

# CASE NO. 710-AT-12

SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM

August 30, 2012

Petitioner: **Zoning Administrator**

Prepared by: **John Hall**, Zoning Administrator  
**Andrew Kass**, Associate Planner

Champaign  
County  
Department of

**PLANNING &  
ZONING**

**Request: Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance by amending the Champaign County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System that is referred to in Section 3; and Footnote 13 in Section 5.3; and subsection 5.4, as follows\* :**

**Part A. Revise the Land Evaluation (LE) part as follows:**

1. **Revise all soil information to match the corresponding information in the *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.**
2. **Revise all existing soil productivity information and replace with information from *Bulletin 811 Optimum Crop Productivity Ratings for Illinois Soils* updated January 15, 2011, by the University of Illinois College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences Office of Research.**
3. **Delete the 9 existing Agriculture Value Groups and existing Relative Values ranging from 100 to 0 and add 18 Agriculture Value Groups with Relative LE ranging from 100 to 0.**

**Part B. Revise the Site Assessment (SA) part as follows:**

1. **Add definitions for "agriculture"; "agricultural production"; "animal units"; "best prime farmland"; "farm dwelling"; "livestock management facility"; "non-farm dwelling"; "principal use"; and "subject site".**
2. **Delete SA Factors A.2.; A.3.; B.2.; B.3.; C.2; D.2.; D.3.; E.1.; E.2.; E.3.; E.4.; F.1.; F.2.; F.3.; F.4.; and F.5.**
3. **Revise SA Factor A.1. to be new Factor 8. ; Factor B.1. to be new Factor 7.; Factor C.1. to be new Factor 5.; Factor D.1. to be new Factor 1.; and revise scoring guidance for each revised Factor, as described in the legal advertisement.**
4. **Add new SA Factors 2a; 2b; 2c; 3; 4; 6; 9; 10; and add scoring guidance for each new Factor, as described in the legal advertisement.**

**Part C. Revise the Ratings for Protection, as described in the legal advertisement.**

**Part D. Revise the general text and reformat.**

**\* NOTE: the description of the Request has been simplified from the actual legal advertisement. See the attached legal advertisement**

---

## STATUS

A Draft Finding of Fact is attached. Evidence that was not included in prior memoranda is underlined and can be found on pages 16 to 21; 23 to 25; and 26, 27, and 29.

A March 7, 2012, email from Terry Savko of the Illinois Department of Agriculture regarding her assessment of the Draft LESA is attached. This email was reviewed by the LESA Update Committee.

---

## ATTACHMENTS

- A email dated March 7, 2012, from Terry Savko to Susan Monte
- B Draft Finding of Fact

---

**From:** Savko, Terry <Terry.Savko@Illinois.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 07, 2012 5:04 PM  
**To:** Susan Monte  
**Subject:** Final LESA Update packet

Hi Susan,

I started working with LESA system development and subsequent reviews in 1986. Your LESA system is the only one in the state that carefully dovetails its comprehensive land use plan with farmland protection. Many of the early Illinois LESA systems were initiated in counties where zoning and/or comprehensive land use plans weren't in place; and those that actually had zoning and planning weren't always intent on protecting agriculture, especially prime farmland.

The Committee has done a very thorough job of examining and revising its SA factors to address the future planning of development and still attempt to maintain the best soils in the world for farming purposes. This group has been unrelenting in its drive to make LESA actually protect the best farmland in the world found in Champaign County. And I commend them for their efforts.

Regarding the point scale and whether to use **high** and **very high**, the overall point spread is difficult to establish due to the overall productivity of the soils in Champaign County. Many are above the 90 relative value (RV) range. This automatically makes the LE point totals higher than found in many counties with LESAs, thus raising is the overall point total. My question is how many of those top scores for LESA reviews have points from 240 and upwards that are moot points and don't evaluate anything? Hopefully, you can answer not many.

This being said, the importance of the SA factors to clearly evaluate the rural areas outside the compact and contiguous development (CUGA) is paramount. Agriculture is an important economic base for Champaign County and needs this type of protection in order to stay viable and productive for long-term use.

I agree on the need to evaluate the revised LESA in five years. In fact, I would suggest to look at the SA factors in two years just to see they truly evaluate what they were designed to evaluate.

Based upon what I have seen, I have no problems with the Draft LESA. I think it is ready to move it up the ladder and on to the County Board for review.

Terry



**Terry Savko, IL Dept of Agriculture**  
**Bureau of Land and Water Resources**  
State Fairgrounds, Springfield, IL 62794-9281  
**217-785-4458** Fax 217-557-0993 [terry.savko@illinois.gov](mailto:terry.savko@illinois.gov)

**DRAFT**

**710-AT-12**

**FINDING OF FACT  
AND FINAL DETERMINATION  
of  
Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals**

---

Final Determination: ***{RECOMMEND ENACTMENT/RECOMMEND DENIAL}***

Date: August 30, 2012

Petitioner: Zoning Administrator

Request: Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance by amending the Champaign County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System that is referred to in Section 3; and Footnote 13 in Section 5.3; and subsection 5.4, as follows:

**Part A.** Revise the Land Evaluation (LE) part as follows:

1. Revise all soil information to match the corresponding information in the *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.
2. Revise all existing soil productivity information and replace with information from *Bulletin 811 Optimum Crop Productivity Rating for Illinois Soils* published August 2000 by the University of Illinois College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences Office of Research.
3. Delete the 9 existing Agriculture Value Groups and existing Relative Values ranging from 100 to 0 and add 18 Agriculture Value Groups with Relative LE ranging from 100 to 0.

**Part B.** Revise the Site Assessment (SA) part as follows:

1. Add definitions for "agriculture"; "agricultural production"; "animal units"; "best prime farmland"; "farm dwelling"; "livestock management facility"; "non-farm dwelling"; "principal use"; and "subject site".
2. Delete SA Factors A.2.; A.3; B.2.; B.3; C.2; D.2.; D.3.; E.1.; E.2.; E.3.; E.4.; F.1.; F.2.; F.3.; F.4.; and F.5.
3. Revise SA Factor A.1. to be new Factor 8; Factor B.1. to be new Factor 7.; Factor C.1. to be new Factor 5.; Factor D.1. to be new Factor 1.; and revise scoring guidance for each revised Factor, as described in the legal advertisement.
4. Add new SA Factors 2a; 2b. 2c; 3; 4; 6; 9; 10; and scoring guidance for each new Factor, as described in the legal advertisement.

**Part C.** Revise the Rating for Protection as described in the legal advertisement.

**Part D.** Revise the general text and reformat

\*NOTE: The description of the Request has been simplified from the actual legal advertisement.

---

**CONTENTS**

**FINDING OF FACT.....pages 3 – 30**  
**DOCUMENTS OF RECORD.....page 31 - 35**  
**SUMMARY FINDING OF FACT.....page 36**  
**FINAL DETERMINATION.....page 37**  
**PROPOSED AMENDMENT.....page 38 –**

---

**FINDING OF FACT**

From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing conducted on **June 14, 2012, June 28, 2012, July 12, 2012, July 26, 2012, August 16, 2012, and August 30, 2012**, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

1. The petitioner is the Zoning Administrator.
2. The proposed amendment is intended to reflect the recommendations of the LESA Update Committee recommendations.
3. Municipalities with zoning and townships with planning commissions have protest rights on all text amendments and they are notified of such cases. No comments have been received to date.

**SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT**

4. The proposed amendment is attached to this Finding of Fact as it will appear in the Zoning Ordinance.

**GENERALLY REGARDING THE LRMP GOALS, OBJECTIVES, AND POLICIES**

5. The *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan* (LRMP) was adopted by the County Board on April 22, 2010. The LRMP Goals, Objectives, and Policies were drafted through an inclusive and public process that produced a set of ten goals, 42 objectives, and 100 policies, which are currently the only guidance for amendments to the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, as follows:
  - A. The Purpose Statement of the LRMP Goals, Objectives, and Policies is as follows:

“It is the purpose of this plan to encourage municipalities and the County to protect the land, air, water, natural resources and environment of the County and to encourage the use of such resources in a manner which is socially and economically desirable. The Goals, Objectives and Policies necessary to achieve this purpose are as follows:”
  - B. The LRMP defines Goals, Objectives, and Policies as follows:
    - (1) Goal: an ideal future condition to which the community aspires
    - (2) Objective: a tangible, measurable outcome leading to the achievement of a goal
    - (3) Policy: a statement of actions or requirements judged to be necessary to achieve goals and objectives
  - C. The Background given with the LRMP Goals, Objectives, and Policies further states, “Three documents, the *County Land Use Goals and Policies* adopted in 1977, and two sets of *Land Use Regulatory Policies*, dated 2001 and 2005, were built upon, updated, and consolidated into the LRMP Goals, Objectives and Policies.

*REGARDING LRMP GOALS*

6. LRMP Goal 1 is entitled “Planning and Public Involvement” and states that as follows:

**Champaign County will attain a system of land resource management planning built on broad public involvement that supports effective decision making by the County.**

The proposed amendment is not directly related to Goal 1 and is *NOT RELEVANT* to Goal 1.

7. LRMP Goal 2 is entitled “Governmental Coordination” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will collaboratively formulate land resource and development policy with other units of government in areas of overlapping land use planning jurisdiction.**

Goal 2 has two objectives and three policies. The proposed amendment is not directly related to Goal 2 but should *HELP ACHIEVE* Goal 2 because it should *HELP ACHIEVE* objective 2.1 that states that Champaign County will coordinate land resource management planning with all County jurisdictions and, to the extent possible, in the larger region, for the following reasons:

- A. The proposed amendment should *HELP ACHIEVE* objective 2.1 by the text amendment process whereby municipalities and townships with planning commissions are notified of any proposed text amendment and have the right to provide comments or even protest any text amendment.

8. LRMP Goal 3 is entitled “Prosperity” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will encourage economic growth and development to ensure prosperity for its residents and the region.**

Goal 3 has three objectives and no policies. The proposed amendment is not directly related to Goal 3 and is *NOT RELEVANT* to Goal 3.

9. LRMP Goal 4 is entitled “Agriculture” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will protect the long term viability of agriculture in Champaign County and its land resource base.**

Goal 4 has 9 objectives and 22 policies. The proposed amendment should *HELP ACHIEVE* Goal 4 for the following reasons:

Objective 4.5 is the only relevant objective under Goal 4. There are no subsidiary policies under Objective 4.5. Objective 4.5 states as follows:

**By the year 2012, Champaign County will review the Site Assessment portion of the LESA for possible updates; thereafter, the County will periodically review the site assessment portion of the LESA for potential updates at least once every 10 years.**



The proposed amendment will **ACHIEVE** Objective 4.5 for the following reasons:

- A. Regarding the proposed Land Evaluation Factors (Part A of the amendment):
- (1) *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition* (referred to as *LESA Guidebook*) is the most recent available guidance for establishing a LESA system. Regarding guidance for establishing LE Factors:
    - (a) Chapter 4 of the *LESA Guidebook* describes four classification systems that may be used to rate soil based qualities which are as follows:
      - i. The Soil Potential Ratings classification system requires the most information regarding yield potential and management costs. Soil Potential Ratings are not available for Champaign County soils.
      - ii. The other three classification systems are Soil Productivity Ratings; Land Capability Classes; and Important Farmland Classes and all are available for Champaign County soils.
  - (2) The Land Evaluation Factors in the existing Champaign County LESA System were classified using Soil Productivity Ratings, Land Capability Classes, and Important Farmland Classes.
  - (3) The *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition, provides current land capability classes (Table 8) and prime farmland (Table 9). (Att. F & G in the Prelim. Memo).
  - (4) Regarding soil productivity ratings for Illinois soils:
    - (a) The productivity index in the existing LESA is from *Soil Productivity in Illinois*, Circular 1156, published in 1978 by the University of Illinois Cooperative Extension Service. Circular 1156 is no longer in publication and has been replaced by later bulletins.
    - (b) As explained on the Illinois Department of Revenue website (see Attachment N to the Prelim. Memo.), there are two types of soil productivity index ratings for Illinois soils which are as follows:
      - i. *Average Crop, Pasture, and Forestry Productivity Ratings for Illinois Soils*, Bulletin 810, August 2000, published by the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign College of Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences Office of Research.  
Regarding Bulletin 810:
        - Bulletin 810 contains the crop yields and productivity indices for crops under the average level of management used by all Illinois farmers for the 10 year period in the 1990's.
        - Bulletin 810 is the current source for farmland productivity under the Illinois Farmland Assessment Law.





