

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Substitute Amendment (ASA-AB868)

Received: 02/26/2004

Received By: btradewe

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Alvin Ott (608) 266-5831

By/Representing: Erin

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: btradewe

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Agriculture - animals

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email: Rep.Ott@legis.state.wi.us

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Committee substitute on livestock facility siting

Instructions:

AB 868 plus 03a2317/1 and 03a2394/1

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	btradewe 02/26/2004	kfollett 02/26/2004					
/1			pgreensl 02/26/2004		lnorthro 02/26/2004	lnorthro 02/26/2004	

FE Sent For:

<END>

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Substitute Amendment (ASA-AB868)

Received: 02/26/2004

Received By: btradewe

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Alvin Ott (608) 266-5831

By/Representing: Erin

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: btradewe

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Agriculture - animals

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email: Rep.Ott@legis.state.wi.us

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Committee substitute on livestock facility siting

Instructions:

AB 868 plus 03a2317/1 and 03a2394/1

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?	btradewe	1/1 kjf 2/2/06	2/2/06 PS	2/2/06 PS/kj			
FE Sent For:							
<END>							

Assembly substitute amendment

To **2003 ASSEMBLY BILL 868**

February 19, 2004 - Introduced by Representatives WARD, OTT, GRONEMUS, VRUWINK, GARD, GUNDERSON, HAHN, TOWNS, WEBER, POWERS, PETTIS, OLSEN, VAN ROY, LOEFFELHOLZ, AINSWORTH, KESTELL, SUDER, HUNDERTMARK and NASS, cosponsored by Senators SCHULTZ, BROWN, M. MEYER, HARSDORF, JAUCH, S. FITZGERALD, KANAVAS and ZIEN. Referred to Committee on Agriculture.

Regen

- 1 **AN ACT to create** 15.135 (1), 93.90 and 165.25 (4) (as) of the statutes; **relating**
2 **to:** the siting and expansion of certain livestock facilities, local zoning
3 ordinances relating to livestock facilities, creating a Livestock Facility Siting
4 Review Board, and granting rule-making authority.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Livestock facility siting and expansion

This bill relates to siting and expanding livestock facilities. A livestock facility is a feedlot or other facility where animals used to produce food, fiber, or other animal products are kept, except that pastures and aquaculture facilities are not livestock facilities. Some of the provisions of the bill depend on the size of a new or expanded livestock facility, measured by animal units. An animal unit is a measure related to the amount of waste produced by different kinds of animals. A beef steer is one animal unit, while a sow is 0.4 animal unit, and a turkey is 0.018 animal unit.

Standards for siting and expansion

The bill requires the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) to specify, by rule, standards for siting and expanding livestock facilities. The bill authorizes DATCP to incorporate existing rules related to soil and water conservation, animal waste management, and nonpoint source water pollution control into the new rules. The bill requires DATCP to review the rules at least once every four years and to get the advice of a committee of experts on the initial rules and on the review of the rules.

Analysis
insert

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

The bill prohibits a city, village, town, or county (political subdivision) from disapproving or prohibiting a livestock facility from being sited or expanded unless at least one of the following conditions applies:

1. The site is located in a zoning district that is not agricultural.
2. The site is located in an agricultural zoning district in which the livestock facility is prohibited.
3. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a state standard promulgated by DATCP under the bill that is incorporated in the political subdivision's ordinances.
4. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a local requirement that is more stringent than a state standard if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on scientific findings of fact that show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.
5. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a local setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement in the state standards.
6. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500 animal units, but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or conditional use permit that the political subdivision adopted before July 19, 2003, and violates a state standard promulgated by DATCP under the bill that is incorporated in the political subdivision's ordinances.
7. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500 animal units, but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or conditional use permit that the political subdivision adopted before July 19, 2003, and violates a local requirement that is more stringent than a state standard if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on scientific findings of fact that show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.
8. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500 animal units, but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or conditional use permit that the political subdivision adopted before July 19, 2003, and violates a local setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement in the state standards.
9. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates a shoreland, construction site erosion control and stormwater management, or floodplain zoning ordinance.
10. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates a state or local building or sanitary code or other generally applicable ordinance.

