

ORDINANCE NO. 2024-____

Prohibiting Trespass on County-owned farmland

Executive Summary

[Insert reasoning for ordinance]

WHEREAS, Jefferson County is committed to ensuring the safety, security, and well-being of all residents and visitors, as well as the protection of County-owned farmland; and

WHEREAS, unauthorized access to County-owned farmland poses potential risks to public safety, property integrity, and environmental sustainability; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary and appropriate to establish regulations that prohibit unauthorized access to County-owned farmland to prevent potential harm and damage;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors as follows:

Section 1.

1.02 DEFINITIONS.

- (1) In this section, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:
 - (a) “County-owned farmland” includes the open land owned by Jefferson County located south of County Highway J and Collins Road, east of State Highway 89, west of Business 26, and north of Business 26 in Jefferson, Wisconsin. A map of the subject property is available at the Jefferson County Land & Water Conservation Department.
 - (b) “Trespass” refers to entering or remaining on County-owned farmland without the express written permission of Jefferson County. For purposes of this ordinance, “trespass” does not include accessing Potter’s Field via the walking trail or utilizing the adjacent bike trails.

1.03 PROHIBITION OF TRESPASS ON COUNTY-OWNED FARMLAND.

- (1) No person shall trespass on any County-owned farmland.

- (2) The Director of the Jefferson County Land & Water Conservation Department and/or the County Administrator are authorized to grant permission to access County-owned farmland to any person upon request.
- (3) This ordinance does not prohibit County staff from accessing County-owned farmland for official County business provided advance notice is given to the Director of Jefferson County Land & Water Conservation Department so the current tenant can be consulted.

1.04 PENALTIES.

- (1) Any person found to be in violation of this ordinance shall be subject to a forfeiture of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, plus any applicable penalty assessments and costs of prosecution.
- (2) Each day that a violation continues shall be deemed a separate offense.

Section 2. This ordinance shall be effective after passage and publication.

Fiscal Note:

Referred By:
Land & Water Conservation Committee

04-16-24



Walt Christensen <wchriswho@gmail.com>

PACE Program Notes

Marc DeVries <MarcD@jeffersoncountywi.gov>

Tue, Mar 19, 2024 at 11:54 AM

To: Morgan Toutant <mendl@jeffersoncountywi.gov>, Tammy Worzalla <TammyW@jeffersoncountywi.gov>

Cc: Walt Christensen <WaltC@jeffersoncountywi.gov>, "wchriswho@gmail.com" <wchriswho@gmail.com>

There are no official minutes for the Finance Committee meeting yet.

In my notes I have that \$500,000 from the sale of county farmland is approved for the PACE program. Ongoing funding needs further discussion.

Before we discuss any further funding, especially ongoing, I would like to know what the ultimate goal of the program is (is it coverage/acres? Or what??) and where are we now in achieving that. If the intent is to restrict farmland from development, my question is how much conservation do we need, and how much of the county is already restricted from development. Maybe there exists some creative ideas to achieve the desired outcome, but we don't know what that outcome is. So far nobody has been able to answer that. How can we discuss ongoing funding when we have no idea where we are or where we are going.

According to my discussions with Patricia, it takes about a year to process one application. They have \$500,000 approved – that should take them through at least a couple budget cycles. Maybe by that time we will have an answer.

Marc

[Quoted text hidden]

Email from Russell Kutz

A quick follow up. At the last Finance committee meeting I had asked if there was any requirement for the 25% county contribution for PACE easements. What I heard that day was no, as some in the past had no county contributions and that it was just an equal split of what remained after the USDA amount. There could be more that is considered than just those two items. I had asked that the LWC Committee maybe consider having a potential county contribution of 25%, with an up to maximum of say \$50,000. In the information on past contributions, not counting the \$0.00, the low was \$44,920 and the high was the recent one at \$76,250. Another one was at \$48,750. There also was one at 30% for \$69,000, for comparison, it would have been \$57,000 at 25%.

My thoughts on having a maximum ceiling was based on seeing how difficult it was to come up with the guesstimation of potential county costs in the future. With a list of 9 on the interested list, this would be a way to handle the volatility and make estimates more predictable. It could also allow the \$500,000 to cover everyone on the list. With appraisals seeming to come in higher, the 50% payment from USDA will also be higher. Benefits to the landowner should still be on par with what was paid out in past years.

Hope this is helpful for your discussions.