- (d) Option 4, using the Bulletin 811 Soils Productivity Index in addition to the USDA Land Capability Classifications and Important Farmland Classifications.
  - (6) At their 11/02/11 meeting the LESA Update Committee reviewed a recommendation by Committee member Kevin Donoho, District Conservationist with the USDA-NRCS Champaign Field Office. Mr. Donoho submitted an LE Calculation Recommendation (see Attachment C to the Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated 6/14/12) which can be summarized as follows:
    - (a) Mr. Donoho stated his preference for the proposed "Option 4".
    - (b) Mr. Donoho stated that an LE system that includes the ability to evaluate 3 soils classification systems simultaneously, including Bulletin 811, Land Capability Classification, and Farmland Classification, can provide the most comprehensive assessment of LE when completed, while remaining simple once developed and implemented.
    - (c) As reported in the minutes of the 11/02/11 LESA Update Committee meeting Mr. Donoho stated he had consulted with the NRCS area soil scientist with regard to the LE options under review, and that the soil scientist concurred with his recommendation.
  - (7) The final LE Factors Update recommendation of the LE Update Committee was a Revised Option 4 Proposal 11/15/11 that was a handout at the 11/16/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting. See Attachment O to the Preliminary Memorandum of Case 710-AT-11. The Revised Option 4 was based on the recommendation of Mr. Donoho but included 18 Agriculture Value Groups to ensure that there was not too broad of a range in productivity of soils included in any one AVG.
- B. Regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors (Part B of the amendment):
- (1) The Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed the minutes of all LESA Update Committee meetings and many of the handouts regarding the recommended Draft Site Assessment Factors and those meetings, handouts, and Committee actions can be summarized as follows:
    - (a) At the first LESA Update Committee meeting held on June 8, 2011, the Update Committee received three alternative sets of Site Assessment Factors as follows:
      - i.* A set of 13 Draft Site Assessment Factors was submitted by Bradley Uken, the manager of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.
      - ii.* A set of six Draft Site Assessment Factors was submitted by John Hall, Champaign County Zoning Administrator.
      - iii.* A set of five Draft Site Assessment Factors was submitted by Susan Monte, Planner with the Champaign County Regional Planning Commission and Facilitator for the LESA Update Committee. This set of Draft Site Assessment Factors was based upon existing site

**DRAFT**

assessment factors in the existing Champaign County LESA that match the SA-1 factors found in *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition*. Soil and Water Conservation Society, 1983.

- (b) The three alternative sets of Draft Site Assessment Factors were considered at the June 21, 2011, and July 13, 2011, LESA Update Committee meetings. At both meetings the LESA Update Committee discussed their intent that the revised Site Assessment Factors should emphasize agricultural productivity and farmland protection over development suitability because development suitability is considered in other aspects of the rezoning process.
- (c) A single set of 11 Draft Site Assessment Factors with limited assessment guidance was distributed to the LESA Update Committee prior to the July 27, 2011, meeting.
- (d) A Working Draft of 12 SA Factors and including two definitions was handed out at the August 10, 2011, LESA Update Committee meeting.
- (e) At the September 7, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee did the following regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors:
  - i. The LESA Update Committee reviewed a group of 12 Draft SA Factors that had been scored against 4 actual land parcels that had been used in previous map amendment cases.
  - ii. The LESA Update Committee compared a one mile radius for SA Factors to a one-and-a-half mile radius for each of the 4 parcels and decided that a one mile radius was sufficient.
  - iii. The LESA Update Committee discussed the availability of annual aerial photography from the Champaign County Soil and Water Conservation District.
  - iv. The LESA Update Committee discussed the difficulty of accurately estimating the number of livestock at a livestock management facility based on a windshield survey.
- (f) At the November 2, 2011, LESA Update Committee meeting the LESA Update Committee reviewed a Draft Updated LESA dated October 27, 2011, with Site Assessment Factors with assessment guidance and defined terms. A 12<sup>th</sup> Site Assessment Factor had been added regarding drainage improvements on the subject site and the Committee decided to pay particular attention to this Factor during the field testing.
- (g) At the November 16, 2011, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee did the following regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors:



*DRAFT*

- versus best prime farmland larger than 25 acres or larger than 15% of a parcel and added points for prime farmland larger than 25 acres.
- iii.* The LESA Update Committee also deleted the SA Factor assessing distance from the subject site to the nearest public assembly use of more than 200 persons and reassigned the 10 points to the SA Factor for best prime farmland.
  - iv.* The LESA Update Committee considered revised “levels of protection” based on the total LESA score that included fewer points in the range of very high rating for protection and more points for both moderate and high rating for protection that had been included in both the Updated Version Revised Draft LESA dated December 5, 2011, and the Strikeout Copy of Updated Version Revised Draft LESA dated December 14, 2011.
- (j) At the January 4, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee did the following regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors:
- i.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed a Revised Draft LESA dated December 29, 2011 and an Alternate Revised Draft LESA dated December 29, 2011, that had fewer SA Factors for sites in the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA).
  - ii.* The LESA Update Committee discussed how to distinguish between “farm” and “non-farm” dwellings.
  - iii.* The LESA Update Committee discussed changing the number of Draft SA Factors for a site located in the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA).
  - iv.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed additional changes to the “levels of protection”.
- (k) At the January 25, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee did the following regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors:
- i.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed the Alternate Update Draft LESA dated January 18, 2012, which had revisions to the Site Assessment Factor assessing best prime farmland.
  - ii.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed changes to the Site Assessment Factor assessing agricultural land use adjacent to the site.
  - iii.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed changes to the Site Assessment Factor assessing the highest percentage of the site in agricultural production in the last 5 years.
  - iv.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed changes to the Site Assessment Factor assessing the amount of agricultural land use within one mile of the site.
  - iv.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed additional changes to the “levels of protection”.

*DRAFT*

- (1) At the February 22, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee did the following regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors:
  - i.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed the Strikeout Version of Revised Draft LESA dated February 10, 2012, which had many minor editing changes and definitional changes and substantive changes to the scoring guidance for many Site Assessment Factors including changes that addressed the “creeping effect” whereby approval of some farmland conversion can inadvertently lower LESA scores on nearby properties.
  - ii.* The LESA Update Committee discussed possible refinements to the definition of “farm dwelling” and reviewed further field test results.
  
- (m) At the March 7, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting the Committee
  - i.* The LESA Update Committee reviewed the Revised Draft LESA dated February 28, 2011, that reduced the SA Factors considered for sites in the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA) to only factors 1 and 2; and added a new definition for “principal use” and included other definitional changes; and included final changes to the “levels of protection”.
  - ii.* The LESA Update Committee requested final editing that would add consistency regarding ‘lesser than’ and ‘greater than’.
  
- (2) Regarding the proposed Site Assessment Factors and how they compare to the Site Assessment Factors in the existing Champaign County LESA System and to LESAs in other relevant Illinois counties:
  - (a) Proposed SA Factor 1 assesses the size of the subject site and is similar to existing SA Factor D.1. except for the following differences:
    - i.* The proposed SA Factor 1 assesses “size of the subject site” but the existing SA Factor D.1. assesses “size of site feasible for farming” so the proposed SA Factor 1 is simpler and easier to assess without considering feasibility issues.
    - ii.* The largest site considered in the proposed SA Factor 1 is “more than 25 acres” and the largest site considered in the existing SA Factor D.1. is “100 acres or more” so the proposed SA Factor 1 is less biased towards site area than the existing LESA.
    - iii.* The smallest site considered in the proposed SA Factor 1 is “5 acres or less” and the smallest site considered in the existing SA Factor D.1. is “less than 5 acres” and zero points is awarded in both instances so there is little difference in this regard.
    - iv.* The possible points awarded for the proposed SA Factor 1 is 10 points (5% of the total for Site Assessment) and possible points awarded for the existing SA Factor D.1. is 8 points (4% of the total for Site Assessment).



*DRAFT*

- v. The proposed SA Factor 1 does not consider 25 acres as an optimum size for farmland but assumes that larger tracts of farmland are more valuable for agriculture than smaller tracts of farmland.
  - vi. This is one of the example site assessment factors included in the *LESA Guidebook* reviewed by the Committee and is consistent with other Illinois county LESA's reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, Ogle, and DeKalb indirectly) but was not in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.
- (b) Proposed SA Factor 2 assesses if the subject site is Best Prime Farmland; and, if so, if the site is more than 15% of a larger land parcel that existed on January 1, 2004, or whether the site is larger than 25 acres; and if not Best Prime Farmland then whether the site is at least 51% Prime Farmland and if so, whether the site is 25 acres or larger or if the site is more than 15% of a larger land parcel that existed on January 1, 2011. Regarding proposed SA Factor 2:
- i. The proposed SA Factor 2 is not similar to any existing SA Factor.
  - ii. The proposed SA Factor 2 relies on the same definition of "best prime farmland" as that used in the Zoning Ordinance.
  - iii. The possible points awarded for the proposed SA Factor 2 is 30 points (15% of the total for Site Assessment) for even the smallest site of Best Prime Farmland and 40 points (20% of the total for Site Assessment) for Best Prime Farmland sites that are larger than 25 acres or more than 15% of a larger land parcel that existed on January 1, 2004.
  - iv. The overall effect of proposed SA Factor is to encourage less conversion of both Best Prime Farmland and Prime Farmland which is consistent with the original intent of the LESA System.
  - v. Regarding the date of January 1, 2004, that is relevant to Best Prime Farmland, 2004 is the year in which best prime farmland and "maximum lot size" was first introduced into the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance and certain parcels of land that existed prior to 1/1/04 are exempt from those Zoning Ordinance limitations on the use of best prime farmland.
  - vi. Regarding the date of January 1, 2011, that is relevant to Prime Farmland, 2011 is the year in which the Draft Update LESA was developed.
  - vii. No other Illinois county is known to have identified "best prime farmland" and no other Illinois LESA includes "best prime farmland" as an SA Factor.
  - viii. None of the other Illinois county LESA's reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, Ogle, and DeKalb) even consider "prime" farmland in their SA Factors.
  - ix. "Best Prime Farmland" and "Prime Farmland" were not in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.



**DRAFT**

- x. The use of “Best Prime Farmland” and “Prime Farmland” as SA Factors is not an impediment to the validity of the proposed Draft LESA and can be instrumental in providing significant distinction in Site Assessment scores for properties that are either “Prime Farmland” or “Best Prime Farmland”.
- (c) Proposed SA Factor 3 assesses whether the site is in the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA). Regarding proposed SA Factor 3:
- i. The proposed SA Factor 3 is somewhat similar to a suite of existing SA Factors that are B.3. (prior governmental actions) and E.1. (central sewer) and E.2. (central water) and E.3. (Transportation) and E.4. (fire protection service).
  - ii. The proposed SA Factor 3 relies on the same definition of “Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA)” as that used in the Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP).
  - iii. If the site is not located in the CUGA the points awarded for proposed SA Factor 3 is 40 points (20% of the total for Site Assessment). For a comparison to the existing SA Factors, this compares to the total of 50 points possible for the entire suite of similar existing SA Factors B.3. and E.1. and E.2. and E.3. and E.4. If the site is located in the CUGA zero points are awarded and SA Factors 4 through 10 are not relevant.
  - iv. As described in Volume 2 of the Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan (LRMP). The CUGA ... {complete}
  - v. The existing LESA does not recognize that not all parts of a municipal ETJ are in the CUGA so the proposed SA Factor 3 is more protective of areas not in the CUGA and that will not have access to sewer or water.
  - vi. SA Factor 3 is similar to “land use policy designation” that is one of the example “non-agricultural productivity” site assessment factors included in the LESA *Guidebook* reviewed by the Committee and is consistent with most of the other Illinois county LESA’s reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, Ogle, DeKalb, but not McLean,) except those counties awarded only 9 to 20 points for this factor but also awarded additional points based on distance from water, sewer, fire protection, etc.; and is similar to Factor #6 (worth a maximum 20 points) in the proposal of 6/8/11 by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau (who also awarded additional points in categories of water, sewer, and road surface).
- (d) Proposed SA Factor 4 assesses the amount of perimeter of the subject site that is adjacent to parcels with a principal use of agriculture. Regarding proposed SA Factor 4:
- i. The proposed SA Factor 4 is similar to existing SA Factor A.2. Land use adjacent to site and A.2. and both SA Factors rely on the Zoning Ordinance definition of agriculture.



*DRAFT*

in the proposal of 6/8/11 by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.

- iii.* While it is true that some specialty farming operations may benefit from being closer to a city or village and it is true that any city or village in Champaign County will contain important services for farmers, it is also true that the County has no control over annexation agreements within 1.5 miles of a city or village and it is true that the 1.5 mile extraterritorial jurisdiction of the larger municipalities in the County will continue to expand for the foreseeable future and therefore the County should be more concerned about prime farmland that is more than 1.5 miles and in some instances much further than 1.5 miles from a city or village.
- (f) Proposed SA Factor 6 assesses the highest percentage of the site in agricultural production in any of the last 5 years. Regarding proposed SA Factor 6:
- i.* The proposed SA Factor 6 is somewhat similar to existing SA Factor A.3. which assesses the percentage of the site that is suitable for agricultural uses and the basic differences are as follows:
- Existing Factor A.3. requires judgment about what land is suitable for agriculture but no guidance is provided. Proposed SA Factor 6 requires very little judgment.
  - Existing Factor A.3. receives a maximum of 10 points (5%) and proposed SA Factor 6 receives a maximum of 15 points (7.5%).
  - Existing Factor A.3. considers whether as little as 10% of the site is suitable for agriculture but proposed SA Factor 6 does not award points if as much as 20% of the site has been in production in the last 5 years. Proposed SA Factor 6 thus provides less protection to land that has not been in production in the last 5 years but in Champaign County prime farmland is almost always in production unless there is some significant reason for it not to be and in those instances the proposed SA Factor 6 therefore makes an allowance (by providing less protection) in those instances.
- ii.* The guidance provided for proposed SA Factor 6 specifies the following:
- Land in government sponsored agricultural programs should be considered as being in production.
  - Woodlands or timberland should only be considered in production if there is a plan for managing the resource and if there is no plan then the resource is not in production.
- iii.* “Percent of site in agricultural use” is one of the example site assessment factors included in the LESA *Guidebook* reviewed by the Committee and proposed SA Factor 6 is identical to a factor in the Kendall County LESA but the McLean and DeKalb county

*DRAFT*

LESA factors are more similar to existing factor A.3. and no Ogle County LESA factor is similar; and the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau included a factor identical to the existing A.3. except that Uken's Factor received a maximum of 20 points #2 focused on "production agriculture" and relied on "whole side scoring" as the existing A.2. and awarded a maximum of 20 (15%) points if all sides were in production agriculture.

vii. Recognizing and considering how much of a site has been farmed in the past 5 years does not mean that only land that has been in production is worth saving but it does provide for instances when an owner has not seen value in production on part of the property and in Champaign County that will generally never be prime farmland or at least not much prime farmland and in those instances SA Factor 6 will provide less protection.

