



1
2
3
4 MINUTES, AS AMENDED AND APPROVED

5 ***Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Update Committee***
6

7 **DATE:** Wednesday, November 16, 2011

8 **TIME:** 6:30 p.m.

9 **PLACE:** Brookens Administrative Center
10 John Dimit Conference Room
11 1776 E. Washington St.
12 Urbana, Illinois
13

14 **Voting Members Present:** Kevin Donoho, Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Steve Moser, Steve Stierwalt, Patti
15 Petrie, Bruce Stickers
16

17 **Non-Voting Member Present:** John Hall
18

19 **Members Absent:** Liz Jones
20

21 **Others Present:** Hal Barnhart, Norman Stenzel
22

23 **CCRPC Facilitator:** Susan Monte
24

25
26 Call to Order and Roll Call
27

28 Griest called the meeting to order at 6:41 p.m. Donoho, Griest, Krapf, Moser, Stierwalt, Petrie, Stickers, and
29 Hall were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.
30

31 Approval of Agenda
32

33 **Motion by Krapf to approve the agenda; seconded by Petrie. Motion carried with unanimous support.**
34

35 Public Participation
36

37 Hal Barnhart, 469 CR 1500 N, Champaign, indicated that he had concerns with the draft site assessment
38 factors, and that he already had shared those concerns with Committee members. Barnhart read a general
39 statement which focused on the definition of best prime farmland in the Champaign County Zoning
40 Ordinance and whether a change to the definition of best prime farmland would enhance or diminish the
41 LRMP goal of protecting the long term viability of agriculture and its land resource base. Barnhart submitted
42 his statement for inclusion as part of the minutes.
43

44 Norman Stenzel, 545A CR 1900 N, Champaign, indicated that he is concerned that the proposed update will
45 not serve to adequately preserve farmland in Champaign County. Stenzel described the creep of farmland
46 conversion that occurred in the northern Illinois area where he was raised and other areas. Stenzel stressed
47 that farmland conversion should be limited in areas of the County beyond the CUGA. Stenzel talked about

1 the population increase globally and the lack of land available to feed the increasing population, and the
2 limited perspectives of those who believe there is enough farmland to meet the growing needs of the
3 population. Stenzel submitted written comments for inclusion as part of the minutes.
4

5 Ms. Griest requested that staff send a copy of the written statements to each Committee member.
6

7 Approval of Minutes

8

9 **Motion** by Petrie to approve the minutes of September 7, 2011, October 12, 2011, and November 2, 2011;
10 seconded by Donoho. Petrie said that a number of clarification items indicated in the September 7, 2011
11 minutes have not been provided by Monte. Petrie expressed gratitude for the detailed minutes provided by
12 Monte. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**
13

14 Field Test Results

15

16 Monte reported that she has received 3 sets of results from the Committee field test so far and that a statistical
17 analysis of the replicability of ratings received and to conduct a correlation test of draft factors are forthcoming.
18

19 Revisions to SA Factors and Defined Terms

20

21 Monte distributed handouts containing adjustments proposed as a result of the recent field testing.
22

23 Monte reviewed Handout 1, a proposal to increase the number of Agricultural Value Groups in the LE Option 4 in
24 order to reduce the range of the adjusted productivity indices in each Group. Hall said it is important to have
25 Agricultural Value Groups for Option 4 because of the need to rank the soils according to Farmland Classification,
26 Land Capability Classification and Adjusted Productivity Index. Hall provided examples of why the Option 4 dated
27 August 3, 2011 needs the type of adjustment proposed. Members discussed the distribution of soils in the top
28 Agricultural Value Groups.
29

30 Petrie expressed concern that the LESA is intended to preserve agriculture and that slicing and dicing does not
31 make a lot of sense. Hall said that a LESA system that is consistent with the adopted Land Resource Management
32 Plan is important. Petrie questioned what is the gain of the proposed adjustment to Option 4. Members
33 discussed the importance of distinguishing among adjusted productivity index values. Griest said that early in the
34 LESA update process the Committee acknowledged that almost all of the farmland in the County falls within the
35 85 threshold of best prime farmland, and that finding the best of the best can assist in allowing for some compact
36 and contiguous development to occur, since we know that the County ordinances allow for some development.
37 Petrie said that growth for the next 20 years can occur in areas already identified for growth and that the
38 purpose of LESA should be to protect farmland. Moser talked about areas of lower soils generally being situated
39 northeast area of the County and observed that is not where growth has occurred for the past 20 years. Griest
40 said the Committee should fine tune the instrument so that it protects the farming operations out beyond the
41 CUGA or the 1-1/2 mile and protects the best soils from being developed and at the same time allows a
42 landowner to sell off a parcel for development if it is not best prime farmland or not in production. Griest
43 suggested the proposed adjustment to Option 4 be carried forward to the next meeting agenda.
44

45 Monte reviewed the SA Factor and defined term revisions proposed from Attachment A of the Meeting 9 Packet
46 to the Committee dated November 11, 2011. Two of the test sites were situated close to the County line and
47 members discussed the utility of requiring additional information about the land use of adjacent counties for SA
48 Factors regarding distance to nearest municipality or amount of land use or zoning within one mile of the subject
49 site. Members moved toward agreement that the added effort and information that would not be directly
50 comparable should not be required.
51

1 Griest indicated a disparity in field test results for SA Factor 2 and questioned whether both SA Factors 2 and 3
2 should disallow timberland and wooded areas that appear undisturbed and not in harvest, so as not to skew
3 results for SA Factor 2. She said in rating SA Factor 2, a site already in residential use received a higher level of
4 protection for agricultural use. Petrie indicated she would prefer that timberland and wooded areas, since they
5 serve to protect streams and limit erosion, should be considered as agricultural land use. Monte indicated that
6 the explanation regarding how to rate SA Factor 2 could be made more clear in the draft. Griest said one of the
7 Committee's original objectives was to make the LESA understandable to the average citizen, and the average
8 citizen will not have the knowledge of property codes and how to access information at the Assessors web site.
9