The bill provides that a political subdivision may not prohibit a type of livestock facility in an agricultural zoning district based on number of animal units if smaller facilities of the same type are allowed in the district, unless the political subdivision also has an agricultural zoning district in which that type of facility is allowed

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

without respect to size. The bill also prohibits a political subdivision from enacting or enforcing a zoning ordinance with a category of agricultural district in which livestock facilities are prohibited unless the political subdivision bases the prohibition on findings of fact related to health and safety.

Conditions for conditional use permits

The bill provides generally that if a political subdivision requires a conditional use permit for the siting or expansion of certain livestock facilities it must require compliance with the applicable state standards as a condition of issuing the conditional use permit. The livestock facilities to which this requirement applies are those that will have more than 500 animal units and those that will have fewer than 500 animal units but that will exceed a size threshold for obtaining a conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's ordinances before July 19, 2003. A political subdivision may condition the issuance of the permit on a local setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement in the state standards. A political subdivision may apply a more stringent requirement than the state standards if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on scientific findings of fact that show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.

Political subdivision procedure

The bill requires that, within 45 days after a person applies to site or expand a livestock facility, the political subdivision notify the applicant whether the application is complete and, if not, what additional information is needed to complete the application. A political subdivision is required to make a record of its decision making on an application, including a recording of any hearing held on the application. The bill requires the political subdivision to base its decision on an application to site or expand a livestock facility on written findings of fact and to make its decision within 90 days after the application is complete, although this period may be extended for good cause.

Review of siting decisions

The bill creates a livestock facility siting review board (LFSRB) with members appointed by the secretary of agriculture, trade and consumer protection, with the advice and consent of the state senate. An aggrieved person may challenge the decision of a political subdivision on an application for approval of a livestock facility siting or expansion on the grounds that the political subdivision incorrectly applied the state standards promulgated by DATCP that are applicable to the siting or expansion or that the political subdivision violated the provisions described above related to siting and expansion of livestock facilities, by requesting LFSRB to review the decision. An aggrieved person is a person who applied for approval of a livestock facility siting or expansion, a person who lives within two miles of the proposed livestock facility site, or a person who owns land within two miles of the site.

LFSRB determines whether the challenge is valid based on the evidence in the record made by the political subdivision. An aggrieved person may appeal LFSRB's decision to circuit court and the court also reviews the decision based on the evidence

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

in the record made by the political subdivision. The bill requires the Department of Justice to represent LFSRB in any appeal.

For further information see the *state and local* fiscal estimate, which will be printed as an appendix to this bill.

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. 15.135 (1) of the statutes is created to read:

15.135 (1) LIVESTOCK FACILITY SITING REVIEW BOARD. (a) There is created a livestock facility siting review board which is attached to the department of agriculture, trade and consumer protection under s. 15.03. The board consists of the following members:

1. A member representing the interests of towns, selected from a list of names submitted by the Wisconsin Towns Association.

2. A member representing the interests of counties, selected from a list of names submitted by the Wisconsin Counties Association.

3. A member representing environmental interests, selected from a list of names submitted by environmental organizations.

4. A member representing livestock farming interests, selected from a list of names submitted by statewide agricultural organizations.

5. ^{Three} ~~One~~ other members

(b) The members under par. (a) shall be nominated by the secretary of agriculture, trade and consumer protection, and with the advice and consent of the senate appointed, for 5-year terms.

SECTION 2. 93.90 of the statutes is created to read:

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 **93.90 Livestock facility siting and expansion.** (1) This section is an
2 enactment of statewide concern for the purpose of providing uniform regulation of
3 livestock facilities.

4 **(1m) DEFINITIONS.** In this section:

5 (a) "Animal unit" has the meaning given in s. NR 243.03 (3), Wis. Adm. Code.

6 (b) "Application for approval" means an application for approval of a livestock
7 facility siting or expansion.

8 (c) "Board" means the livestock facility siting review board.

9 (d) "Expansion" means an increase in the number of animals fed, confined,
10 maintained, or stabled.

11 (e) "Livestock facility" means a feedlot or facility, other than a pasture, where
12 animals used in the production of food, fiber, or other animal products are or will be
13 fed, confined, maintained, or stabled for a total of 45 days or more in any 12-month
14 period. "Livestock facility" does not include an aquaculture facility.

15 (f) "Political subdivision" means a city, village, town, or county.