(g) Proposed SA Factor 7 assesses the percentage land zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR within 1 mile of the site. Regarding proposed SA Factor 7:

i. The proposed SA Factor 7 is very similar to existing SA Factor B.1. which assesses the percentage land zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR within 1.5 miles of the site and the differences are as follows:

- In general, a 1.5 mile radius will encompass more than twice as much land as a 1.0 mile radius and therefore SA Factor 7 will require only about half as much analysis as existing SA Factor B.1.
- The Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ et seq) does not rely on any separation greater than one mile for livestock management facilities and therefore from an agricultural consideration there is no need to use a radius greater than one mile.
- Using a radius less than 1.5 miles helps minimize the effect of the urbanized area for LESA sites that are located within the municipal 1.5 mile extraterritorial planning jurisdiction (ETJ) established by statute. This is generally only relevant to those parts of the municipal ETJ that are not within the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA) and that are at least one mile from the municipal boundary.
- Existing SA Factor B.1. has a total of 10 points and proposed SA Factor 7 also has a total of 10 points.

ii. Not much guidance is provided for proposed SA Factor 7 because this Factor is nearly identical to an existing Factor that has no guidance.

iii. "Percent of land zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR within 1 mile of the site" is similar to "compatibility of surrounding uses" that is one of

*DRAFT*

the example site assessment factors included in the LESA Guidebook reviewed by the Committee and is consistent with other Illinois county LESA's reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, Ogle, and DeKalb); and is similar to Factor #4 in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau except that Uken's proposal retained the 1.5 mile radius of the existing LESA.

- (h) Proposed SA Factor 8 assesses the percentage of land within 1 mile of the site with a principal use of agriculture. Regarding proposed SA Factor 8:
- i. The proposed SA Factor 8 is very similar to existing SA Factor A.1. which assesses the percentage of area in agricultural uses within 1.5 miles of the site and the differences are as follows:
    - Regarding the differences between the 1.0 mile and 1.5 mile radius of assessment, refer to the discussion under SA Factor 7.
    - Existing SA Factor A.1. awards points in a non-linear method by assigning 0 points if less than 25% of the area is in agriculture and then 8 points (44% of the total of 18) if between 25% to 49% is agriculture and then 12 points (67% of the total of 18) if 50% to 74% is in agriculture and then 16 points (89% of the total of 18) if 75% to 89% is in agriculture and the total 18 points if only 90% is in agriculture. The non-linear scale at which the points are awarded in SA Factor A.1. is not based on any known phenomenon and appears arbitrary whereas the linear scale used in proposed SA Factor 8 is a simple linear distribution.
    - The proposed SA Factor 8 distinguishes between sites that are best prime farmland or at least 51% prime farmland and other sites. If the subject site is either best prime farmland or at least 51% prime farmland proposed SA Factor 8 specifies that the assessment should only consider parcels with a principal use of agriculture that existed on April 12, 2011. This limit on consideration of non-agricultural development after April 12, 2011, is intended to address the concern about the "creeping effect" that is reviewed in the LESA Guidebook that was reviewed by the LESA Update Committee. The creeping effect is what happens when approval of non-agricultural development subsequently leads to less agricultural land use in the area that then causes lower subsequent LESA ratings on other nearby lands. This provision will ensure that any approval of non-agricultural development on a site that is either best prime farmland or 51% prime farmland will not contribute to a lower rating on SA Factor 8 for any non-agricultural development proposed



*DRAFT*

in the future. April 12, 2011, is the date of the annual digital ortho-photography for the year 2011.

- ii. Even though proposed SA Factor 8 is nearly identical to existing Factor A.1. the proposed SA Factor 8 has extensive guidance that is not included with existing Factor A.1. that has no guidance. The guidance is necessary to ensure that any assessment is as close as possible to the current practices in the Department of Planning and Zoning. The guidance for this Factor needs to mirror as much as possible the practices of the Department of Planning and Zoning.
- iii. “Percent of land of land within 1 mile of the site with a principal use of agriculture” is similar to “compatibility of surrounding uses” that is one of the example site assessment factors included in the LESA Guidebook reviewed by the Committee and is consistent with other Illinois county LESA’s reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, Ogle, but not DeKalb); and is similar to Factor #1 in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau except that Uken’s proposal retained the 1.5 mile radius of the existing LESA.
- (i) Proposed SA Factor 9 assesses the distance from the site to the nearest 10 non-farm dwellings. Regarding proposed SA Factor 9:
- i. The proposed SA Factor 9 is not similar to any existing SA Factor. The following is relevant information regarding this Factor:
- The Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ et seq) requires new livestock management facilities to meet minimum separations from the nearest non-farm residence and “populated area” and defines “populated area” as an area containing a public assembly use or 10 non-farm dwellings.
  - The required separations in the Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ et seq) vary depending upon the number of “animal units” (equates to different number of different types of livestock) at the livestock management facility. The required separations vary from ¼ mile for a non-farm residence or ½ mile for a populated area and a livestock management facility of 50 to 1,000 animal units up to ½ mile for any non-farm residence or 1 mile from a populated area for a livestock management facility of more than 7,000 animal units.
  - Assessing a subject site for proximity to the closest 10 non-farm dwellings will reveal which sites could accommodate new livestock management facilities. However, livestock management facilities are not a large component of Champaign County agriculture.



*DRAFT*

- Proximity to the closest 10 non-farm dwellings is also directly relevant to compatibility with row crop agriculture and row crop agriculture is the largest component of Champaign County agriculture. Each new non-farm dwelling is one more possible incompatibility for row crop agriculture and the same areas that could accommodate new livestock management facilities are the areas in which row crop agriculture can operate with the fewest incompatibilities with non-farm dwellings.
  
- ii.* Guidance for proposed SA Factor 9 is similar to that for proposed SA Factor 8 since both should mirror the practices in the Department of Planning and Zoning. The guidance for this Factor also needs to mirror as much as possible the practices of the Department of Planning and Zoning.
  
- iii.* “Distance from the site to the nearest 10 non-farm dwellings” is similar to “compatibility of surrounding uses” that is one of the example site assessment factors included in the LESA *Guidebook* reviewed by the Committee and is only somewhat similar to Factor 4 in the Ogle County LESA (Number of non-farm dwellings within .5 miles of the site) and not similar to any other factor in any other Illinois county LESA reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, and DeKalb); and is not similar to any Factor in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.
  
- (j) Proposed SA Factor 10 assesses the distance from the site to the nearest known livestock management facility and the size of that facility. Regarding proposed SA Factor 10:
  - i.* The proposed SA Factor 10 is not similar to any existing SA Factor. The following is relevant information regarding this Factor:
    - The Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ *et seq*) requires new livestock management facilities to meet minimum separations from the nearest non-farm residence and “populated area” and defines “populated area” as an area containing a public assembly use or 10 non-farm dwellings.
    - The required separations in the Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ *et seq*) vary depending upon the number of “animal units” (equates to different number of different types of livestock) at the livestock management facility. The required separations vary from ¼ mile for a non-farm residence or ½ mile for a populated area and a livestock management facility of 50 to 1,000 animal units up to ½ mile for any non-farm residence

**DRAFT**

- or 1 mile from a populated area for a livestock management facility of more than 7,000 animal units.
  - The Illinois Department of Agriculture has registered six livestock management facilities in Champaign County with 400 or more “animal units”. The LESA Update Committee reviewed a map illustrating where these facilities are located in the county and used the map during the field testing.
  - Three of the field test sites were located near livestock management facilities of less than 400 animal units.
  - Assessing a subject site for proximity to livestock management facilities will reveal which sites could accommodate new livestock management facilities. However, livestock management facilities are not a large component of Champaign County agriculture.
  - Proximity to livestock management facilities is also directly relevant to compatibility with row crop agriculture and row crop agriculture is the largest component of Champaign County agriculture. The same areas that could accommodate new livestock management facilities are the areas in which row crop agriculture can operate with the fewest incompatibilities with non-farm dwellings.
  - Livestock management facilities of less than 50 animal units are not considered in the assessment because small facilities can easily be established as a response to a zoning change and the degree of incompatibility is much less if there are less than 50 animal units.
  - This Factor receives a maximum of 10 points which is only 5% of the total for Site Assessment and therefore the lack of a livestock management facility will not “leave a lot of points on the table” or result in unusually low assessments.
- ii.* Factor 10 is divided into Part a (proximity to a facility of 400 or more animal units); Part b (proximity to a facility of 200 to 299 animal units); and Part c (proximity to a facility of 5- to 199 animal units). Guidance for proposed SA Factor 10 is as follows:
- Part a should be assessed first and Part b should only be assessed if the response to Part a is “more than 1 mile” and likewise for Part b and then Part c.
  - The assessment may be based on data available from the Livestock Management Facilities Program at the Illinois Department of Agriculture or actual site inspection or drive-by inspection or landowner interview or testimony in the zoning case.
- iii.* “Distance from the site to the nearest known livestock management facility” is not similar to any of the example site assessment factors

**DRAFT**

included in the LESA Guidebook reviewed by the Committee and is not similar to any factor in any other Illinois county LESA reviewed by the Committee (Kendall, McLean, Ogle, and DeKalb); and is not similar to any Factor in the 6/8/11 proposal by Brad Uken of the Champaign County Farm Bureau.

- (3) Test sites were used by the LESA Update Committee to evaluate the Draft LESA. Some of the test sites were chosen at random and others were sites formerly proposed for an RRO rezoning. In addition the test sites were used to compare scores obtained using the existing LESA and the Draft LESA. The following are statements regarding comparisons between the Draft LESA and the existing LESA:
- (a) For Test Sites not in the Continuous Urban Growth Area (CUGA) the Draft LESA scores were always higher than the existing LESA scores. Overall test sites not within the CUGA averaged 17% higher scores than the existing LESA scores. Higher LESA scores are generally considered more protective of prime farmland.
  - (b) For Test Sites within the CUGA the Draft LESA scores were always lower than existing LESA scores and never more than 150 points and therefore never received more than a “LOW” rating for protection, which is consistent with the purpose of the CUGA. Test Sites 4 and D rated a “MODERATE” rating for protection in the existing LESA.
  - (c) Test Site A was the only test site that was “prime farmland” and not “best prime farmland”. Test Site A received a “MODERATE” rating for protection under both the existing and Draft LESA. If Test Site A was “best prime farmland” the Draft LESA score would have been 30 points higher and would have received a “HIGH” rating for protection. The existing LESA does not distinguish between “prime farmland” and “best prime farmland” or even less productive soils.
  - (d) Test Site A can be compared to Test Site 1 and Test Site 16 which are both 40 acres and best prime farmland. The differences in LESA rating between Test Site A versus Test Site 1 and Test Site 16 are much larger in the Draft LESA (differences of 60 points and 65 points, respectively) than the existing LESA (differences of 31 points and 37 points, respectively). At least half of the difference between Draft LESA and existing LESA scores for Test Site 1 and Test Site 16 are due to the 30 points for best prime farmland in the Draft LESA. The total LESA score for each Test Site 1 and Test Site 16 is very high and is within 10% of the highest possible rating of 300.
  - (e) Test Site 8 and Test Site 17 are both less than 20 acres in area with “best prime farmland” and have very similar scores using the existing LESA (224 and 226, respectively) but have a greater difference in scores under the Draft LESA (244 with a “HIGH” rating and 258 with a “VERY HIGH”

*DRAFT*

rating, respectively). In the Draft LESA the points for these two sites differ by a few points on many Site Assessment Factors but the major difference is on Site Assessment Factor 6 (highest percent of site in production in last 5 years) where Test Site 17 is rated at 15 and Test Site 8 is rated at 0. Under the existing LESA both sites are rated a 10 on existing Site Assessment Factor 3 (amount of site suitable for production).