10 With regard to SA Factor 3, Petrie said that there are some conservation programs that are longer than five years
11 and questioned why five years was selected. Members acknowledged that CRP sites are considered as part of
12 agriculture land use, and discussed the difficulty of obtaining CRP information from the FSA. Donoho indicated
13 that it is relatively safe to make the assumption that if portions of a rural parcel is not in row crop and the land is
14 grassed and appears unmowed or unharvested, that the land is in CRP since there is approximately 20,000 acres
15 of that land use in the County, and that most CRP areas are intended to remain out of production for 10 years.
16

17 Monte reviewed Handout 3 containing an explanation for how to determine whether an agricultural land use is
18 adjacent to a subject site, and Handout 4 consisting of a proposal to revise the distribution of points more
19 proportionately for selected factors.
20

21 Petrie requested that the SA Factor regarding timberland and zoning be tested for redundancy, as well as other
22 factors. Hall said these factors as completely different. Petrie inquired as to the difference between SA Factors
23 #1 (percentage of area in agricultural uses within 1 mile of subject site) and #5 (distance from subject site to
24 nearest city or village limits).
25

26 With regard to SA Factor #5, Griest indicated that one test site was located adjacent to Penfield, which is an
27 unincorporated settlement, and that site was awarded 15 points for protection, and she asked whether existing
28 unincorporated settlements should be included, in addition to cities and village boundaries. Hall said that a
29 smaller community such as Penfield has residences that are all on septic systems, and that even one more septic
30 system in Penfield is a problem. Hall reviewed an alternate scoring system for this factor, which would award
31 more points areas further out than presently indicated.
32

33 Monte indicated that SA Factor #6 regarding CUGA does not address a subject that is partially within the CUGA.
34 Monte advised that Part b) of SA Factor #6 should be eliminated since any parcel within 200 feet of an existing
35 sewer system most typically would be required to be annexed.
36

37 Members discussed field test results for SA Factor #7 and reviewed the rationale for inclusion of SA Factor #7.
38 Donoho requested that SA Factor #7 include less of an abrupt change between the two categories of animal units
39 for more equitable scoring.
40

41 **Motion by Krapf to extend the meeting time to 8:30 p.m.; seconded by Petrie. Motion carried with unanimous**
42 **support.**
43

44 Members discussed utilizing the Handout #2 proposed format and tiered approach to scoring for the SA factors.
45

46 Members reached agreement to remove draft SA Factor #12 regarding drainage improvements due partially to a
47 lack of consistent means to measure this factor.
48

49 **Motion by Moser to extend the meeting time to 9:00 p.m.; seconded by Stierwalt. Motion carried with**
50 **unanimous support.**
51

- 1 Griest requested that the agenda item regarding a recommendation for defining best prime farmland be placed
- 2 on the next meeting date agenda. Members discussed the timeline for conducting a second round of field testing
- 3 of a reduced number of test sites, excluding test sites with existing homes on smaller sized parcels.
- 4
- 5 Monte agreed to provide information regarding test sites for the second round of field testing and a revised copy
- 6 of the Draft LESA Update including revisions reviewed during today's meeting to members by the end of day on
- 7 Friday, November 18. Monte requested that members provide feedback and second round field test results to
- 8 her by Monday at noon.
- 9
- 10 Next Meeting Date
- 11
- 12 Members agreed to hold the next Committee meeting tentatively on Tuesday, November 29, 2011 at 6:30 p.m.,
- 13 or alternatively on Monday, November 28, 2011, at 6:30 p.m.
- 14
- 15 Adjournment
- 16
- 17 Griest adjourned the meeting at 9:04 p.m.
- 18
- 19 Respectfully submitted,
- 20
- 21 Susan Monte, LESA Update Committee Facilitator



Date: November 11, 2011
To: LESA Update Committee
From: Susan Monte, Committee Facilitator
Regarding: Review at Meeting 9 on Wednesday November 16

This memo describes the agenda items to be considered at the LESA Update Committee meeting on Wednesday, November 16.

Field Test Results

We will review the field test application of the Draft LESA Update to the 18 Field Test Sites.

Attachment A contains Field Test Notes.

Attachment B contains an explanation regarding identifying public places of assembly.

Attachment C contains Field Test Results.

Revisions to Draft SA Factors and Defined Terms

Revisions to draft SA Factors will be considered, such as those suggested in the Field Test Notes (Attachment A).

Best Prime Farmland Recommendation

Members will consider making a recommendation regarding an LE relative value on which to base a definition for Best Prime Farmland.

Note that two LE relative values (93 and 87) are considered in the Field Test Results (Attachment C)

Updated LESA Draft

Revisions to the Updated LESA Draft dated October 27, 2011 will be considered.

Attachments

A Field Test Notes

B Explanation regarding identifying public places of assembly

C Field Test Results

FIELD TEST Notes

SA Factor 1

1. The following single revised defined term 'agricultural land use' is proposed to replace the 2 defined terms 'agricultural use' and 'agricultural production' in SA Factors 1, 2, and 3:

"All agricultural and related uses that can be considered to be part of a farm operation. This would include farmland (cropland), pasture lands, raising livestock, or timberlands whether or not in current production, land enrolled in a conservation program, barns, outbuildings, and farm dwellings."

2. For mapping purposes, within 1 mile of the subject site, the revised defined term for 'agricultural land use' is mapped to include parcels with a property tax code of 8100 (agricultural) and 8150 (agricultural with owner/occupied single family), and parcels with property tax codes 1100, 1150, 1200, and 1250 if the area of the parcel is 35 acres or greater.

