark/Gr                              | w w            |                      |

### 

| Date: <u>5/3</u> | 110         | Landown                            | er: <u>Jaco</u>                  | b + Me   | egan H                             | UCK  |                     |      |
|------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---------------------|------|
|                  | Sanitation  |                                    |                                  | -  |                                    | ing district unless i<br>hearing, as part o  |                     | d of |
| 1.               | The rezor   | ned land is bet                    | ter suited for a                 | use not allowe   | d in the farmla                    | nd preservation zo   | ning district.      | /    |
|                  | Yes         | ) or                               | N                                | o Explain:   | Rocation                           | ig how   | e clase             | to   |
| 2.               | The rezon   | ling is consiste<br>he time of the | nt with any co<br>rezoning.      | USAING<br>mprehensive pl   | Also id<br>an, adopted by          | ng how<br>lonce<br>the Grant County  | Board which is in   |      |
|                  |             | Yes                                | or                               | No   | or                                 | N/A  |                     |      |
|                  | Explai      | n: appr                            | oved by                          | Paris  | Tup 4                              | 118/14   |                     |      |
| 3. 1             |             | ing is substant<br>Non- farm d     | ially consisten<br>evelopment w  | t with the Gran  | t County farmla<br>o non-agriculty | and preservation programs of less progra | oductive agricultur | al   |
|                  | 5.2         |                                    | •                                |  |                                    | t will cause minimo<br>Ily sensitive areas.  |                     |      |
|                  | 5.3         |                                    | evelopment wi<br>farmable size į | 7  | ^                                  | as to leave a maxin<br><b>No</b>   | num amount of       |      |
|                  | 5.4         | Non-farm red                       | sidential deve<br><b>Yes</b>     | lopment will be<br><b>No</b>   | directed to exi                    | sting platted subd   | ivisions and sanita | ary  |
|                  | 5.5         | other policie                      | •                                | his section, con   | -                                  | ed in rural areas, wing located where  |                     |      |
| 6 The rezor      | ning will n | ot substantial                     | ly impair or lin                 | nit current or fu  | ture agricultura                   | al use of other pro  | tected farmland.    |      |
|                  |             | 6.5 Covered<br>6.6 Covered         | by a Farmland<br>by an agricult  | preservation zo<br>Preservation A<br>ural conservation<br>ected from non | on easement                        | velopment  |                     |      |
|                  | Ye          | s or                               | No                               |  |                                    | Ì  |                     |      |
|                  | Explain     | ı <b>:</b>                         |                                  |  |                                    |  |                     |      |
| 7 The CSZC       | recomme     | ends does not                      |                                  | approval to the  | Grant County E                     | Board of Superviso   | ors                 |      |
|                  | Le          | ster/ Roc                          | pr                               |  |                                    |  |                     |      |

### (A Hachment F Worksheet) Review of Standards for Rezoning Land out of Farmland Preservation

| Date: 5/3/16 Landowner: Cody + Tamra Nelson  |
|--|
| The Grant County Board may not rezone land out of a farmland preservation zoning district unless the Grant County Zoning and Sanitation Committee finds all of the following in writing, after public hearing, as part of the official record of the rezoning:                             |
| 1. The rezoned land is better suited for a use not allowed in the farmland preservation zoning district.   |
| (Yes) or No Explain: Not prime farmground  |
| <ol><li>The rezoning is consistent with any comprehensive plan, adopted by the Grant County Board which is in<br/>effect at the time of the rezoning.</li></ol>  |
| (Yes) or No or N/A   |
| Explain: Approved by Hickory Grove 4/14/14   |
| <ul> <li>The rezoning is substantially consistent with the Grant County farmland preservation plan policy.</li> <li>Non- farm development will be directed to non-agricultural soils or less productive agricultural soils, consistent with the needs of the development.</li> </ul> No No |
| 5.2 Non-farm development will be directed to areas where it will cause minimum disruption of established farm operations or damage to environmentally sensitive areas. Yes No  |
| 5.3 Non-farm development will be encouraged to locate so as to leave a maximum amount of farmland in farmable size parcels. Yes No   |
| 5.4 Non-farm residential development will be directed to existing platted subdivisions and sanitary districts. Yes No $\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{A}$  |
| Agriculturally-related development, while not discouraged in rural areas, will still comply with other policies set forth in this section, consistent with being located where it will be a maximum benefit to agriculture. Yes  |
| 6 The rezoning will not substantially impair or limit current or future agricultural use of other protected farmland.  |
| 6.4 Located in a Farmland preservation zoning district 6.5 Covered by a Farmland Preservation Agreement 6.6 Covered by an agricultural conservation easement 6.7 Otherwise legally protected from nonagricultural development  |
| Yes or No  |
| Explain:   |
| 7 The CSZ recommends does not recommend approval to the Grant County Board of Supervisors (Circle one)   |
| Grant Gary   |

Grant County FSA Report May 3, 2016 Submitted by: Tammy Eibey, CED

#### **Dates to Remember**

NAP Application Deadline for 2016 Nursery Crops May 1, 2016

Offices Closed in Observance of Memorial Day May 30, 2016

Last day to obtain a Marketing Assistance Loan on 2015 coarse grain crops May 31, 2016

County Committee Election Nomination Period June 15-August 1, 2016

Offices Closed in Observance of Independence Day July 4, 2016

County Committee Election Open House at all FSA Offices July 13, 2016

Acreage reporting deadline for spring-seeded crops July 15, 2016

ARCPLC Enrollment deadline for 2016 Contracts August 1, 2016

REPEAT EACH MONTH! We have a high interest in the CRP/HELI program here in Grant County. We are trying to get the cropping history information completed and working with the producers to determine what they actually want to enroll and which program will work best for their operation. Some are wanting us to run several scenarios for them with different fields and acres to see what the rental rates may be, this is slowing the process. Some producers are slow to get back in touch with us but the staff is continuing to make progress. I feel they are working well with the conservation staff. We have no idea when we will receive notice from the national office as to what is accepted for the general signup. Maybe sometime this month! (Rumor week of May 1<sup>st</sup>!) We also have a high number of contracts that are expiring in September that need to be worked on to see if they want to reenroll or let expire. NRCS is keeping track of all the ones we need to act on from producers that want certain contract start dates or ones they have completed CPO's. One thing that is also hard to keep up on are producers that are requesting revisions to their mid contract management practice that requires COC approval plus a revision to the CPO by NRCS.

We are also working on our appointments for the ARC/PLC program. Annually producers need to sign the CCC-861 contract for each farm. Deadline is August 1<sup>st</sup> but we want to be 90% done by the time we get busy with crop certifications this spring. Postcards with appointment times were printed and sent out. There are no late filing provisions for this program. As I write this,