(4) The ZBA compared the existing LESA score and the proposed Draft LESA score for two properties that belonged to two ZBA members. The properties were as follows:

- (a) A 38.25 acre property consisting of four separate tax parcels in Section 26 of Newcomb Township. This property consists of about 31% Drummer soil and about 69% Xenia soil and under the existing LESA has an overall LE of 85.13 and under the Draft LESA has an overall LE of 87 but would still be best prime farmland by virtue of 31% of the soil being Agriculture Value Group 2. Regarding the site assessment and protection rating for this property:
- This property is less than a mile from the Village of Mahomet but is not located in the CUGA;
  - Most (97.3%) of the land within a one mile radius is zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR but only 58% of that land is in agricultural use. See the attached map for SA Factor 8.
  - Less than half (47.4%) of the site perimeter borders parcels with a principal use of agriculture.
  - The entire property has 10 or more non-farm dwellings that border it.
  - There is a known 400 or more animal unit livestock management facility within .9 mile of the property.
  - Total SA for the existing LESA is 102 points and the Draft LESA totals 149 points.
  - The total score for the existing LESA is 187 points which is a mid-range “Moderate” level of protection under the existing LESA.
  - The total score for the Draft LESA is 236 points which is a mid-range “High” level of protection under the Draft LESA. Note that the Draft LESA score is about 26% higher than the existing LESA.
- (b) A 19.75 acre property consisting of two separate tax parcels in Section 2 of Sidney Township. This property consists overall of about 14% Drummer soil and about 80% Xenia soil and under the existing LESA has an overall LE of 76.2 and under the Draft LESA has an overall LE of 83 but would still be best prime farmland by virtue of 14% of the soil being Agriculture Value Group 2. Regarding the site assessment and protection rating for this property:
- As reviewed above, this property is best prime farmland overall and totals less than 25 acres.

**DRAFT**

- This property is 1.7 miles from the Village of Sidney and is not located in the CUGA;
- All of the land within a one mile radius is zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR and 79.3% of that land is in agricultural use. See the attached map for SA Factor 8.
- About a third (33%) of the site perimeter borders parcels with a principal use of agriculture.
- The property is within .46 mile of 10 non-farm dwellings.
- There are no known livestock management facilities of 50 animal units or more within one mile of the property.
- Total SA for the existing LESA is 116 points and the Draft LESA totals 145 points.
- The total score for the existing LESA is 192 points which is a mid-range “Moderate” level of protection under the existing LESA.
- The total score for the Draft LESA is 228 points which is a low “High” level of protection (only 3 points above Moderate) under the Draft LESA. Note that the Draft LESA score is about 20% higher than the existing LESA.

(5) In general, the proposed SA Factors can be summarized as follows:

(a) The proposed SA Factors are more focused on agricultural productivity than are the existing SA Factors. The proposed Draft LESA has 145 points (72.5% of possible Site Assessment points) awarded for factors that the LESA Guidebook considered as productivity related. This compares to only 74 points (37% of possible Site Assessment points) in the existing LESA that is focused on productivity.

(b) The proposed SA Factors are less focused on development pressures and other public values than are the existing SA Factors. The proposed Draft LESA has only 15 points (SAF #5) for Development Pressure (or 55 points (27.5% of total SA) if SAF#3 is considered) and none for other values. This compares to the existing LESA that has 78 points (39% of total SA) for Development Pressure and 48 points (24%) for other public values.

(c) The proposed SA Factors are valid based on the focus on agricultural productivity and conformance with the Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan (SAF#3).

(d) The proposed SA Factors are reliable based on the guidance that is included and the field testing by the LESA Update Committee.

(6) An email dated March 7, 2012, from Ms. Terry Savko of the Illinois Department of Agriculture to the LESA Update Committee can be summarized as follows:

(a) She commended the LESA Update Committee for a thorough revision of the SA Factors with a focus on protecting prime farmland.







**DRAFT**

large rural site with an LE= 100 would likely receive at least 234 points which is the lower range of a “very high” rating.

- (2) The proposed Draft LESA System also has four levels of “rating for protection” that are “very high” for total LESA scores of 251 to 300; “high” for total LESA scores of 226 to 250; “moderate” for total LESA scores of 151 to 225; and “low” for total LESA scores of less than 150. Regarding the proposed Draft LESA ratings for protection:
- (a) The range of 75 points for both “very high” and “high” ratings is the same range of points as for the “moderate” rating. These ranges of ratings is arguably more equitable than the existing LESA ratings.
- (b) The range of 150 for the “low” rating is lower than the existing “low” rating but the proposed “low” rating can only apply to sites in the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA). Sites in the CUGA should receive no more than a “low” rating for protection and sites outside of the CUGA should receive a higher rating for protection.
- (c) A comparison of expected Draft LESA scores for hypothetical large, non-CUGA Best Prime Farmland sites found the following:
- If careful assumptions are made regarding the probable ratings for proposed SA Factors 3, 7, 8, and 9 based on a site being further than 1.5 miles from a municipality and if 0 points are assumed for SA Factor 10, it can be expected that a large (25 acres or larger) best prime farmland site with an LE of 91 to 100 would have a total LESA rating of “very high” (approx. 262 to 290 points) if more than 1.5 miles from a municipality and “moderate” to “very high” (approx. 209 to 277 points) if less than 1.5 miles from a municipality. If the site is best prime farmland based on the 10% of AVG 1,2,3, or 4 soils the LE could be as low as 73 and the total LESA scores would be accordingly lower.
  - The probable ratings for large best prime farmland sites outside of the CUGA are consistent with expectations that such sites should receive the highest rating for protection.

D. Regarding the proposed general text and reformatting (Part D of the amendment):  
*Evidence to be added*

10. LRMP Goal 5 is entitled “Urban Land Use” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will encourage urban development that is compact and contiguous to existing cities, villages, and existing unincorporated settlements.**

The proposed amendment is **NOT RELEVANT** to Goal 5 because the proposed amendment does not relate to urban land use.

11. LRMP Goal 6 is entitled “Public Health and Safety” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will ensure protection of the public health and public safety in land resource management decisions.**

The proposed amendment is *NOT RELEVANT* to Goal 6 in general.

12. LRMP Goal 7 is entitled “Transportation” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will coordinate land use decisions in the unincorporated area with the existing and planned transportation infrastructure and services.**

The proposed amendment is *NOT RELEVANT* to Goal 7 in general.

13. LRMP Goal 8 is entitled “Natural Resources” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will strive to conserve and enhance the County’s landscape and natural resources and ensure their sustainable use.**

Goal 8 has 9 objectives and 36 policies. The proposed amendment should *HELP ACHIEVE* Goal 8 for the following reasons:

Objective 8.2 is the only relevant objective under Goal 8. Objective 8.2 states as follows:

**Champaign County will strive to conserve its soil resources to provide the greatest benefit to current and future generations.**

The proposed Draft LESA will *HELP ACHIEVE* Objective 8.2 for the following reasons:

The only subsidiary policy under Objective 8.2 is policy 8.2.1 that reads as follows:

**The County will strive to minimize the destruction of its soil resources by non-agricultural development and will give special consideration to protection of best prime farmland. Best prime farmland is that comprised of soils that have a Relative Value of at least 85 and includes parcels with mixed soils that have a Land Evaluation score of 85 or greater as defined in the LESA.**

The proposed amendment will *HELP ACHIEVE* Policy 8.2.1 for the following reasons:

A. The current LESA does not include any discussion of “best prime farmland” nor does it assign any site assessment points in a LESA assessment to best prime farmland or even prime farmland.

B. Proposed Site Assessment (SA) Factor 2 assesses whether or not the subject site is best prime farmland or whether or not the subject site is at least 51% prime farmland or some lesser quality farmland as follows:

- (1) SA Factor 2 awards 30 points if the site is best prime farmland and an additional 10 points if the site is more than 15% of a larger tax parcel that existed on 1/1/04 or if the parcel is larger than 25 acres.
- (2) SA Factor 2 also awards 10 points if the site is not best prime farmland but is at least 51% prime farmland and is larger than 25 acres or is part of 25 acres of prime farmland that has been developed from a larger prime farmland tax parcel since April 12, 2011.
- (3) Because SA Factor 2 assesses whether or not the subject site is best prime farmland or whether or not the subject site is at least 51% prime farmland it also assesses whether or not the site is a lesser quality soil in which case no points are awarded.

14. LRMP Goal 9 is entitled “Energy Conservation” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will encourage energy conservation, efficiency, and the use of renewable energy sources.**

The proposed amendment is *NOT RELEVANT* to Goal 9 in general.

15. LRMP Goal 10 is entitled “Cultural Amenities” and states as follows:

**Champaign County will promote the development and preservation of cultural amenities that contribute to a high quality of life for its citizens.**

Goal 10 is *NOT RELEVANT* to the proposed amendment in general.

***REGARDING THE PURPOSE OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE***

16. The proposed amendment appears to ***HELP ACHIEVE*** the purpose of the Zoning Ordinance as established in Section 2 of the Ordinance for the following reasons:
- A. Paragraph 2.0 (a) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to secure adequate light, pure air, and safety from fire and other dangers.  
  
The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.
  - B. Paragraph 2.0 (b) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to conserve the value of land, BUILDINGS, and STRUCTURES throughout the COUNTY.  
  
The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.
  - C. Paragraph 2.0 (c) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to lessen and avoid congestion in the public streets.  
  
The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- D. Paragraph 2.0 (d) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to lessen and avoid hazards to persons and damage to property resulting from the accumulation of runoff of storm or flood waters.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- E. Paragraph 2.0 (e) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to promote the public health, safety, comfort, morals, and general welfare.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- F. Paragraph 2.0 (f) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to regulate and limit the height and bulk of buildings and structures hereafter to be erected.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- G. Paragraph 2.0 (g) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to establish, regulate, and limit the building or setback lines on or along any street, trafficway, drive or parkway.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- H. Paragraph 2.0 (h) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to regulate and limit the intensity of the use of lot areas, and regulating and determining the area of open spaces within and surrounding buildings and structures.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- I. Paragraph 2.0 (i) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to classify, regulate, and restrict the location of trades and industries and the location of buildings, structures, and land designed for specified industrial, residential, and other land uses.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- J. Paragraph 2.0 (j) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to divide the entire County into districts of such number, shape, area, and such different classes according to the use of land, buildings, and structures, intensity of the use of lot area, area of open spaces, and other classification as may be deemed best suited to carry out the purpose of the ordinance.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- K. Paragraph 2.0 (k) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to fix regulations and standards to which buildings, structures, or uses therein shall conform.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- L. Paragraph 2.0 (l) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to prohibit uses, buildings, or structures incompatible with the character of such districts.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- M. Paragraph 2.0 (m) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to prevent additions to and alteration or remodeling of existing buildings, structures, or uses in such a way as to avoid the restrictions and limitations lawfully imposed under this ordinance.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- N. Paragraph 2.0 (n) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to protect the most productive agricultural lands from haphazard and unplanned intrusions of urban uses.

The proposed amendment is directly related to this purpose because the proposed amendment will improve the existing LESA system which provides a rating of the level of protection a piece of land should be given based on its soils and other locational characteristics.

- O. Paragraph 2.0 (o) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to protect natural features such as forested areas and watercourses.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- P. Paragraph 2.0 (p) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to encourage the compact development of urban areas to minimize the cost of development of public utilities and public transportation facilities.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

- Q. Paragraph 2.0 (q) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to encourage the preservation of agricultural belts surrounding urban areas, to retain the agricultural nature of the County, and the individual character of existing communities.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.

{

- R. Paragraph 2.0 (r) of the Ordinance states that one purpose of the zoning regulations and standards that have been adopted and established is to provide for the safe and efficient development of renewable energy sources in those parts of the COUNTY that are most suited to their development.

The proposed amendment is not directly related to this purpose.