1100 single family/non-owner occupied residence

1150 owner/occupied single family residence

1200 duplex/rental

1250 owner/occupied duplex (owner resides in ½)

3. Two of the Field Test Sites were nearby or adjacent to a County line. Current scoring reflects the 1-mile distance from these Test Sites as encompassing land of adjacent counties, with the response based on the best estimate of the percentage of agricultural land uses in the adjacent county, and not on actual data from the adjacent county.

The Committee may wish to refine the LESA scoring assessment to be based on actual data from adjacent counties. Aerial digital ortho photo images are available from the USDA NRCS at no cost, (presently), and parcel size data is available from Land Atlas and Plat Books compiled and published by Rockford Map Publishers, Inc., for a nominal cost. An inquiry to the County Assessor of the adjacent county could be made to obtain information about land use of parcels in an adjacent county.

SA Factor 2

To improve clarity, the revised defined term for 'agricultural land use' is proposed.

SA Factor 3

Staff proposes adjustments to SA Factor 3 to improve clarity with use of the revised defined term for 'agricultural land use' and as a means to approximate the amount of wooded areas or timberland on a parcel that appear undisturbed and not in harvest:

3	<u>The highest percentage of the subject site in agricultural land use in any of the last 5 years, excluding wooded areas or timberland on the subject site that appear undisturbed and not in harvest.</u>	80% to 100%	15 points	
		60% to 79%	11 points	
		40% to 59%	7 points	
		20% to 39%	3 points	
		Less than 20%	0 points	

Description: This factor assesses the highest percentage of agricultural land use of the subject site over the past five years, disallowing wooded areas or timberland on the subject site that appears undisturbed and not in harvest.

Scoring: This factor is based on the most recent five years of annual digital ortho photography, typically available from the USDA/FSA - Aerial Photography Field Office. Estimate the highest percentage of area of the subject site in that is in agricultural land use, not including wooded areas or timberland on the subject site that appear undisturbed and not in harvest.

SA Factor 4

If a subject site is nearby or adjacent to a County with zoning, should the adjacent county's zoning district information be considered in responding to this SA factor?

SA Factor 5

Same question regarding whether to include the distance measure to an adjacent municipal corporate limits of an adjacent county.

SA Factor 6

1. Field Test Site 18 is partially within CUGA. Should the points be adjusted if not fully within CUGA?
2. 'Other serviceable areas' are those immediately adjacent or within 200 feet of the corporate limits of smaller communities in the County with no adopted comprehensive land use plan, that have a public sewer system. Staff is presently checking whether annexation is required for sewer service in these serviceable areas. If so, then this part of draft SA Factor should be eliminated.

SA Factor 7

Field Test Site 15 was the only site within the distance of a known Livestock Management Facility of 400 or more animal units. Staff made assumptions regarding the remaining field test sites based on a review of digital ortho photos of the 1-mile surrounding area for each.

SA Factor 8

Field Test Site 15 is located .26 to .5 miles of a museum/fairgrounds area where the Antique Tractor Club meets once per year. This museum/fairgrounds area, though likely visited by 200 or more persons during the event, does not meet the explanation provided in the ILGA Administrative Code regarding how to interpret common place of assembly. (See Attachment A.) Staff recommends that a relevant excerpt of this explanation be added to the Scoring for SA Factor 8.

SA Factor 10

With regard to size of subject site, two different measurement sources have been used in the Field Test Site information provided to you:

- 1) measure of acreage based on the area of the polygon for each test site on the CCGIS Consortium GIS data; and
- 2) County Assessor Office measure of acreage.

The Assessor's measure of acreage is the measure which should be used for calculations since it is based on legal documents such as deeds and plats.

SA Factor 12

The field test for this factor was limited since contact of the owner of the field test site is not advised. For purposes of scoring, staff assumed that the test sites 2 to 4.99 acres in size did not have drainage improvements. Staff based the assumption of whether drainage improvements were present based on digital ortho photos of the remaining test sites.

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
87, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4

TS 1	1	98.7 % ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
	2	all sides in ag use	20	20
	3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
	4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
	5	1.28 miles to Philo corporate limits	15	15
	6	not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile	0	0
	8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
	9	0.75 to 1 mile	8	8
	10	40.4 acres	10	10
	11		20	20
	12	assume none from aerial	0	0
		SA	178	178
		LE	94	94
		Total LESA	272	272

TS 2	1	20 % ag land uses within 1 mile	0	0
	2	70% perimeter in non-ag use	8	8
	3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
	4	24 % area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	5	5
	5	adjacent to Urbana corporate limits	0	0
	6	Within CUGA	0	0
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume none based on aerial photo	0	0
	8	Flex-N Gate Manufacturing within 0.75 to 1 mile	8	8
	9	adjacent	0	0
	10	14.3 acres	6	6
	11		0	0
	12	assume a clay time line from aerial	5	5
		SA	47	67
		LE	89	89
		Total LESA	136	156

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
87, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4

TS 3			
1	98% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
2	all sides in ag use	20	20
3	< 20% based on 5 years digital photos	0	0
4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
5	3.35 miles to Urbana corporate limits	15	15
6	Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
9	.51 to .75	6	6
10	2.99 acres	2	2
11		20	20
12	assume none	0	0
	SA	153	153
	LE	100	100
	Total LESA Score	253	253

TS 4			
1	73% ag land uses within 1 mile	10	10
2	all sides in ag use	20	20
3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
4	87% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
5	caddy corner to Savoy corporate limits	0	0
6	Within CUGA	0	0
7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
8	.75 to 1 mile to Willard Airport	10	10
9	.51 to .74 miles	6	6
10	81.5 acres	10	10
11		20	20
12	assume linear tile system based on aerial photo	5	5
	SA	116	116
	LE	100	100
	Total LESA Score	216	216