16 **(2) DEPARTMENT DUTIES.** (a) For the purposes of this section, the department
17 shall promulgate rules specifying standards for siting and expanding livestock
18 facilities. In promulgating the rules, the department may incorporate by
19 cross-reference provisions contained in rules promulgated under ss. 92.05 (3) (c) and
20 (k), 92.14 (8), 92.16, and 281.16 (3) and ch. 283. The department may not promulgate
21 rules under this paragraph that conflict with rules promulgated under s. 92.05 (3)
22 (c) or (k), 92.14 (8), 92.16, or 281.16 (3) or ch. 283.

23 (b) In promulgating rules under par. (a), the department shall consider
24 whether the proposed standards, other than those incorporated by cross-reference,
25 are all of the following:

Insert →
5-25

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1

1. Practical and workable.

2

2. Cost-effective.

3

3. Objective.

4

4. Based on available scientific information that has been subjected to peer review.

5

6

5. Designed to promote the ^{growth and} long-term viability of animal agriculture in this state.

7

8

6. Designed to balance the economic viability of farm operations with protecting natural resources and other community interests.

9

10

7. Usable by officials of political subdivisions.

11

(c) The department shall review rules promulgated under par. (a) at least once every 4 years.

12

13

(d) The secretary shall appoint a committee of experts to advise the department on the promulgation of the rules under par. (a) and on the review of rules under par.

14

15

(c).

16

(e) In addition to the rules under par. (a), the department shall promulgate rules that do all of the following:

17

18

1. Specify the information and documentation that must be provided in an application for approval in order to demonstrate that a livestock facility siting or expansion complies with applicable state standards under sub. (2) (a).

19

20

21

2. Specify the information and documentation that must be included in a record of decision making under sub. (4) (b).

22

23

(3) POLITICAL SUBDIVISION AUTHORITY. (a) Notwithstanding ss. 33.455, 59.03 (2) (a), 59.69, 60.10 (2) (i), 60.61, 60.62, 61.34 (1), 61.35, 62.11 (5), 62.23, 66.0415, 92.07

24

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

(2), 92.11, and 92.15 (3) (a), a political subdivision may not disapprove or prohibit a livestock facility siting or expansion unless at least one of the following applies:

1. The site is located in a zoning district that is not an agricultural zoning district.

2. The site is located in an agricultural zoning district in which the proposed new or expanded livestock facility is prohibited, subject to pars. (b) and (c).

3. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates an ordinance adopted under s. 59.692, 59.693, 60.627, 61.351, 61.354, 62.231, 62.234, or 87.30.

4. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates ^{Insert 7-9} a state or political subdivision ~~building or sanitary code or other generally applicable ordinance.~~

5. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a state standard under sub. (2) (a) ~~that is incorporated in the political subdivision's ordinances.~~

6. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a requirement that is more stringent than the state standards under sub. (2) (a) if the political subdivision does all of the following:

a. Adopts the requirement by ordinance before the applicant files the application for approval.

b. Bases the requirement on ^{Insert 7-19} ~~scientific~~ findings of fact, adopted by the political subdivision, that ^{clearly} show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.

7. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement under sub. (2) (a) if the setback requirement is incorporated in the political subdivision's ordinances as a numerical standard.

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 8. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500
 2 animal units but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or
 3 conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's
 4 ordinances before July 19, 2003, and the proposed new or expanded livestock facility
 5 violates a state standard under sub. (2) (a) ~~that is incorporated in the political~~
 6 ~~subdivision's ordinance.~~

7 9. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500
 8 animal units but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or
 9 conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's
 10 ordinances before July 19, 2003, and the proposed new or expanded livestock facility
 11 violates a requirement that is more stringent than the state standards under sub.
 12 (2) (a) if the political subdivision does all of the following:

13 a. Adopts the requirement by ordinance before the applicant files the
 14 application for approval.

15 b. Bases the requirement on ~~scientific~~ findings of fact, adopted by the political
 16 subdivision, that ^{clearly} show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or
 17 safety.

Insert 8-15

18 10. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500
 19 animal units but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or
 20 conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's
 21 ordinances before July 19, 2003, and the proposed new or expanded livestock facility
 22 violates a setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement
 23 under sub. (2) (a), if the setback requirement is incorporated in the political
 24 subdivision's ordinances as a numerical standard.

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 (ae) A political subdivision that requires a special exception or conditional use
2 permit for the siting or expansion of any of the following livestock facilities shall
3 require compliance with the applicable state standards under sub. (2) (a) as a
4 condition of issuing the special exception or conditional use permit:

5 1. A new or expanded livestock facility that will have 500 or more animal units.