**DOCUMENTS OF RECORD**

1. Preliminary Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated June 8, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B Champaign County Board Committee of the Whole Memorandum dated March 26, 2012, with attachments:
    - A Champaign County Resolution No. 7642
    - B Champaign County Resolution No. 7797
    - C Brief Comparison of Existing LESA to Proposed Update Draft LESA
    - D Champaign County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) Update Draft dated March 7, 2012
  - C Resolution No. 2248 Adopting the Champaign County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System, February 1984 (existing LESA)
  - D U.S.D.A. N.R.C.S. Champaign County, Illinois Conversion Legend 1975 Map Symbol to 2001 Map Symbol
  - E Table 5. Acreages and Proportionate Extent of the Soils from *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.
  - F Table 8. Land Capability and Yields per Acre of Crops and Pasture from *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.
  - G Table 9. Prime Farmland from *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.
  - H Chapter 4. Selecting and scaling Land Evaluation factors excerpted from *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition*. Soil and Water Conservation Society, 1983
  - I *Description of Data Used in Each LE Option*. Attachment D to the 10/04/11 LESA Update Committee memorandum
  - J *LE Scores for Each Option Applied to Test Sites*. Attachment E to the 10/04/11 LESA Update Committee memorandum
  - K *Comparing the LE Options*. Attachment F to the 10/04/11 LESA Update Committee memorandum
  - L Pages 129 to 135 excerpted from *Soil Survey of Champaign County, Illinois* 2003 edition.
  - M Parts 622.00 to 622.04 from the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) National Soil Survey Handbook
  - N Soil Productivity Index Ratings for Illinois soils web page introductory pages
  - O Revised Option 4 Proposal 11/15/11 (Handout 1 for the 11/16/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - P Memorandum to LESA Update Committee dated 12/28/11 (Handout from John Hall to the LESA Update Committee on 1/4/12)
  
2. Preliminary Memorandum for Case 711-AT-12 dated June 14, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Champaign County Board Committee of the Whole Memorandum dated March 26, 2012, with attachments:
    - A Brief Comparison of Existing Best Prime Farmland to Proposed Best Prime Farmland
  
  - B Comparison of "At Risk Amounts" of LE=100 Soil Under Different Best Prime Farmland (BPF) Definitions (Attachment B to the 12/19/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum)

- C (included separately) LESA Update Committee memorandum dated 2/14/12 (Memo#2 for the 2/22/12 LESA Update Committee meeting) with Attachments:
  - A Field Test Scores and BPF Definition Options
  - B Map of Soils Outside CUGA and Incorporated Areas
  - C BPF Definition Options Data on Soils Outside CUGA and Incorporated Areas
  - D Suggested Text for Best Prime Farmland Definition Recommendations
  
- 3. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated June 14, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B Memorandum to LESA Update Committee dated 10/04/11
  - C LE Calculation Recommendation to LESA Update Committee by Kevin Donoho dated 10/26/11
  - D Draft Evidence Regarding the Recommended Update to Land Evaluation Factors
  
- 4. Comments submitted by Norman Stenzel received June 15, 2012
  
- 5. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated June 21, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B *On the SA Portion of LESA: Validity and Reliability* submitted by Norman Stenzel on June 15, 2012
  - C Comparison Scoresheets for LESA Update Field Test Sites
  - D Comparing Existing LESA Scores to Recommended Draft LESA Score
  - E Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/et seq.) General Requirements Related to Size of Facility. February 15, 2007
  - F Documents from the from the LESA Update Committee:
    - (1) LESA Update Field Test Sites Handout November 2, 2011 (a handout at the November 2, 0211, LESA Update Committee meeting)
    - (2) Location Map of 18 Initial Test Parcels
    - (3) Various maps for LESA Update Field Test Sites
    - (4) Chapter 5. Selecting and scaling Site Assessment Factors excerpted from *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition*. Soil and Water Conservation Society, 1983
    - (5) Chapter 6. Combining and weighting factor ratings for a LESA System excerpted from *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition*. Soil and Water Conservation Society, 1983
    - (6) Illinois LESA System. Revised August 2001. Illinois Department of Agriculture
    - (7) Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System for Kendall County, Illinois
    - (8) Ogle County, Illinois Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System
    - (9) Article 11- Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) System excerpted from the McLean County, Illinois Zoning Ordinance
    - (10) DeKalb County, Illinois Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System
  
- 6. Level of Protection Handout for Case 711-AT-11 for June 28, 2012, meeting

7. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated July 3, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B *Farm Focused Alternative LESA* submitted by Norman Stenzel on July 1, 2012
  
8. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated July 26, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B Additional Draft Evidence Regarding the Draft Site Assessment Factors
  - C Approved Minutes of the June 8, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachments
    - Memorandum from John Hall, Champaign County Zoning Administrator dated June 8, 2011, with Draft SA Factors
    - Site Assessment Factors submitted on June 8, 2011, by Bradley Uken, Champaign County Farm Bureau Manager
    - Images from the Powerpoint presentation including Preliminary SA Factors
  - D Approved Minutes of the June 21, 2011, LESA Update Committee
  - E Approved Minutes of the July 13, 2011, LESA Update Committee
  - F Approved Minutes of the August 10, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachment:
    - Handout 1 Working Draft-SA Factors as of 8/10/11
  - G Approved Minutes of the September 7, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachment:
    - Meeting 6- Review of Draft SA Factors (Attachment A to the 9/2/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum)
  - H Approved Minutes of the October 12, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachment:
    - 10/05/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with Attachment:  
Attachment A Modified Draft SA Factors Based on Committee Review Comments on 9/7/11
  - I Approved Minutes of the November 2, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachments:
    - 10/27/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with Attachments:
      - o Updated Version Draft LESA dated October 27, 2011
      - o Champaign County Review of Site Suitability Factors in Rezoning Cases
  - J Approved Minutes of the November 16, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachments:
    - 11/11/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with Attachments:
      - o Attachment A Field Test Notes
      - o Attachment C Field Test Results
      - o Handout 2 Alternative Draft Site Assessment (from 11/16/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
      - o Handout 3 (from 11/16/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - K Approved Minutes of the November 29, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachments:
    - 11/23/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum
  - L Approved Minutes of the December 14, 2011, LESA Update Committee with attachments:
    - 12/06/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with Attachments:
      - o Attachment D Field Test Site Results
      - o Attachment E Proposed Revisions to Draft LESA Update
  - M Approved Minutes of the January 4, 2012, LESA Update Committee with attachments:
    - 12/29/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with Attachments:
      - o Handout (Memorandum) from John Hall, Zoning Administrator (from 1/04/12 LESA Update Committee Meeting)

- N Approved Minutes of the January 25, 2012, LESA Update Committee with attachment:  
- 1/18/12 LESA Update Committee Memorandum
- O Approved Minutes of the February 22, 2012, LESA Update Committee with attachment:  
- 2/10/12 LESA Update Committee Memorandum with attachment:  
o Attachment A The creeping effect. Pages 121 & 122 excerpted from *Land Evaluation and Site Assessment: A Guidebook for Rating Agricultural Lands, Second Edition*. Soil and Water Conservation Society, 1983
- P Draft Minutes of the March 7, 2012, LESA Update Committee with attachment:  
- 2/28/12 LESA Update Committee Memorandum
- Q Versions of the Draft Updated LESA (in notebooks at the tables during ZBA meetings and on the website):
- Updated Version Draft LESA dated October 27, 2011 (an attachment to the 10/27/11 LESA Update Committee Memorandum for the 11/02/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Updated Version Revised Draft LESA dated November 17, 2011 (a handout in a 11/18/11 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 11/29/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Updated Version Revised Draft LESA dated December 5, 2011 (a handout in a 12/06/11 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 12/14/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Strikeout Copy of Updated Version Revised Draft LESA dated December 14, 2011 (a handout at the 12/14/11 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Revised Draft LESA dated December 29, 2011 (a handout in a 12/29/11 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 1/04/12 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Alternate Revised Draft LESA dated December 29, 2011 (a handout in a 12/29/11 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 1/04/12 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Alternate Update Draft LESA dated January 18, 2012, that was an attachment to the January 25, 2012, LESA Update Committee Agenda
  - Strikeout Version of Revised Draft LESA dated February 10, 2012 (a handout in a 2/10/12 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 2/22/12 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
  - Revised Draft LESA dated February 28, 2011 (a handout in a 2/29/12 email from Susan Monte to the LESA Update Committee and a handout at the 3/07/12 LESA Update Committee Meeting)
- R Comparison of Expected Draft LESA Scores For Hypothetical, Large, Non-CUGA. BPF Sites (a handout from the January 25, 2012, LESA Update Committee meeting)
9. Written Statement submitted by Norman Stenzel on August 9, 2012
10. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated August 10, 2012, with attachments:
- A Description of Case from Legal Advertisement
  - B Written statement submitted by Norman Stenzel on August 9, 2012
  - C Comparative score sheet for Thorsland-Haynes property
  - D Map of SA Factor 8 analysis for Thorsland-Haynes property

11. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated August 16, 2012, with attachments:
  - A Comparative score sheet for Seven Sisters Farms
  - B Map of SA Factor 8 analysis for Seven Sisters Farms
  - C Revised Map of SA Factor 8 analysis for Thorsland & Haynes
  
12. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 710-AT-12 dated August 30, 2012, with attachment:
  - A email dated March 7, 2012, from Terry Savko to Susan Monte
  - B Draft Finding of Fact
  
13. Supplemental Memorandum for Case 711-AT-12 dated August 30, 2012, with attachment:
  - A Draft Finding of Fact



**SUMMARY FINDING OF FACT**

From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing conducted on, **June 14, 2012, June 28, 2012, July 12, 2012, July 26, 2012, August 16, 2012, and August 30, 2012**, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

1. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment *IS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE* the Land Resource Management Plan because:
  - A. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment *IS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE* LRMP Goal 4.
  - B. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment will also *HELP ACHIEVE* LRMP Goal 8.
  - C. The proposed Zoning Ordinance text amendment *WILL NOT IMPEDE* the achievement of the other LRMP goals.

**FINAL DETERMINATION**

Pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.2 of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County determines that:

The Zoning Ordinance Amendment requested in Case 710-AT-12 should ***{BE ENACTED / NOT BE ENACTED}*** by the County Board in the form attached hereto.

The foregoing is an accurate and complete record of the Findings and Determination of the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County.

SIGNED:

Eric Thorsland, Chair  
Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals

ATTEST:

Secretary to the Zoning Board of Appeals

Date

{INSERT PROPOSED AMENDMENT HERE}

**CHAMPAIGN COUNTY  
LAND EVALUATION AND SITE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM**

**UPDATE**

**Draft dated March 7, 2012**

**Prepared by the  
Champaign County Regional Planning Commission**



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

### LESA Update Committee Members

- Kevin Donoho
- Debra Griest, Committee Chair
- Elizabeth R. Jones
- Kyle Krapf
- W. Steven Moser
- Patti Petrie
- Steve Stierwalt
- Bruce Stickers
- John Hall, Advisory Committee Member

### Project Staff

Champaign County Regional Planning Commission (CCRPC)  
1776 East Washington Street  
Urbana, IL 61802  
Phone: 217.328.3313  
Website: [www.ccrpc.org](http://www.ccrpc.org)

- Susan Monte, CCRPC Planner and LESA Update Committee Facilitator

### Consultant

Office of Farmland Protection  
Bureau of Land and Water Resources  
Illinois Department of Agriculture

- Terry Savko, Agricultural Land/Water Resource Specialist



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION .....	1
2	LAND EVALUATION .....	3
	LE WORKSHEET.....	4
3	SITE ASSESSMENT.....	6
	SA WORKSHEET.....	8
4	CALCULATING THE TOTAL LESA SCORE .....	20

Tables

- 1 Summary of SA Factors
- 2 Summary of SA Factors and Potential SA Points
  
- A Composition of Agriculture Value Groups (in Appendix A)

Appendices

- A Champaign County LESA Agriculture Value Groups
- B Defined Terms

## INTRODUCTION

The Champaign County Land Evaluation and Site Assessment System (LESA) is a tool designed to provide County officials with a systematic and objective means to numerically rate a site or a parcel in terms of its agricultural importance.

### *Intended Use of LESA*

The LESA is intended for the following applications within Champaign County:

- To assist County officials to evaluate the proposed conversion of farmland on a parcel or site in County rezoning cases that include farmland conversion to a non-agricultural land use.
- To assist in the review state and federal projects for compliance with the Illinois Farmland Preservation Act and the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act in terms of their impact on important farmland.

The Land Evaluation (LE) portion of LESA is additionally intended as a means to determine the 'Best Prime Farmland' designation of a particular site or parcel.

The LESA is one of several tools intended to assist in making land use decisions; it should be used in conjunction with the *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan*, and land use regulations including the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, *Champaign County Subdivision Regulations*, and *Champaign County Stormwater Management Policy*.

### *LESA Score Overview*

The LESA system is a numerical rating system that consists of two separate components: Land Evaluation (LE) and Site Assessment (SA).

The LE portion of LESA is based on the soils properties of a subject site. A single LE score is calculated, with a maximum LE score of 100 points possible.

The SA portion of LESA consists of ten non-soil factors shown in Table 1. Each SA factor identifies a separate and measurable condition. SA Factors 1, 2, and 3 are used to assess the importance of continuing the agricultural use of a site located in any unincorporated area. SA Factors 4 through 10 are additionally used to assess the importance of continuing the agricultural use of a site located outside of the Contiguous Urban Growth Area (CUGA). The maximum SA score possible for a site is 200 points.

Table 1. Summary of SA Factors

Applicable to all subject sites:	
1	size of site
2	Best Prime Farmland designation of site
	if Best Prime Farmland, site size and configuration
	if Prime Farmland, site size and configuration
3	whether site is located within the CUGA <sup>1</sup>
Applicable to sites located outside of the CUGA <sup>1</sup>	
4	percentage of site perimeter adjacent to agriculture principal uses
5	distance from site to nearest municipality
6	largest area of site in agricultural production over past five years
7	area of land zoned rural within one mile
8	area of agriculture principal uses within one mile
9	distance to nearest 10 non-farm dwellings
10	proximity to livestock management facility

Note:

<sup>1</sup> 'CUGA' is an acronym for the 'Contiguous Urban Growth Area'. The CUGA is a feature of the annually updated Land Use Management Area Map of the *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan*. The CUGA is described in the Site Assessment section of LESA.

The total LESA score is the sum of the LE points and SA points for a particular site. The maximum total LESA score possible for a site is 300 points.

The higher the total LESA score, the more highly rated the site is to be protected for continued agricultural use. The total LESA score of a site signifies a rating for protection of a site as follows:

251 – 300	very high rating for protection
226 – 250	high rating for protection
151 – 225	moderate rating for protection
150 or below	low rating for protection

## LAND EVALUATION

The Land Evaluation (LE) portion of LESA is based on the ranking of Champaign County soils according to the following three soils classification systems.