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

		SA Factor 11 Assumption: BPF = LE Relative Value of 93, to include Ag Value Groups 1, 2 and 3	SA Factor 11 Assumption: BPF = LE Relative Value of 87, to include Ag Value Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4
TS 5	1	0	0
	2	8	8
	3	0	0
	4	3	3
	5	0	0
	6	0	0
	7a	n/a	n/a
	7b	0	0
	8	0	0
	9	0	0
	10	6	6
	11	0	0
	12	0	0
		SA 17	SA 17
		LE 78	LE 78
		Total LESA Score 95	Total LESA Score 95

TS 6	1	20	20
	2	20	20
	3	15	15
	4	20	20
	5	10	10
	6	0	0
	7a	n/a	n/a
	7b	0	0
	8	10	10
	9	6	6
	10	2	2
	11	20	20
	12	0	0
		SA 123	SA 123
		LE 100	LE 100
		Total LESA Score 223	Total LESA Score 223

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

TS 7	1	99% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
	2	All sides in ag use	20	20
	3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
	4	99% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
	5	4.2 miles to Thomasboro corporate limits	15	15
	6	Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
	8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
	9	.51 to .74 miles	6	6
	10	80.02 acres	10	10
	11		20	20
12	assume linear tile system based on aerial photo	5	5	
	SA	181	181	
	LE	95	95	
	Total LESA Score	276	276	

TS 8	1	94% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
	2	All sides in ag use	20	20
	3	15% based on 5 years digital photos	0	0
	4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
	5	1.63 miles to St. Joseph corporate limits	15	15
	6	Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
	8	more than 1 mile based on aerial photo & parcel data	10	10
	9	.51 to .74 miles	6	6
	10	15.5 acres	6	6
	11		0	0
12	assume none based on aerial photo	0	0	
	SA	137	157	
	LE	88	88	
	Total LESA Score	225	245	

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

TS 9	1	97% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
	2	all sides in ag use	20	20
	3	33% based on 5 years digital photos	3	3
	4	98% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
	5	4-38 miles to Rantoul corporate limits	15	15
	6	Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
	8	0.75 to 1 mile to nearest public assembly	8	8
	9	0.75 to 1 mile to nearest 10 nonfarm dwellings	8	8
	10	2-67 acres	2	2
	11		20	20
12	assume none	0	0	
		SA	156	156
		LE	100	100
		Total LESA Score	256	256

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
87, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4

TS 10	1	99% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
	2	all sides in ag use	20	20
	3	100 % based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
	4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
	5	3-9 miles to corporate limits of Pesotum	15	15
	6	not within CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
	8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
	9	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
	10	161.67 acres	10	10
	11		0	0
12	assume linear tile system based on aerial photo	5	5	
		SA	165	185
		LE	91	91
		Total LESA Score	256	276

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

		SA Factor 11 Assumption: BPF = LE Relative Value of 87, to include Ag Value Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4
TS 11	1 93% ag land uses within 1 mile	20
	2 all sides in ag use	20
	3 100% based on 5 years digital photos	15
	4 96% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20
	5 0.91 miles to St. Joseph corporate limits	10
	6 not within CUGA or other serviceable area	40
	7a more than 1 mile	n/a
	7b assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0
	8 estimate more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10
	9 within .51 to .74 miles based on aerial photo	6
	10 22.7 acres	6
	11	0
	12 assume linear tile system based on aerial photo	5
	SA	152
	LE	78
	Total LESA Score	230

TS 12	1 94% ag land uses within 1 mile	20
	2 all sides in ag use	20
	3 < 20% based on 5 years digital photos	0
	4 100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20
	5 2.2 miles to Urbana corporate limits	15
	6 Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40
	7a more than 1 mile	n/a
	7b assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0
	8 estimate more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10
	9 estimate .51 to .74 based on aerial photo	6
	10 2.15 acres	2
	11	0
	12 assume none	0
	SA	133
	LE	82
	Total LESA Score	215

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

TS 13		20	20
1	95% ag land uses within 1 mile (assumed)	20	20
2	all sides in ag use (assumed)	20	20
3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
4	100% area within 1 mile=AG-1,AG-2 or CR (within CU	20	20
5	2.28 miles to Pesotum corporate limits	15	15
6	Not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	10	10
9	assume more than 1 mile based on parcel data	10	10
10	76 acres	10	10
11		20	20
12	assume none based on aerial photo	0	0
	SA	180	180
	LE	100	100
	Total LESA Score	280	280

TS 14		20	20
1	99.7% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
2	all sides in ag use	20	20
3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
5	3.0 miles to Ivesdale corporate limits	15	15
6	not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
8	estimate more than 1 mile based on parcel data	10	10
9	estimate more than 1 mile based on parcel data	10	10
10	20.3 acres	6	6
11		20	20
12	assume linear tile system based on aerial photo	5	5
	SA	181	181
	LE	97	97
	Total LESA Score	278	278

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
87, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4

TS 15			
1	91% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
2	41% of perimeter in non-agricultural use	12	12
3	0% based on 5 years digital photos	0	0
4	90% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
5	3.77 miles to Gifford corporate limits	15	15
6	not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
7a	0.52 miles from Livestock Mgmt Facility 400 AU	4	4
7b	n/a	0	0
8	assume more than 1 mile based on parcel data	0	0
9	0.25 miles to .5 miles	4	4
10	2.8 acres	2	2
11		0	0
12	assume none	0	0
	SA	117	117
	LE	81	81
	Total LESA Score	198	198