6 2. A new or expanded livestock facility that will have fewer than 500 animal
7 units but that will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or
8 conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's
9 ordinances before July 19, 2003.

10 (am) Notwithstanding par. (ae), a political subdivision may apply to a new or
11 expanded livestock facility described in par. (ae) 1. or 2., as a condition of issuing a
12 special exception or conditional use permit, a setback requirement that is less
13 stringent than a setback requirement under sub. (2) (a) if the setback requirement
14 is incorporated in the political subdivision's ordinances as a numerical standard.

15 (ar) Notwithstanding par. (ae) a political subdivision may apply to a new or
16 expanded livestock facility described in par. (ae) 1. or 2., as a condition of issuing a
17 special exception or conditional use permit, a requirement that is more stringent
18 than the state standards under sub. (2) (a) if the political subdivision does all of the
19 following:

20 1. Adopts the requirement by ordinance before the applicant files the
21 application for approval.

22 2. Bases the requirement on ~~scientific~~ ^{Insert 9-22} findings of fact, adopted by the political
23 subdivision, that ^{clearly} show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or
24 safety.

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 (b) Notwithstanding ss. 59.69, 60.61, 60.62, 61.35, and 62.23, a political
2 subdivision may not prohibit a type of livestock facility in an agricultural zoning
3 district based on number of animal units if livestock facilities of that type with fewer
4 animal units are allowed in that zoning district, unless the political subdivision also
5 has an agricultural zoning district in which livestock facilities of that type are
6 permitted or conditional uses without respect to number of animal units.

7 (c) Notwithstanding ss. 59.69, 60.61, 60.62, 61.35, and 62.23, a political
8 subdivision may not enact or enforce a zoning ordinance with a category of
9 agricultural district in which livestock facilities are prohibited unless the political
10 subdivision bases that prohibition on ^{Insert 10-10} ~~findings of fact related to health and safety~~
11 ~~adopted by the governing body of the political subdivision.~~

12 (d) Notwithstanding ss. 92.15 (4) and 281.16 (3) (e), a political subdivision that
13 requires compliance with state standards under sub. (2) (a) as a condition of issuing
14 a special exception or conditional use permit for an expanded livestock facility is not
15 required to determine that cost-sharing is available to the operator of the livestock
16 facility for facilities or practices needed to comply with those standards. ^{Insert 10-16-A}

^{Insert 10-16-B} 17 (4) POLITICAL SUBDIVISION PROCEDURE. (a) No later than 45 days after a political
18 subdivision receives an application for approval, the political subdivision shall notify
19 the applicant whether the application for approval is complete and, if it is not
20 complete, what information is needed to complete the application for approval. As
21 soon as the applicant has provided all of the required information, the political
22 subdivision shall notify the applicant that the application for approval is complete.

23 (b) A political subdivision shall make a record of its decision making on an
24 application for approval, including a recording of any public hearing, copies of

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 documents submitted at any public hearing, and copies of any other documents
2 provided to the political subdivision in connection with the application for approval.

3 (c) A political subdivision shall base its decision on an application for approval
4 on written findings of fact that are supported by the evidence in the record under par.
5 (b).

6 (d) Except as provided in par. (e), a political subdivision shall approve or
7 disapprove an application for approval no more than 90 days after the day on which
8 it notifies the applicant that the application for approval is complete. If an applicant
9 complies with the rules promulgated under sub. (2) (e) 1. and the information and
10 documentation provided by the applicant is sufficient to establish, without
11 considering any other information or documentation, that the application complies
12 with applicable requirements for approval, the political subdivision shall approve
13 the application unless the political subdivision finds, based on other clear and
14 convincing information or documentation in the record, that the application does not
15 comply with applicable requirements.

16 (e) A political subdivision may extend the time limit in par. (d) if the political
17 subdivision needs additional information to determine whether to approve or deny
18 the application for approval, if the applicant makes a material modification to the
19 application for approval, or for other good cause specified in writing by the political
20 subdivision.