- **Land Capability Classification**

A system of grouping soils developed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). Soils are grouped primarily on the basis of their capability to produce common cultivated crops and pasture plants without deteriorating over a long period of time. A detailed explanation of the Land Capability Classification system is provided in Part 622.02 of the USDA NRCS National Soil Survey Handbook.

- **Farmland Classification**

A soils classification system developed by the USDA NRCS to better manage and maintain the soils resource base of land most suitable for producing food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops. Farmland Classification identifies the soils series map units as: Prime Farmland; Farmland of Statewide Importance; or Farmland of Local Importance. A detailed explanation of the 'Farmland Classification' system, including the definition of Prime Farmland, is provided in Parts 622.03-622.04 of the USDA NRCS National Soil Survey Handbook.

- **Productivity Index of Illinois Soils Under Optimum Management**

The soils productivity index is based on data published in Table S2 of Bulletin 811, developed by the Office of Research, College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC). Bulletin 811 provides crop yields and productivity indices under an optimum level of management used by the top 16% of farmers in Illinois. The crop yields were updated in January, 2011 to reflect growing conditions from 2000 to 2009. Bulletin 811 Year 2011 crop yields and productivity indices for optimum management are maintained at the UIUC Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Sciences.

### ***Agriculture Value Group***

The LE portion of LESA places the soils of Champaign County into several 'Agriculture Value Groups' ranging from the best to the worst, based on the three soils classifications systems indicated above, which generally gauge a site's suitability for crop production based on soil properties. A relative LE value is determined for each Agriculture Value Group, with the best group assigned a relative value of 100 and all other groups assigned lower relative values. Table A in Appendix A contains details regarding the composition of the Agriculture Value Groups.

### ***Calculating a Land Evaluation Score***

The Land Evaluation (LE) score is calculated separately from calculations to determine the Site Assessment (SA) score.

The LE score of a subject site is typically calculated by the Champaign County Champaign County Soil and Water Conservation District office and provided to the Champaign County Zoning Office as part of the Natural Resource Report for a subject site.

## LE WORKSHEET

The LE Worksheet provided on the following page can be used to calculate the LE score for a subject site.

The steps below describe how to calculate an LE score, based on the format of the LE Worksheet:

1. Outline the subject site to be rezoned, and overlay with a Champaign County soils map unit layer. Soils data produced by the National Cooperative Soil Survey is available at the NRCS-operated 'Web Soil Survey.'

Soils data produced by the National Cooperative Soil Survey, and Champaign County parcel data, is available at the Champaign County GIS Consortium website 'GIS Web Map – Public Interface for Champaign County, Illinois.'

2. In Column 1, list both the 'soil map unit' and 'soil series' (e.g., '154A Flanagan') for each soil located on the subject site.
3. From Table A in Appendix A, record the Agriculture Value Group for each soil in Column 2.
4. From Table A in Appendix A, record the LE for each Agriculture Value Group in Column 3.
5. Calculate the acreage of each soil within the subject site. Record the number of acres for each soil in Column 4.
6. For each soil, multiply the LE indicated in Column 3 by the number of acres indicated in Column 4. Record the product in Column 5.
7. Add up the Column 4 acres and record the total. Add up the products shown in Column 5 and record the total.
8. Divide the Column 5 total by the Column 4 total. The result is the LE Score for the subject site.

When calculating an LE score, a score ending in 0.49 or lower should be rounded down to the nearest whole number. A score ending in 0.5 or higher should be rounded up to the next whole number.

The maximum number of LE points possible for any subject site is 100.



LE WORKSHEET

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5
Map Unit Symbol and Soil Series	Agriculture Value Group	Group Relative LE	Acres	Product of Column 3 and Column 4
			Totals:	
				Column 5 total divided by Column 4 total :
				LE Score:

**Example:** A 5.3 acre parcel that has five soil types: 134B Camden, 152A Drummer, 242A Kendall, 3107A Sawmill, and 570C2 Martinsville. Following the steps outlined to calculate the LE, the LE score for this parcel equals 88.

COLUMN 1	COLUMN 2	COLUMN 3	COLUMN 4	COLUMN 5
Map Unit Symbol and Soil Series	Agriculture Value Group	Group Relative LE	Acres	Product of Column 3 and Column 4
242A Kendall	5	88	0.20	17.60
152A Drummer	2	100	0.83	83
570C2 Martinsville	13	75	0.01	0.75
134B Camden	9	83	1.64	136.12
3107A Sawmill	6	87	2.63	228.81
			Totals:	5.31
				466.28
				Column 5 total divided by Column 4 total:
				87.81
				LE Score:
				88

## SITE ASSESSMENT

The Site Assessment (SA) process provides a system for identifying important factors, other than soils, that affect the economic viability of a site for agricultural uses.

### SA Factors

The primary criteria used to identify SA factors are that each factor: 1) be relevant to continued agricultural use of a subject site within the rural areas of Champaign County; and 2) be measurable.

There are 10 SA Factors. Table 2 contains a summary of the 10 SA Factors and the point values assigned to each SA Factor.

Table 2. Summary of SA Factors and Potential SA Points

SA Factors that apply in all areas:		Potential Points		
		Subtotal	Total	
1	size of site	10	90	
2	a) Best Prime Farmland designation of site	30		
	b) if Best Prime Farmland, site size and configuration as of 1/1/2004	10		
	c) if Prime Farmland, site size and configuration as of 4/12/2011			
3	whether site is located within the CUGA <sup>1</sup>	40		90
<b>SA Factors that apply only outside of the CUGA<sup>1</sup></b>				
4	percentage of site perimeter adjacent to agriculture principal uses	20		110
5	distance from site to nearest municipality	15		
6	highest area of site in agricultural production over past five years	15		
7	area of land zoned rural within one mile	10		
8	area of agriculture principal uses within one mile	20		
9	distance to nearest 10 non-farm dwellings	20		
10	proximity to a livestock management facility	10	200	

Note:

<sup>1</sup> 'CUGA' is an acronym for the 'Contiguous Urban Growth Area'.

SA Factors 1, 2 and 3 are applied to all subject sites. SA Factors 4 through 10 are additionally applied to subject sites located outside the Contiguous Urbana Growth Area (CUGA). CUGA is identified in the 'Land Use Management Areas Map' of the *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan* as land designated for non-agricultural land use. The Land Use Management Areas Map is updated annually to reflect accurate municipal boundaries and to reflect any adjustments to the CUGA based on changes to areas served by public sanitary sewer.

The CUGA consists of:

- land designated for urban land use on the future land use map of an adopted municipal comprehensive land use plan, intergovernmental plan or special area plan, and located within the service area of a public sanitary sewer system with existing sewer service or sewer service planned to be available in the near-to mid-term (within approximately five years);
- land to be annexed by a municipality and located within the service area of a public sanitary sewer system with existing sewer service or sewer service planned to be available in the near-to mid-term (within approximately five years); or
- land surrounded by incorporated land or other urban land within the County.

### ***Calculating the SA Score***

The SA score of a subject site is calculated by planning staff of the Champaign County Planning and Zoning Department. The SA scoring is based on review of several sources of information which may typically include:

- Champaign County GIS Consortium data regarding parcels, corporate limits, zoning districts, digital orthophoto, etc.
- 'Land Use Management Map' of *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan*
- field site inspection or windshield survey of site
- landowner interview

Each of the SA factors has point values, ranked on a 'best-to-worst' scale. The point values for each SA Factor are proportionately represented and no interpolation to an intermediate value should occur to obtain an SA Factor score.

The maximum number of possible SA score for a subject site or parcel is 200.

The process of calculating the SA score of a subject site involves: selecting the appropriate point value response for each SA Factor, and then adding the SA Factor points to obtain a total SA score.

The SA Worksheet beginning on the following page contains a description of each SA Factor and scoring instructions for each SA Factor.

SA WORKSHEET

<b>1</b>	What size is the subject site?	More than 25 acres	10 points	_____
		20.1 to 25 acres	8 points	
		15.1 to 20 acres	6 points	
		10.1 to 15 acres	4 points	
		5.01 to 10 acres	2 points	
		Less than 5 acres	0 points	

**Factor 1** considers that the size of the subject site has an impact on its long-term viability for agricultural purposes. The factor recognizes that the predominant row crop form of agriculture is generally more efficiently farmed on larger sites.

**Scoring Factor 1:** Determine the area of the subject site based on current Champaign County Assessor Office tax parcel size data or on a legal description of the subject site.

<b>2a</b>	Is the subject site Best Prime Farmland ?	Yes	30 points	_____
		No	0 points	

**Factor 2a** assigns value to a subject site if it is designated as Best Prime Farmland, consistent with the *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan* goals, objectives and policies.

An estimated 96.6% of the County consists of Prime Farmland soils. "Best Prime Farmland" is a subset of Prime Farmland soils identified by Champaign County in order to differentiate among Prime Farmland soils. The definition of 'Best Prime Farmland' is provided in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

**Scoring Factor 2a:** Refer to the LE score of the subject site and to the "Best Prime Farmland" definition in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

<b>2b</b>	If the subject site is Best Prime Farmland, which one of the following statements is correct:	10 points	_____
	(1) The subject site is no more than 15% of a larger real estate tax parcel (or multiple parcels) that existed on January 1, 2004? (Yes 0 points)		
	(2) The subject site is larger than 15% of a larger real estate tax parcel (or multiple parcels) that existed on January 1, 2004? (Yes 10 points)		
	(3) The subject site was not part of a larger tax parcel or parcels on January 1, 2004, and is not larger than 25 acres. (Yes 0 points)		
	(4) The subject site was not part of a larger tax parcel or parcels on January 1, 2004, and is larger than 25 acres. (Yes 10 points)		

**Factor 2b** assigns value to a subject site if it exceeds the lot size and configuration limits noted. The 15% limit and 25-acre lot size limit featured are arbitrary values selected to represent the general

**Factor 2b** (continued)

concern about the conversion and loss of best prime farmland. The *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance* has included a maximum lot size limit on Best Prime Farmland since July, 2004.

**Scoring Factor 2b:** Review subject site size and configuration based on Champaign County parcel identification tax maps for the year 2004 (also referred to as the 27<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Champaign County tax map atlas).

<p><b>2c</b></p>	<p>If the subject site is not Best Prime Farmland and is at least 51% Prime Farmland, which one of the following statements is correct:</p> <p>(1) The subject site is larger than 25 acres. (Yes 10 points)</p> <p>(2) All of the following statements are true:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The subject site is part of a larger parcel that existed on April 12, 2011.</li> <li>ii. Since April 12, 2011, a separate portion or portions of that larger parcel have been converted to a non-agricultural use as the result of a rezoning or special use.</li> <li>iii. In total, the area of the subject site and those areas converted to a non-agricultural use (as identified in item ii. above) is larger than 25 acres.</li> </ul> <p>(Yes 10 points)</p> <p>(3) Neither (1) or (2) above apply to the subject site. (Yes 0 points)</p>			
------------------	---	--	--	--

**Factor 2c** assigns value to a subject site which is not Best Prime Farmland but which consists of at least 51% Prime Farmland and exceeds a 25-acre lot size and configuration as of April 12, 2011. The 25-acre size threshold is an arbitrary value selected to represent the general concern about the conversion and loss of Prime Farmland.

This factor awards 10 points to a subject site if it would result in conversion of 25 or more acres of Prime Farmland, or if the subject site would cumulatively contribute to the conversion of 25 or more acres of Prime Farmland on a larger parcel existing as of April 12, 2011.

**Scoring Factor 2c:** Assess whether the soils on the subject site are comprised of at least 51% Prime Farmland based on the 'Farmland Classification' column of Table A in Appendix A.

Review the lot size and configuration based on Champaign County parcel identification tax maps and digital orthophotography as of April 12, 2011. (April 12, 2011 is the date of the annual digital orthophotography available for the year 2011.)



<b>3</b>	Is the subject site located within the Contiguous Urban Growth Area?	no	40 points	_____
		yes	0 points	

**Factor 3** is a general measure of development pressures which tend to support the conversion of agricultural sites to urban uses.

The 'Land Use Management Areas Map' of the *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan* specifies the location of the 'Contiguous Urban Growth Area' (CUGA). CUGA is land designated for non-agricultural land use, and consists of:

- land designated for urban land use on the future land use map of an adopted municipal comprehensive land use plan, intergovernmental plan or special area plan, and located within the service area of a public sanitary sewer system with existing sewer service or sewer service planned to be available in the near-to mid-term (within approximately five years);
- land to be annexed by a municipality and located within the service area of a public sanitary sewer system with existing sewer service or sewer service planned to be available in the near-to mid-term (within approximately five years); or
- land surrounded by incorporated land or other urban land within the County.

**Scoring Factor 3:** Review the CUGA boundaries of the current *Champaign County Land Resource Management Plan* "Land Use Management Map".