TS 16			
1	97% ag land uses within 1 mile	20	20
2	all sides in ag use	20	20
3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15	15
4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20	20
5	1.2 miles to Champaign corporate limits	15	15
6	not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40	40
7a	more than 1 mile	n/a	n/a
7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial photo	0	0
8	assume more than 1 mile based on parcel data	10	10
9	0.75 to 1 mile to nearest 10 non-farm dwellings	8	8
10	40.2 acres	10	10
11		20	20
12	assume none based on aerial photo	0	0
	SA	178	178
	LE	100	100
	Total LESA Score	278	278

Attachment C

FIELD TEST SITE RESULTS

SA Factor 11 Assumption:
BPF = LE Relative Value of
93, to include Ag Value
Groups 1, 2 and 3

		SA Factor 11 Assumption: BPF = LE Relative Value of 93, to include Ag Value Groups 1, 2 and 3	SA Factor 11 Assumption: BPF = LE Relative Value of 87, to include Ag Value Groups 1, 2, 3 and 4
TS 17	1	90% ag land uses within 1 mile	20
	2	all sides in ag use	20
	3	100% based on 5 years digital photos	15
	4	100% area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2 or CR	20
	5	1.9 miles to Urbana corporate limits	15
	6	not in CUGA or other serviceable area	40
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a
	7b	estimate none within 1 mile based on aerial photo	0
	8	more than 1 mile based on parcel data and aerial	10
	9	0.26 to .5 mile based on parcel data and aerial	4
	10	16.4 acres	6
	11		20
	12	assume none based on aerial photo	0
		SA	170
		LE	97
		Total LESA Score	267

TS 18	1	66% ag land uses within 1 mile	10
	2	94.7% of perimeter in non-ag use	0
	3	0% based on 5 years digital photos	0
	4	94.5 % area within 1 mile zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR	20
	5	0.43 miles to Mahomet corporate limits	0
	6	partially within CUGA (approx 10% of site in CUGA)	0
	7a	more than 1 mile	n/a
	7b	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial & parcels	0
	8	assume more than 1 mile based on aerial	10
	9	0.25 to less than adjacent	2
	10	4.87 acres	2
	11		0
	12	assume none	0
		SA	44
		LE	77
		Total LESA Score	121

Proposed Adjustment to Draft SA Factors

SA1	Within CUGA	40	40
-----	-------------	----	----

Factors that apply everywhere:

SA2	Size of property	10	75
SA3	Best Prime Farmland	30	
SA4	Adjacent land use	20	
SA5	Distance to nearest city limits	15	

Factors that apply only outside CUGA:

SA6	% of site in agricultural land use in last 5 years	15	85	200
SA7	% of land zoned rural within 1 mile	10		
SA8	% agricultural land use within 1 mile	20		
SA9	Distance to 10 non-farm dwellings	20		
SA10	Proximity to livestock operation	10		
SA11	Proximity to assembly use	10		
<i>SA Total</i>				

***KEY BACKGROUND THAT MUST BE EXPLAINED IN LESA INTRODUCTION: THE LESA SYSTEM IS BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF THE CUGA**

CUGA or Non-CUGA (40) points

Factor __: Proposed Draft #6 (**CUGA or non-CUGA**)- 40 points
 (Note: The first four factors total 65 points w/in ETJ so even an LE of 100 inside CUGA will not receive anything greater than 165 which is currently a Low Rating (maximum for low rating is 179). CUGA incorporates many other factors (1, 4, and 9) and remaining other factors are not relevant in CUGA (2, 3, 7, 8, 10);

FACTORS THAT APPLY EVERYWHERE (75 points)

- Factor __: Proposed Draft # 10 (**size of property**)- 10 points
NOTE REVISED SCORING:

More than 25.0 acres	10 points
20.1 to 25.0 acres	8 points
15.1 to 20.0 acres	6 points
10.1 to 15.0 acres	4 points
5.01 to 10.0 acres	2 points
Less than 5.0 acres	0 points
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #11 (**best prime farmland**)- 30 points (INCREASED)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #2 (**adjacent land use**)- 20 points
 (Note: not especially relevant in CUGA)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #5 (**distance to nearest city limits**)- 15 points
NOTE REVISED SCORING:

More than 3.0 miles	15 points
1.51 to 3.0 miles	10 points
w/in 1.5 miles	5 points
Adjacent	0 points

FACTORS THAT APPLY ONLY OUTSIDE OF CUGA (85 points)}

- Factor __: Proposed Draft #3 (**% of site in ag land use in last 5 years**)- 15 points
 (Note: not relevant in CUGA)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #4 (**% of land zoned rural w/in 1 mile**)- 10 points
 (Note: already inherent in CUGA; REDUCED- zoning not as important as use in terms of compatibility)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #9 (**distance to 10 non-farm dwellings**)- 20 points
 (Note: already inherent in CUGA)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #1 (**% Ag use within one mile**)- 20 points
 (Note: already inherent in CUGA)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #7 (**proximity to livestock operation**)- 10 points
 (Note: not relevant in CUGA)
- Factor __: Proposed Draft #8 (**proximity to assembly use**)- 10 points
 (Note: not relevant in CUGA)

Proposed Draft #12 IS ELIMINATED

In worst case where more than 3 miles from munic. and adjacent to 10 non farm dwellings and a public assembly land use, max possible SA is 180 and LE of 85 totals 265; min. possible for 10 acre site is 172 and LE of 85 totals 257; if more than one mile from any livestock operation then total lowers to 255 or 247

11/16/2011 Handout 3

Proposed to be added in description of scoring for SA factors that reference 'adjacent':

Adjacent property is property that shares a lot line with or is directly across a street, private street or access easement, or right-of-way (other than a freeway or principal arterial) from the subject property.

From IL LESA's Factor 2 Adjacent Land Use

If a road bounds the property on one or more sides, the adjacent land use shall be determined by the use of the land across the road in all cases except with 4-lane highways. Where a 4-lane highway bounds the property on one or more sides, the adjacent land use on that side(s) shall be considered non-agricultural. Scoring will be proportional if the site does not have 4 sides.