21 (5) REVIEW OF SITING DECISIONS. (a) In this subsection "aggrieved person" means
22 a person who applied to a political subdivision for approval of a livestock facility
23 siting or expansion, a person who lives within 2 miles of ~~the site at which~~
24 ^{that} facility is proposed to be sited or expanded, or a person who owns land within 2 miles
25 of ~~the site at which a livestock facility is proposed to be sited or expanded~~

Insert 11-25
per

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

SECTION 2

1 (b) An aggrieved person may challenge the decision of a political subdivision
 2 on an application for approval on the grounds that the political subdivision
 3 incorrectly applied the state standards under sub. (2) (a) that are applicable to the
 4 livestock facility siting or expansion or violated sub. (3), by requesting the board to
 5 review the decision. An aggrieved person is not required to exhaust the political
 6 subdivision's administrative remedies before requesting review by the board. An
 7 aggrieved person shall request a review under this paragraph within 30 days after
 8 the political subdivision approves or disapproves the application for approval or, if
 9 the aggrieved person chooses to exhaust the political subdivision's administrative
 10 remedies, within 30 days after the final decision in the political subdivision's
 11 administrative review process.

INSET 12-11
 12 (c) Upon receiving ~~a request under par. (b)~~ *INSET 12-12* the board shall determine whether
 13 the challenge is valid. The board shall make its decision without deference to the
 14 decision of the political subdivision and shall base its decision only on the evidence
 15 in the record under sub. (4) (b). In a case that involves the application of
 16 requirements related to water quality, the board shall consult with the department
 17 of agriculture, trade and consumer protection or with the department of natural
 18 resources concerning the application of the requirements related to water quality. *INSET 12-18*

19 (d) If the board determines that a challenge is valid, the board shall reverse the
 20 decision of the political subdivision. The decision of the board is binding on the
 21 political subdivision, subject to par. (e). If a political subdivision fails to comply with
 22 a decision of the board that has not been appealed under par. (e), an aggrieved person
 23 may bring an action to enforce the decision.

24 (e) An aggrieved person or the political subdivision may appeal the decision of
 25 the board to circuit court. The filing of an appeal does not *in itself* stay the effect of a decision

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 of the board that the application for approval of a livestock facility siting or expansion
2 complies with the state standards under sub. (2) (a).

3 (f) A circuit court to which a decision of the board is appealed under par. (e) shall
4 review the decision of the board based on the evidence in the record under sub. (4)
5 (b).

6 **SECTION 3.** 165.25 (4) (as) of the statutes is created to read:

7 165.25 (4) (as) The department of justice shall furnish legal services to the
8 livestock facility siting review board in defending appeals under s. 93.90 (5) (e) of
9 decisions of the board.

10 **SECTION 4. Nonstatutory provisions.**

11 (1) PROPOSED RULES. The department of agriculture, trade and consumer
12 protection shall submit in proposed form the rules required under section 93.90 (2)
13 (a) and (e) of the statutes, as created by this act, to the legislative council staff under
14 section 227.15 (1) of the statutes no later than the first day of the 12th month
15 beginning after the effective date of this subsection.

16 (2) TERMS OF INITIAL BOARD MEMBERS. Notwithstanding the length of the terms
17 specified for members of the livestock facility siting review board in section 15.135
18 (1) (b) of the statutes, as created by this act, the initial members shall be appointed
19 for the following terms:

20 (a) The member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 1. of the statutes, as
21 created by this act, for a term expiring on May 1, 2007.

22 (b) The member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 2. of the statutes, as
23 created by this act, for a term expiring on May 1, 2008.

24 (c) The member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 3. of the statutes, as
25 ~~created by this act, for a term expiring on May 1, 2009~~

Insert 13-25

ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 (d) The member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 4. of the statutes, as
2 ~~created by this act, for a term expiring on May 1, 2010.~~

Insert 14-2

3 (e) ^{One} ~~The~~ member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 5. of the statutes, as
4 created by this act, for a term expiring on May 1, 2011.

SECTION 5. Initial applicability.

6 (1) The treatment of section 93.90 of the statutes first applies to applications
7 for approval of livestock facility siting or expansion that are received on the effective
8 date of this subsection.

9 **SECTION 6. Effective dates.** This act takes effect on the day after publication,
10 except as follows:

11 (1) The treatment of section 93.90 of the statutes and SECTION 5 (1) takes effect
12 on the first day of the 18th month beginning after publication.