**If the subject site is located within the CUGA, skip the remaining SA Factor questions and indicate a total SA score for only SA Factors 1, 2 and 3 at the end of the SA Worksheet.**

**Continue to answer the following SA Factor questions only if the subject site is located outside the CUGA ...**

<b>4</b>	<p>Amount of the perimeter of a subject site that is adjacent to parcels with a principal use of agriculture.</p> <p>a) If the subject site is Best Prime Farmland and/or at least 51% Prime Farmland, the amount of the perimeter of the subject site that is adjacent to parcels with a principal use of agriculture that existed on April 12, 2011.</p> <p>b) If the subject site is less than 51% Prime Farmland, the amount of the perimeter of the subject site that is adjacent to parcels with a principal use of agriculture.</p>	<p>91 to 100% of perimeter 81 to 90% of perimeter 71 to 80% of perimeter 61 to 70% of perimeter 51 to 60% of perimeter 41 to 50% of perimeter 31 to 40% of perimeter 21 to 30% of perimeter 11 to 20% of perimeter 1 to 10% of perimeter none</p>	<p>20 points 18 points 16 points 14 points 12 points 10 points 8 points 6 points 4 points 2 points 0 points</p>	
----------	--	---	---	--

**Factor 4** assesses the amount of the perimeter of the subject site that is adjacent to parcels that have the principal use of agriculture. The assessment is made based on principal use of each parcel that is adjacent to the subject site. The principal use of a parcel (as used in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*) represents the main use for which a lot is intended.

Additionally, for a subject site that is Best Prime Farmland and/or at least 51% Prime Farmland, Factor 4 includes the provision to not recognize any adjacent non-agricultural principal use established after a set date of April 12, 2011. (April 12, 2011 is the date of the annual digital orthophotography available for the year 2011.) This measure is intended to partially address the problem referred to as ‘creeping effect’ whereby case-by-case land use decisions may lower LESA scores on nearby sites, thereby justifying more land conversion decisions.

More points are assigned to a subject site that is surrounded by parcels with the principal use of agriculture.

**Scoring Factor 4:** Measure the perimeter of the subject site adjacent to parcels with a principal use of agriculture.

Defined terms relevant to the scoring of this factor include:

**AGRICULTURE:** The growing, harvesting and storing of crops including legumes, hay, grain, fruit and truck or vegetable crops, floriculture, horticulture, mushroom growing, orchards, forestry and the keeping, raising and feeding of livestock or poultry, including dairying, poultry, swine, sheep, beef cattle, pony and horse production, fur farms, and fish and wildlife farms; farm buildings used for growing, harvesting and preparing crop products for market, or for

**Scoring Factor 4** (continued)

use on the farm; roadside stands, farm buildings for storing and protecting farm machinery and equipment from the elements, for housing livestock or poultry and for preparing livestock or poultry products for market; farm dwellings occupied by farm owners, operators, tenants or seasonal or year-round hired farm workers. It is intended by this definition to include within the definition of agriculture all types of agricultural operations, but to exclude therefrom industrial operations such as a grain elevator, canning or slaughterhouse, wherein agricultural products produced primarily by others are stored or processed.

**FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker. (In Champaign County, it is generally assumed that a dwelling located on a lot that is 35 acres or larger is a farm dwelling, unless information provided as part of the public record to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicates otherwise.)

**PRINCIPAL USE:** As used in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, the main purpose for which land is designed, arranged, intended, or for which it is or may be occupied or maintained. (The primary purpose of a lot may not necessarily be the largest use on the lot in terms of the area of the lot that is occupied by that use and it may not necessarily be the use that generates the most income for the person who owns or resides on the lot.)

***Guidelines for measuring perimeter of subject site adjacent to parcels with principal use of agriculture:***

Adjacent property is property that touches or that is directly across a street, highway or interstate right-of-way or a rail road right-of-way from a subject site.

Measure the perimeter of the subject site that is adjacent to parcels that have a principal use of agriculture. Parcels with a principal use of agriculture are generally as follows:

- a. Any parcel that is 35 acres or larger whether or not there is a dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- b. Parcels that are less than 35 acres in area and that either have a farm dwelling or have no dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- c. Exceptions to the above are the following:
  - (1) Any parcel that is inside an incorporated municipality.
  - (2) Any parcel that is zoned Residential, Business, or Industrial on the Champaign County Zoning Map and contains a non-agricultural principal use.
  - (3) Any parcel or portion of a parcel on which a Special Use has been approved by the County except for a Rural Specialty Business or greenhouse.
  - (4) Institutional land that is not specifically used for production agriculture such as land owned by the University of Illinois but not in agricultural production or land owned by the Champaign County Forest Preserve District that is not in agricultural production.
  - (5) Any parcel or portion of a parcel considered as nonconforming use, as defined in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

<b>5</b>	Distance from the subject site to the nearest city or village limits.	more than 3 miles 1.51 to 3 miles within 1.5 miles adjacent	15 points 10 points 5 points 0 points	_____
----------	---	--	--	-------

**Factor 5** awards higher points the further a subject site is from a city or village. Factor 5 is based on the general assumption that the further the subject site is from a municipality, the less chance there is of a nearby land use or development that would conflict with the agricultural land use of that subject site.

**Scoring Factor 5:** Measure outward from the property lines of the subject site to the nearest municipal boundary.

<b>6</b>	The highest percentage of the subject site in agricultural production in any of the last 5 years.	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	

**Factor 6** is intended to serve as a general indicator of the agricultural viability of a subject site.

**Scoring Factor 6:** Based on the most recent five years of annual digital orthophotography, estimate the highest percentage of area of the subject site in agricultural production. To obtain accurate information, the scoring of Factor 6 may additionally require a field site inspection, windshield survey of the subject site, or landowner interview.

Defined terms relevant to the scoring of this factor include:

**AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION:** The growing, harvesting, and storing of crops and the keeping, raising, and feeding of livestock or poultry and the buildings and land used in those activities, including:

- any farm dwelling,
- land taken out of production for purposes of government-sponsored agricultural programs, or
- land being used productively, such as woodlands for which there is a plan for managing the timber.

**FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker. (In Champaign County, it is generally assumed that a dwelling located on a lot that is 35 acres or larger is a farm dwelling, unless information provided as part of the public record to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicates otherwise.)

***Guidelines for estimating percentage of subject site in agricultural production in any of the last 5 years***

Based on review of digital orthophotography of the subject site for the most recent five years,

- a. If there is no structure on the subject site and the subject site appears to be in crop land, then count the entire subject site as in agricultural production.
- b. If only a street or road improvement is present on the subject site, and no wooded area is present on the subject site, then count the entire subject site as in agricultural production.
- c. Unless information is available to indicate otherwise,
  - (1) If the subject site is 35 acres or larger and has both a dwelling and what appears to be crop land, then count the entire site as agricultural production.
  - (2) If the subject site is less than 35 acres and has both a dwelling and what appears to be crop land, then count all of the subject site-- except for one acre, inclusive of the dwelling -- as in agricultural production. The one acre will be assumed to contain the well, septic, system, and any non-agricultural outbuildings.
- d. A part of the subject site that appears not to be crop land may be counted as in agricultural production only provided the landowner indicates that part of the subject site was or is not in production due to participation in a government-sponsored agricultural program, or due to implementation of a crop management plan.

<b>7</b>	Percentage of land zoned AG-1 Agriculture, AG-2 Agriculture or CR Conservation-Recreation within 1 mile of subject site.	91 to 100%	10 points	
		81 to 90%	9 points	
		71 to 80%	8 points	
		61 to 70%	7 points	
		51 to 60%	6 points	
		41 to 50%	5 points	
		31 to 40%	4 points	
		21 to 30%	3 points	
		11 to 20%	2 points	
		1 to 10%	1 points	
none	0 points			

**Factor 7** measures the amount of land in the one-mile area surrounding the subject site zoned AG-1 Agriculture, AG-2 Agriculture, or CR Conservation-Recreation. These are the rural zoning districts within the County.

More points are assigned to a higher percentage of land zoned AG-1, AG-2, or CR within one mile of the subject site because:

- rural zoning districts are intended for agricultural land uses, and
- land within these districts is subject to use restrictions and limits on the density and location of non-agricultural land uses.

**Scoring Factor 7:** Measure the area zoned AG-1, AG-2, and CR outward one mile from the property lines of the subject site.



<b>8</b>	Percentage of area within 1 mile of a subject site which consists of parcels with a principal use of agriculture.  a) If the subject site is Best Prime Farmland and/or at least 51% Prime Farmland,  the percentage of area within one mile of the subject site which consists of parcels with a principal use of agriculture that existed on April 12, 2011.  b) If the subject site is less than 51% Prime Farmland,  the percentage of area within one mile of the subject site which consists of parcels with a principal use of agriculture.	91 to 100%	20 points	
		81 to 90%	18 points	
		71 to 80%	16 points	
		61 to 70%	14 points	
		51 to 60%	12 points	
		41 to 50%	10 points	
		31 to 40%	8 points	
		21 to 30%	6 points	
		11 to 20%	4 points	
		1 to 10%	2 points	
none	0 points			

**Factor 8** is a major indicator of the agricultural character of the general area, based on the assumption that areas in the County dominated by agriculture are generally more viable for farm purposes. The assessment is made based on the principal use of parcels located within one mile of the subject site. The principal use of a parcel (as used in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*) represents the main use for which a lot is intended.

Additionally, for a subject site that is Best Prime Farmland and/or at least 51% Prime Farmland, Factor 8 includes the provision to not recognize any non-agricultural principal use established after a set date of April 12, 2011 within one mile of the subject site except for development that has been annexed by a municipality. (April 12, 2011 is the date of the annual digital orthophotography available for the year 2011.) This measure is intended to partially address the problem referred to as ‘creeping effect’ whereby case-by-case land use decisions may lower LESA scores on nearby sites, thereby justifying more land conversion decisions.

More points are assigned to a subject site with a greater percentage of area within one mile consisting of parcels with the principal use of agriculture.

**Scoring Factor 8:** Estimate the area of land within a one-mile distance outward from the property lines of the subject site that consists of parcels with the principal use of agriculture.

The defined terms shown below generally form the basis on which this factor is scored:

**AGRICULTURE:** The growing, harvesting and storing of crops including legumes, hay, grain, fruit and truck or vegetable crops, floriculture, horticulture, mushroom growing, orchards, forestry and the keeping, raising and feeding of livestock or poultry, including dairying, poultry, swine, sheep, beef cattle, pony and horse production, fur farms, and fish and wildlife farms; farm buildings used for growing, harvesting and preparing crop products for market, or for use on the farm; roadside stands, farm buildings for storing and protecting farm machinery and equipment from the elements, for housing livestock or poultry and for preparing livestock or poultry products for market; farm dwellings occupied by farm owners, operators, tenants or seasonal or year-round hired farm workers. It is intended by this definition to include within the definition of agriculture all types of agricultural operations, but to exclude therefrom industrial operations such as a grain elevator, canning or slaughterhouse, wherein agricultural products produced primarily by others are stored or processed.

**Scoring Factor 8** (continued)

**FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker. (In Champaign County, it is generally assumed that a dwelling located on a lot that is 35 acres or larger is a farm dwelling, unless information provided as part of the public record to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicates otherwise.)

**PRINCIPAL USE:** As used in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, the main purpose for which land is designed, arranged, intended, or for which it is or may be occupied or maintained. (The primary purpose of a lot may not necessarily be the largest use on the lot in terms of the area of the lot that is occupied by that use and it may not necessarily be the use that generates the most income for the person who owns or resides on the lot.)

***Guidelines for estimating area within one mile of subject site consisting of parcels with principal use of agriculture:***

Generally identify parcels with a principal use of agriculture as follows:

- a. Any parcel that is 35 acres or larger whether or not there is a dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- b. Parcels that are less than 35 acres in area and that either have a farm dwelling or have no dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- c. Exceptions to the above are the following:
  - (1) Any parcel that is inside an incorporated municipality.
  - (2) Any parcel that is zoned Residential, Business, or Industrial on the Champaign County Zoning Map and contains a non-agricultural principal use.
  - (3) Any parcel or portion of a parcel on which a Special Use has been approved by the County, except for a Rural Specialty Business or greenhouse.
  - (4) Institutional land that is not specifically used for production agriculture such as land owned by the University of Illinois but not in agricultural production, or land owned by the Champaign County Forest Preserve District that is not in agricultural production.
  - (5) Any parcel or portion of a parcel considered as nonconforming use, as defined in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

<b>9</b>	What is the distance from the subject site to the nearest 10 non-farm dwellings?	more than 1 mile	20 points	
		0.76 to 1 mile	18 points	
		0.51 to 0.75 mile	16 points	
		0.26 to 0.50 mile	14 points	
		0.01 to 0.25 mile	12 points	
		adjacent	0 points	

**Factor 9** considers the proximity of the nearest 10 non-farm dwellings as a general indicator of an existing land use incompatibility with production agriculture and an incompatibility with livestock facilities vis-a-vis the *Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/ et seq.)*

In Champaign County, it is generally assumed that a dwelling located on a lot less than 35 acres is a non-farm dwelling, unless information provided as part of the public record to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicates that a dwelling is part of on-site agricultural operations or otherwise qualifying as a farm dwelling.

The defined term for Non-Farm Dwelling is shown below:

**NON-FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling that is not occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker.

**Scoring Factor 9:** Measure the linear distance outward from the closest point on the property line of the subject site to the façade of the tenth nearest non-farm dwelling.