1
2
3
4 MINUTES– As Amended and Approved

5 ***Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Update Committee***
6

7 **DATE:** Tuesday, November 29, 2011
8 **TIME:** 6:32 p.m.
9 **PLACE:** Brookens Administrative Center
10 John Dimit Conference Room
11 1776 E. Washington St.
12 Urbana, Illinois
13

14 ***Voting Members Present:*** Kevin Donoho, Debra Griest, Liz Jones, Kyle Krapf, Steve Moser, Pattsy Petrie, Bruce
15 Stickers, Steve Stierwalt
16

17 ***Voting Members Absent:***
18

19 ***Non-Voting Member Present:*** John Hall
20

21 ***Others Present:*** Hal Barnhart, Norman Stenzel
22

23 ***CCRPC Facilitator:*** Susan Monte
24

25
26 **Call to Order and Roll Call**
27

28 Griest called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m. Griest, Jones, Krapf, Moser, Stierwalt, Petrie, Stickers, and
29 Hall were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum.
30

31 **Approval of Agenda**
32

33 **Motion by Stierwalt to approve the agenda; seconded by Krapf. Motion carried with unanimous support.**
34

35 **Public Participation**
36

37 Norman Stenzel, 545A CR 1900 N, Champaign, said that the SA portion of LESA should serve as a conscience,
38 and not as a zoning instrument, and that the SA score should indicate whether a site has production value to
39 livelihood of farmers, and that even if there are alternative uses, and the site is good land and it supports
40 farmers, then nothing else is necessary to say. Stenzel requested the Committee review remaining issues: 1)
41 reducing points if a subject site is close to something that is already non-farming since the subject site is still
42 good farmland; 2) not representing small crop farming in the draft LESA; 3) setting arbitrary cut-off scores,
43 using non-objective data, and basing decisions on knowledge about a subject site, and need for a double-
44 blind test of the draft update. Stenzel submitted written comments.
45

46 Donoho entered the meeting at approximately 6:40 p.m.
47

1 Hal Barnhart, 469 CR 1500 N, Champaign, shared three concerns: 1) changing definition of Best Prime
2 Farmland; 2) raising the LESA threshold for high level of protection from 220 to 260; and 3) whether the
3 LESA scoring is of an entire site or whether it is of a portion of a site. Barnhart distributed a graphic to
4 illustrate that a portion of a site having lower LE value could be selected for development, thereby resulting
5 in a lower LESA score.

6
7 Griest shared the content of Stenzel's written comments with the Committee.
8

9 Approval of Minutes

10
11 **Motion** by Donoho to approve the minutes of November 16, 2011; seconded by Petrie. Donoho requested a
12 clarification to describe grassed land on page 3, second paragraph, to add the phrase "and appears unmowed or
13 unharvested". **Motion, as modified, carried with unanimous support.**
14

15 Field Test Results

16
17 Griest summarized the content of the Champaign County Farm Bureau letter dated November 23, 2011. Monte
18 summarized the results of field testing the draft SA factors submitted by Brad Uken on June 8, 2011 on the 11
19 test sites and compared those results to the results of field testing the draft SA factors as revised November 17,
20 2011.
21

22 Petrie suggested the Committee reconsider variables related to public health, safety and welfare, such as those
23 included in the Farm Bureau draft dated June 8, 2011. She expressed concern that the Committee is not properly
24 evaluating the SA criteria, and that further adjusting of SA factors should be based on field testing of different
25 test sites. Krapf indicated the Committee agreed to retest the SA factors based on a subset of the original 18
26 field test sites and that no concerns had been brought up at that time. Griest disagreed that field testing of the
27 same sites using modified criteria was inappropriate because by using a subset of the initial sites, the Committee
28 had the benefit of comparative value to be able to test against. She said the Committee knew what the sites
29 produced from the first test, saw some weaknesses, and wanted to see if the changes made corrected for those
30 weaknesses. Petrie suggested the Committee add new sites to the subset of field test sites for retesting.
31 Donoho noted field test sites removed for the second field test round were so similar to each other that they had
32 no duplicative value. Stickers was pleased that the field test results provided the type of scores that he expected.
33 Griest agreed, indicating the field test results were consistent with her expectation that larger parcels would
34 receive higher total scoring.
35

36 Petrie expressed concern that the 18 field test sites do not represent the types of sites actually reviewed using
37 the LESA. Committee members discussed how the size of sites proposed for development compared to the field
38 test sites. Members reviewed the 40-acre test site graphic provided by Barnhart.
39

40 Moser reviewed which portions of the County generally have less than Prime Farmland soils and hoped the
41 Committee will come up with a recommendation to define Best Prime Farmland, because so much of the County
42 consists of Prime Farmland, and because there is a major difference between Drummer-Flanagan and lesser soils
43 such as Bryce-Swygert.
44

45 Griest asked Hall whether there is a statutory restriction that limits the LESA to consider only the parcel being
46 proposed for development; e.g., if a landowner wanted to develop only five acres of an 80-acre parcel. Hall was
47 not aware of this type of statutory restriction.
48

49 Stickers was pleased that the draft LESA update SA factors assigned Test Site #17 sufficient points to rate it very
50 high for protection, because he considers this site as a potential 'leap-frog' development site, given its location of
51 approximately one mile from the CUGA edge.