13 (END)

Analysis Insert

**ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT ,
TO 2003 ASSEMBLY BILL 868**

1 AN ACT *to create* 15.135 (1), 93.90 and 165.25 (4) (as) of the statutes; **relating**
2 **to:** the siting and expansion of certain livestock facilities, local zoning
3 ordinances relating to livestock facilities, creating a Livestock Facility Siting
4 Review Board, and granting rule-making authority.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

Livestock facility siting and expansion

This substitute amendment relates to siting and expanding livestock facilities. A livestock facility is a feedlot or other facility where animals used to produce food, fiber, or other animal products are kept, except that pastures and aquaculture facilities are not livestock facilities. Some of the provisions of the substitute amendment depend on the size of a new or expanded livestock facility, measured by animal units. An animal unit is a measure related to the amount of waste produced by different kinds of animals. A beef steer is one animal unit, while a sow is 0.4 animal unit, and a turkey is 0.018 animal unit.

Standards for siting and expansion

The substitute amendment requires the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) to specify, by rule, standards for siting and expanding livestock facilities. The substitute amendment authorizes DATCP to incorporate existing rules related to soil and water conservation, animal waste management, and

Analysis Insert

4

nonpoint source water pollution control into the new rules. The substitute amendment requires DATCP to review the rules at least once every four years and to get the advice of a committee of experts on the initial rules and on the review of the rules.

The substitute amendment prohibits a city, village, town, or county (political subdivision) from disapproving or prohibiting a livestock facility from being sited or expanded unless at least one of the following conditions applies:

1. The site is located in a zoning district that is not agricultural.
2. The site is located in an agricultural zoning district in which the livestock facility is prohibited.
3. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a state standard promulgated by DATCP under the substitute amendment.
4. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have 500 or more animal units and violates a local requirement that is more stringent than a state standard if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on reasonable and scientifically defensible findings of fact that clearly show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.
6. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500 animal units, but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or conditional use permit that the political subdivision adopted before July 19, 2003, and violates a state standard promulgated by DATCP under the substitute amendment.
7. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility will have fewer than 500 animal units, but will exceed a size threshold for requiring a special exception or conditional use permit that the political subdivision adopted before July 19, 2003, and violates a local requirement that is more stringent than a state standard if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on reasonable and scientifically defensible scientific findings of fact that clearly show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.
9. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates a shoreland, construction site erosion control and stormwater management, or floodplain zoning ordinance.
10. The proposed new or expanded livestock facility violates a building, electrical, or plumbing code that is consistent with a state code.

The substitute amendment provides that a political subdivision may not prohibit a type of livestock facility in an agricultural zoning district based on number of animal units if smaller facilities of the same type are allowed in the district, unless the political subdivision also has an agricultural zoning district in which that type of facility is allowed without respect to size. The substitute amendment also prohibits a political subdivision from enacting or enforcing a zoning ordinance with a category of agricultural district in which livestock facilities are prohibited unless the political subdivision bases the prohibition on reasonable and scientifically

↓

defensible findings of fact that clearly show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.

Conditions for conditional use permits

The substitute amendment provides generally that if a political subdivision requires a conditional use permit for the siting or expansion of certain livestock facilities it must require compliance with the applicable state standards as a condition of issuing the conditional use permit. The livestock facilities to which this requirement applies are those that will have more than 500 animal units and those that will have fewer than 500 animal units but that will exceed a size threshold for obtaining a conditional use permit that was incorporated into the political subdivision's ordinances before July 19, 2003. A political subdivision may condition the issuance of the permit on a local setback requirement that is less stringent than a setback requirement in the state standards. A political subdivision may apply a more stringent requirement than the state standards if the political subdivision adopts the requirement by ordinance before the operator asks for approval of the siting or expansion and bases the requirement on reasonable and scientifically defensible findings of fact that clearly show that the requirement is necessary to protect public health or safety.

The substitute amendment also prohibits a political subdivision from enacting a requirement that a person obtain a conditional use permit for the expansion of a livestock facility that exists when the requirement takes effect, except that a political subdivision may enact such a requirement if the requirement applies only when the number of animal units that the livestock facility will have after expansion exceeds by more than 20 percent the number of animal units that the livestock facility has before expansion.

Political subdivision procedure

The substitute amendment requires that, within 45 days after a person applies to site or expand a livestock facility, the political subdivision notify the applicant whether the application is complete and, if not, what additional information is needed to complete the application. A political subdivision is required to make a record of its decision making on an application, including a recording of any hearing held on the application. The substitute amendment requires the political subdivision to base its decision on an application to site or expand a livestock facility on written findings of fact and to make its decision within 90 days after the application is complete, although this period may be extended for good cause.