<b>10</b>	<p>a) How close is the subject site to a known livestock management facility of 400 or more animal units?</p> <p><i>Answer Parts b or c) only if the subject site is more than 1 mile from a known livestock management facility of 400 or more animal units.</i></p>	<p>adjacent to 0.25 mile 10 points                      0.26 to 0.5 mile 9 points                      0.51 to 0.75 mile 8 points                      0.76 to 1 mile 7 points                      more than 1 mile n/a</p>	_____
	<p>b) How close is the subject site to a known livestock management facility of 200 - 399 animal units?</p> <p><i>Answer Part c) only if the subject site is more than 1 mile from a known livestock management facility of 200-399 animal units.</i></p>	<p>adjacent to 0.25 mile 7 points                      0.26 to 0.5 mile 6 points                      0.51 to 0.75 mile 5 points                      0.76 to 1 mile 4 points                      more than 1 mile n/a</p>	
	<p>c) How close is the subject site to a known livestock management facility of 50 – 199 animal units?</p>	<p>adjacent to 0.25 mile 4 points                      0.26 to 0.5 mile 3 points                      0.51 to 0.75 mile 2 points                      0.76 to 1 mile 1 point                      more than 1 mile 0 points</p>	

**Factor 10** is a measure of the compatibility of the subject site for continued agricultural use based on its proximity to an existing nearby livestock management facility. More points are assigned to a subject site in closer proximity to a known livestock management facility.

**Scoring Factor 10:** A response may be based on data available from the Livestock Management Facilities Program, Illinois Department of Agriculture, actual site inspection, and/or landowner interview.

The maximum points possible for this factor is 10 points.

This is a 3-part factor. Part a) measures proximity of a subject site to a livestock management facility of 400 or more animal units. If the subject site is located more than one mile from such facility, then respond to Part b). Part b) measures proximity of a subject site to a livestock management facility of 200-399 animal units. If the subject site is located more than one mile from such facility, then respond to Part c).

<b>SA Total Score</b>	_____
-----------------------	-------

**CALCULATING THE TOTAL LESA SCORE**

The total LESA score is the sum of the LE points and SA points for a particular site or parcel. The maximum total LESA score possible for a site is 300 points.\*

LE Total	_____
SA Total	_____
Total LESA Score	_____

The higher the total LESA score, the more highly rated the subject site or parcel is to be protected for continued agricultural use. The total LESA score of a site signifies a rating for protection of the subject site or parcel as follows:

251 – 300	very high rating for protection
226 – 250	high rating for protection
151 – 225	moderate rating for protection
150 or below	low rating for protection

\* The maximum LE score possible for a site is 100 points.  
The maximum SA score possible for a site is 200 points.

Table A Composition of Agriculture Value Groups

Agriculture Value Group	Relative LE <sup>1</sup>	Land Capability Classification	Farmland Classification	Adjusted Soil Productivity Index <sup>2</sup>	Map Unit Symbol and Soil Series	# Acres Countywide	Percentage of County Land
1	100	1	Prime	98 - 100	154A Flanagan silt loam	100,553	15.74
					198A Elburn silt loam	17,641	2.76
					149A Brenton silt loam	16,465	2.58
2	100	2e, 2w	Prime, Prime1	98 - 100	152A Drummer silty clay loam	254,484	39.82
					679B Blackberry silt loam	4,985	0.78
3	94	1, 2e, 2w	Prime, Prime1	93 - 95	171B Catlin silt loam	17,385	2.72
					153A Pella silty clay loam	6,422	1.01
					623A Kishwaukee silt loam	3,105	0.49
					481A Raub silt loam	22,903	3.58
4	91	1, 2e, 2w	Prime, Prime1	90 - 92	663B Clare silt loam	8,391	1.31
					67A Harpster silty clay loam	2,153	0.34
					234A Sunbury silt loam	2,014	0.32
					56B Dana silt loam	22,838	3.57
					219A Millbrook silt loam	1,454	0.23
					490A Odell silt loam	1,269	0.20
					687B Penfield loam	2,327	0.36
					125A Selma loam	2,908	0.46
					148B2 Proctor silt loam	15	0.002
					232A Ashkum silty clay loam	29,196	4.57
5	88	2e, 2w	Prime, Prime1	87 - 89	206A Thorp silt loam	2,641	0.41
					146A Elliot silt loam	761	0.12
					242A Kendall silt loam	1,441	0.23
					3107A Sawmill silty clay loam	11,080	1.73
6	87	3w	Prime2	87	56B2 Dana silt loam	136	0.02
					330A Peotone silty clay loam	3,744	0.59
7	85	1, 2e, 2w	Prime, Prime1	83 - 86	236A Sabina silt loam	3,011	0.47
					102A La Hogue loam	1,423	0.22
					233B Birbeck silt loam	2,669	0.42
					235A Bryce silty clay	1,623	0.25
					134A Camden silt loam	14	0.002

continued



Table A Composition of Agriculture Value Groups (AVG) continued

Agriculture Value Group	Relative LE <sup>1</sup>	Land Capability Classification	Farmland Classification	Adjusted Soil Productivity Index <sup>2</sup>	Map Unit Symbol and Soil Series	# Acres Countywide	Percentage of County Land
8	84	3e, 3w	Not Prime	89 - 84	637A+ Muskego silty clay loam 687C2 Penfield loam	47 809	0.01 0.13
9	83	2e, 2w, 3w	Prime, Prime3	81 - 83	146B2 Elliott silty clay loam 622B Wyanet silt loam 134B Camdem silt loam 680B Campton silt loam 91A Swygert silty clay loam 146C2 Elliott silty clay loam 291B Xenia silt loam 448B Mona silt loam 3473A Rossburg silt loam	28,484 7,312 1,207 1,651 73 1,485 4,837 245 982	4.46 1.14 0.19 0.26 0.01 0.23 0.76 0.04 0.15
10	79	2e	Prime	78 - 79	387B Ockley silt loam 570B Martinsville silt loam	1,125 708	0.18 0.11
11	78	3e	Statewide Importance	78	622C2 Wyanet silt loam	6,331	1.00
12	76	2e, 3e	Prime	74 - 76	131B Alvin fine sandy loam 223B2 Varna silt loam 91B2 Swygert silty clay loam 150B Onarga sandy loam 223C2 Varna silt loam 91C2 Swygert silty clay loam 530B Ozaukee silt loam 618B Senachwine silt loam	205 8,040 2,791 290 3,116 411 509 269	0.03 1.26 0.44 0.05 0.49 0.06 0.08 0.04
13	75	3e	Statewide Importance	74 - 75	322C2 Russell silt loam 570C2 Martinsville loam	1,930 1,021	0.30 0.16
14	71	2e, 2w, 3w	Prime, Prime1, Prime2	68 - 73	23A Blount silt loam 530C2 Ozaukee silt loam 3302A Ambraw silty clay loam 23B2 Blount silt loam	804 411 2,794 808	0.13 0.06 0.44 0.13

continued

Table A Composition of Agriculture Value Groups (AVG) continued

Agriculture Value Group	Relative LE <sup>1</sup>	Land Capability Classification	Farmland Classification	Adjusted Soil Productivity Index <sup>2</sup>	Map Unit Symbol and Soil Series	# Acres Countywide	Percentage of County Land
15	69	3e	Statewide Importance	69	530D2 Ozaukee silt loam	543	0.09
					618C2 Senachwine silt loam	850	0.13
16	66	4e	Statewide Importance, Not Prime	62 - 69	387C3 Ockley clay loam	301	0.05
					570D2 Martinsville loam	360	0.06
					223D3 Varna silty clay loam	2,826	0.44
					622D3 Wyanet clay loam	357	0.06
					618D2 Senachwine silt loam	632	0.10
					530E2 Ozaukee silt loam	382	0.06
17	50	6e, 7e	Not Prime	37 - 57	618E2 Senachwine silt loam	511	0.08
					618F Senachwine silt loam	398	0.06
					241C3 Chatsworth silty clay	36	0.01
					241D3 Chatsworth silty clay	285	0.05
					533 Urban Land	1,607	0.25
18	n/a	n/a	Not Prime	n/a	802B Orthents loamy undulating	4,290	0.67
					830 Landfill	115	0.02
					865 Gravel Pit	460	0.07
					W Water	1,319	0.21

Table A Notes

1. LE is the weighted, average designated Land Evaluation score assigned to each Agriculture Value Group.
2. The "Adjusted Productivity Index" is derived from Productivity Index data published in Table S2 of Bulletin 811. The Productivity Indices provided in Table S2 are for 0% to 2% slopes and slightly eroded conditions. Productivity indices were adjusted for increasing slope and erosion in accordance with Table S3 of Bulletin 811: "Decimal Adjustments in Crop Yields and Productivity Indices Under an Optimum Level of Management for Various Slope Groups and Erosion Phases."

**DEFINED TERMS**

**AGRICULTURE:** The growing, harvesting and storing of crops including legumes, hay, grain, fruit and truck or vegetable crops, floriculture, horticulture, mushroom growing, orchards, forestry and the keeping, raising and feeding of livestock or poultry, including dairying, poultry, swine, sheep, beef cattle, pony and horse production, fur farms, and fish and wildlife farms; farm buildings used for growing, harvesting and preparing crop products for market, or for use on the farm; roadside stands, farm buildings for storing and protecting farm machinery and equipment from the elements, for housing livestock or poultry and for preparing livestock or poultry products for market; farm dwellings occupied by farm owners, operators, tenants or seasonal or year-round hired farm workers. It is intended by this definition to include within the definition of agriculture all types of agricultural operations, but to exclude therefrom industrial operations such as a grain elevator, canning or slaughterhouse, wherein agricultural products produced primarily by others are stored or processed. Source: *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

The principal use of a parcel (as defined in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*) represents the main use for which a lot is intended. Guidelines for estimating whether a parcel has a principal use of agriculture are generally as follows:

- a. Any parcel that is 35 acres or larger whether or not there is a dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- b. Parcels that are less than 35 acres in area and that either have a farm dwelling or have no dwelling, with the exceptions noted below.
- c. Exceptions to the above are the following:
  - 1) Any parcel that is inside an incorporated municipality.
  - 2) Any parcel that is zoned Residential, Business, or Industrial on the *Champaign County Zoning Map* and contains a non-agricultural principal use.
  - 3) Any parcel or portion of parcels on which a Special Use has been approved by the County, except for a Rural Specialty Business or greenhouse.
  - 4) Institutional property that is not specifically used for production agriculture such as land owned by the University of Illinois but not in agricultural production or land owned by the Champaign County Forest Preserve District that is not in agricultural production.
  - 5) Any parcel or portion of a parcel considered as nonconforming use, as defined in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

**AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION:** The growing, harvesting, and storing of crops and the keeping, raising, and feeding of livestock or poultry and the buildings and land used in those activities, including: any farm dwelling; land taken out of production for purposes of government-sponsored agricultural programs; or land being used productively, such as woodlands for which there is a plan for managing the timber.

**ANIMAL UNITS:** A measure that is based on the number, species and size of an animal. The following table lists for selected species, the size and number of animals multiplied by a specified conversion factor equivalent to 50 animal units:

Species/Size	Conversion Factor	50 Animal Units
Swine over 55 lbs.	0.4	125
Swine under 55 lbs.	0.03	1,667
Dairy	1.4	35
Young dairy stock	0.6	84
Cattle	1.0	50
Sheep, lamb, goats	0.1	500
Horses	2.	25
Turkeys	0.02	2,500
Laying hens or broilers	0.01 – 0.03 *	1,667 -5,000 *
Ducks	0.02	2,500

Source: Livestock Management Facilities Program, Illinois Department of Agriculture

Table Note: \* depends on type of livestock waste handling facility provided

**BEST PRIME FARMLAND:** A subset of Prime Farmland soils identified by the County, and as defined in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*.

**FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker. (In Champaign County, it is generally assumed that a dwelling located on a lot that is 35 acres or larger is a farm dwelling, unless information provided as part of the public record to the Zoning Board of Appeals indicates otherwise.)

**LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT FACILITY:** A 'livestock management facility' is any animal feeding operation, livestock shelter, or on-farm milking and accompanying milk-handling area. A 'livestock waste handling facility' is an immovable structure or device (except sewers) used for collecting, pumping, treating, or disposing of livestock waste or for the recovery of by-products from the livestock waste. Two or more livestock management facilities under common ownership, within ¼ mile of each other, and that share a common livestock waste handling facility are considered a single livestock management facility. (Illinois Livestock Management Facilities Act (510 ILCS 77/et seq.)

**NON-FARM DWELLING:** A dwelling that is not occupied by a farm owner or operator, tenant farm worker, or hired farm worker.

**PRINCIPAL USE:** As used in the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, the main purpose for which land is designed, arranged, intended, or for which it is or may be occupied or maintained. (The primary purpose of a lot may not necessarily be the largest use on the lot in terms of the area of the lot that is occupied by that use and it may not necessarily be the use that generates the most income for the person who owns or resides on the lot.)

**SUBJECT SITE:** The area of a parcel that is proposed for development. As an example, for a zoning case to request a rezoning, the subject site will be the area of the parcel or parcels that is proposed to be rezoned.