1
2 Proposed Adjustment of Protection for Rating
3

4 Griest expressed support for the proposed adjustment of the protection ratings, indicating she was pleased to
5 see that increased differentiation among sites would be provided. She said that she thinks the increased
6 differentiation would not make a site more vulnerable to conversion, but that it sets the highest and most
7 deserving of protection in an even farther category, so they are more special and more protected. She said she
8 would like to see further differentiation yet.
9

10 Hall noted that the draft LESA Update scores are higher than scores obtained from the existing LESA. He said that
11 the existing LESA never produced a score above 244, but in reviewing Test Sites 8, 11, sites within 1-1/2 miles of a
12 municipality and not in CUGA, and further out, he was impressed with the different scores received by these
13 sites. He reviewed a concern regarding Test Site #16 which is relatively close to the Southwest Sewage
14 Treatment plant, and has a high score. Hall said that, in general, the 11 SA Factors seems to work very well, and
15 though very high, the scores seem to match the expectations that most persons have about the total scores.
16

17 Adjustments to SA Factors
18

19 Monte shared that Terry Savko, Office of Farmland Protection, IDOA, had inquired about draft SA Factor #10
20 regarding livestock management facilities, and that Terry is reviewing the Draft LESA Update revised November
21 17, 2011.
22

23 Monte requested that the committee reconsider the rationale for draft SA Factor #6. Committee members
24 reviewed the origin of this factor, and the application of the factor to specific test sites, and the potential impacts
25 of adjusting the factor. The Committee agreed to remove the clause "excluding wooded areas or timberland on
26 the subject site that appear undisturbed and not in harvest" from SA Factor #6, and to reiterate the definition of
27 'agricultural land use' in the description of the factor.
28

29 **Motion** by Stickers to accept the eleven SA factors considered, including the revisions to SA Factor 6, and minor
30 clarifications to improve narrative; seconded by Moser. Petrie indicated that: two draft SA factors are similar;
31 that there are no health, safety and welfare criteria included; and that the rationale for inclusion of SA factor #4
32 was not discussed. Moser requested the question be called. Griest asked Monte to call the roll.
33

34 **Adopted by roll call vote.**

35 **Yeas: Donoho, Jones, Moser, Stierwalt, Stickers, and Griest – 6;**

36 **Nays: Krapf, and Petrie – 2.**
37

38 Krapf expressed his concern that adjacency of a federal or state highway is considered a non-agricultural land use
39 with regard to SA Factor #3, and that what is on the other side of the highway is what is important. Members
40 agreed, and Stickers added that a railroad right-of-way also should not be considered as an adjacent land use.
41 Members agreed that SA Factor #3 be adjusted to reflect this change.
42

43 **Motion** by Krapf to extend the meeting time to 8:30 p.m.; seconded by Donoho. **Motion carried with**
44 **unanimous support.**

45 Griest requested Petrie clarify her concern regarding inclusion of criteria related to health, safety and welfare,
46 and the Committee reviewed rationale for inclusion of SA factors.
47

48 Griest said remaining items to discuss include: points distribution, and whether points are scaled appropriately.
49

50 Petrie said range of scoring and points distribution should be revisited at the next Committee meeting.
51

1 Members discussed the micro distinction featured in the linear distribution of points for SA Factors #3, 7, and 8,
2 and whether the increased number of categories was user-friendly. Stickers noted that in order to distinguish
3 among sites which tend to have high LESA scores, that the micro-ranges are helpful to tease out slight differences
4 between some of the test sites.

5
6 Members discussed the continuing growth outward from the corporate limits of the largest municipalities in the
7 County over the past 20 years, and acknowledged that a County LESA system is advisory, and that a LESA system
8 alone has limited influence when development proposals are considered at the municipal level.

9
10 Griest suggested members re-examine the SA factors, and to test any proposed adjustments. Jones suggested
11 that test sites that had previously gone through a rezoning request be added to the subset of field test sites for
12 retesting.

13
14 Monte described the correlation matrix of SA factors and noted that more than half of the SA factors are
15 relatively highly correlated, with an r factor of over 0.6. Monte reviewed field test results as they relate to
16 replicability, and indicated that clarification to the scoring instructions for three SA factors (# 3, #8, and #9) will
17 need to be provided so that the scoring responses obtained in field testing for these SA factors are consistent.

18 Best Prime Farmland Recommendation

19
20
21 **Motion** by Moser to increase the LE threshold to define Best Prime Farmland from 85 to 92; seconded by Krapf.
22 Moser observed that since 1979 the actual slopes and characteristics of soils in Champaign County generally
23 referred to as 'a', 'b', and 'c', have not changed. Stickers indicated an LE of 85 includes almost all soils in the
24 County and would like an LE of 90 but could agree with 92. Committee members reviewed differences in the
25 crop yield between soils in Agricultural Value Groups 3 and 4. Petrie urged caution is suggesting a change to LE
26 score and inquired as to the percentages of land in each agricultural value group. With the information that
27 approximately 76 percent of soils in the County occur in Agricultural Value Groups 1 through 4, Petrie proposed
28 the LE be increased to 90.

29
30 **Motion** by Krapf to extend the meeting time to 9:00 p.m.; seconded by Moser. **Motion carried with unanimous**
31 **support.**

32
33 Monte reviewed an example of how the definition of Best Prime Farmland could be structured. Jones asked why
34 change the LE. Krapf indicated he prefers an LE of 90. Griest said based on field testing, she noticed noticed no
35 significant differentiation using an LE score of 91. Donoho noted the LE shown for each agricultural value group
36 is a weighted average. Committee members discussed LE score options. Moser requested the question be
37 called. Griest asked Monte to call the roll.

38 **Motion failed by roll call vote.**

39 **Yeas: Moser, Donoho – 2;**

40 **Nays: Stickers, Petrie, Jones, Stierwalt, Krapf, and Griest – 6.**

41
42 Hall advised that the LE selected should represent a range that corresponds with the 'best' prime farmland. He
43 noted that it is clear that soils with an LE of 100 are the best, and that the question is how far to expand the
44 definition from 100. The existing LE definition starts with best, and goes down to soils that are 15% less
45 productive. The Committee voted to not accept a definition that starts with best and that include soils that are
46 approximately 10% less productive. Jones observed the vote was probably called prior to members having a
47 good understanding, and said she still had questions. Jones understands that most of area around Champaign
48 and Urbana which are soils with high LE values of 93 and above. She requested clarification about what soils are
49 on the fringe areas just outside the CUGA. Petrie requested the Committee be provided with an overlay of the
50 productivity indices over the CUGA areas, in order to examine whether raising the LE to 92 to define Best Prime
51 Farmland will be self-defeating for the area around the CUGA.

1
2 Jones asked how this plays out for zoning. Hall indicated that Best Prime Farmland affects zoning rights of
3 individuals in two ways: 1) on a by right basis, it establishes a maximum lot size of 3 acres. The more land that is
4 considered Best Prime Farmland, the more landowners are affected on a by right basis. Regarding discretionary
5 development proposals, 2) once a landowner uses up by right development rights, and wants to rezone a parcel
6 in the AG-1, AG-2, or CR Districts, then Rezoning in a rural zoning district, a proposed development on Best Prime
7 Farmland would need to meet a higher level of suitability for development. Hall said that, first and foremost, a
8 discretionary development proposal is affected by what you are proposing; and other suitability factors include
9 septic suitability, floodplain presence, distance from fire protection service, etc. Committee members discussed
10 an example of an RRO that was approved with an LE value of 85.

11
12 Stierwalt asked how to understand at what point that the score of a site will be impacted based on the amount of
13 other than Best Prime Farmland soils on that site. Petrie reviewed that the LE of a site is based on a weighted
14 average. Griest questioned and Hall clarified that the soils in each agricultural value group are assigned the
15 relative value for the LE of the agricultural value group.

16
17 Petrie and Krapf requested examples of how an LE score is calculated for a subject site. Moser read a definition
18 of Prime Farmland from the 1979 Circular 1156.

19
20 Next Meeting Date

21
22 Members agreed to hold the next Committee meeting on Wednesday, December 14, 2011 at 6:30 p.m.

23
24 Adjournment

25
26 Griest adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

27
28 Respectfully submitted,

29
30 Susan Monte, LESA Update Committee Facilitator
31



Date: November 23, 2011

To: LESA Update Committee

From: Susan Monte, Committee Facilitator

Regarding: Meeting 10 on Tuesday, November 29

Please note the change in meeting location to the Lyle Shields Meeting Room at Brookens.

Field Test Results

1) Redundancy of SA Factors

Correlation coefficients describe the relationship of individual SA factors to each other SA factor. Staff completed a simple correlation matrix and found high levels of correlation among more than half the SA factors. Presently staff is conducting multiple regression analyses of the SA Factors and plans to share and discuss results prior to or at the November 29 meeting.

2) Replicability of Responses

To be replicable is to provide consistent results by different reviewers. The replicability of the Draft LESA Update will be measured based on field test results received. The consistency of the ratings for each test site will be described as follows:

Test Site <i>n</i>				
Factor	Control Score*	Committee Median	Committee Range	Committee Standard Deviation
LE	95			
SA1	10			
SA2	30			
SA3	20			
SA4	5			
SA5	40			
SA6	15			
SA7	20			
SA8	20			
SA9	8			
SA10	0			
SA11	10			
Subtotal SA	178			
Total LESA	273			

* The control score is the score calculated by staff.

Meeting 10 LESA Update Committee

Recommended Adjustments to Draft LESA Update dated 11/17/2011

- 1) John Hall recommends to slightly adjust the Rating for Protection applied to the total LESA score. The proposed adjustment is intended as a means to differentiate among the highest scoring subject sites.

Rating for Protection	Existing Range of Scores	Proposed Range of Scores
Very High	220 – 330 (a range of 80 points)	260 – 300 (a range of 40 points)
High	200 – 219 (a range of 20 points)	220 – 259 (a range of 40 points)
Moderate	180 - 199 (a range of 20 points)	180 – 219 (a range of 40 points)
Low	179 or less (a range of 179 points)	179 or less (a range of 179 points)

Staff applied control scores from the second Field Test to the Existing and Proposed Ratings for Protection. The proposed adjustment impacts the Rating for Protection for two of the 11 test sites. The results are displayed below:

Test Site	Total LESA Control Score	Existing Rating for Protection	Proposed Rating for Protection	
1	273	Very High	Very High	no change
2	97	Low	Low	no change
4	160	Low	Low	no change
7	279	Very High	Very High	no change
8	220	Very High	High	proposed is a lower rating
10	281	Very High	Very High	no change
11	220	Very High	High	proposed is a lower rating
13	285	Very High	Very High	no change
14	278	Very High	Very High	no change
16	278	Very High	Very High	no change
17	270	Very High	Very High	no change

Items 2 and 3 below are the result of staff stepping back from the SA Factors to answer the simple question: "why is this SA factor included?"

- 2) Staff is re-evaluating the rationale for SA Factor 6 in its present form. It no longer makes sense to me that any significant amount of wooded area or timberland on the subject site that appears undisturbed or not in harvest would detract from the continued agricultural value—in a general sense-- of a subject site.

If, instead, this factor is intended to gauge the need for clear-cutting a site in order to allow for row crop production or other agricultural land use, then it should be more clearly stated as such.

- 3) Staff is reviewing the rationale for inclusion of SA Factor 4 regarding proximity to nearest city limits. SA Factor 4 seems most related to potential development pressure and potentially higher real estate value of a subject site. Are these valid concerns in considering the continued agricultural value of a site?

If retained, SA Factor 4 is another factor about development pressure. (The other being SA Factor 5 regarding the CUGA.) SA Factor 4 could also relate to potential for conflicting land use.