Review of siting decisions

The substitute amendment creates a livestock facility siting review board (LFSRB) with members appointed by the secretary of agriculture, trade and consumer protection, with the advice and consent of the state senate. An aggrieved person may challenge the decision of a political subdivision on an application for approval of a livestock facility siting or expansion on the grounds that the political subdivision incorrectly applied the state standards promulgated by DATCP that are applicable to the siting or expansion or that the political subdivision violated the provisions described above related to siting and expansion of livestock facilities, by requesting LFSRB to review the decision. An aggrieved person is a person who



LFSRB must make its

decision within 60 days of receiving a copy of the record from the political subdivision, although this period may be extended for good cause.

A

applied for approval of a livestock facility siting or expansion, a person who lives within two miles of the proposed livestock facility ~~AND~~ or a person who owns land within two miles of the ~~site of~~ proposed livestock facility

LFSRB determines whether the challenge is valid based on the evidence in the record made by the political subdivision. An aggrieved person may appeal LFSRB's decision to circuit court and the court also reviews the decision based on the evidence in the record made by the political subdivision. The substitute amendment requires the Department of Justice to represent LFSRB in any appeal.

end of analysis must

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

1 SECTION 1. 15.135 (1) of the statutes is created to read:

2 15.135 (1) LIVESTOCK FACILITY SITING REVIEW BOARD. (a) There is created a
3 livestock facility siting review board which is attached to the department of
4 agriculture, trade and consumer protection under s. 15.03. The board consists of the
5 following members:

6 1. A member representing the interests of towns, selected from a list of names
7 submitted by the Wisconsin Towns Association.

8 2. A member representing the interests of counties, selected from a list of
9 names submitted by the Wisconsin Counties Association.

10 3. A member representing environmental interests, selected from a list of
11 names submitted by environmental organizations.

12 4. A member representing livestock farming interests, selected from a list of
13 names submitted by statewide agricultural organizations.

14 5. Three other members.

15 (b) The members under par. (a) shall be nominated by the secretary of
16 agriculture, trade and consumer protection, and with the advice and consent of the
17 senate appointed, for 5-year terms.

18 SECTION 2. 93.90 of the statutes is created to read:

ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT,
TO 2003 ASSEMBLY BILL 868

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 ✓1. Page 4, line 14: delete that line and substitute:

3 "5. Three other members."

4 ✓2. Page 5, line 25: after that line insert:

Insert 15-25
5 ✓1. Protective of public health or safety. *12*

6 ✓3. Page 6, line 1: substitute "1m." for "1."

7 ✓4. Page 6, line ⁵6: delete "long-term" and substitute "growth and".

8 ✓5. Page 7, line 9: delete the material beginning with "state" and ending with

9 "ordinance" on line 10 and substitute ¹building, electrical, or plumbing code that is

Insert 7-9
10 consistent with the state building, electrical, or plumbing code for that type of

11 facility. *2*

12 ✓6. Page 7, line 12: delete the material beginning with "that" and ending with

13 "ordinances" on line 13.

Insert 7-19

1 ✓7. Page 7, line 19: delete "scientific" and substitute "reasonable and
2 → scientifically defensible"

3 ✓8. Page 7, line 20: before "show" insert "clearly".

4 ✓9. Page 7, line 22: delete lines 22 to 25.

5 ✓10. Page 8, line 5: delete the material beginning with "that" and ending with
6 "ordinances" on line 6.

7 ✓11. Page 8, line 15: delete "scientific" and substitute "reasonable and
8 scientifically defensible"

Insert 8-15

9 ✓12. Page 8, line 16: before "show" insert "clearly".

10 ✓13. Page 8, line 18: delete lines 18 to 24.

11 ✓14. Page 9, line 22: delete "scientific" and substitute "reasonable and
12 scientifically defensible"

Insert 9-22

13 ✓15. Page 9, line 23: before "show" insert "clearly".

14 ✓16. Page 10, line 10: delete the material beginning with "findings" and ending
15 with "subdivision" on line 11 and substitute "reasonable and scientifically defensible
16 findings of fact, adopted by the political subdivision, that clearly show that the
17 prohibition is necessary to protect public health or safety"

Insert 10-10

18 ✓17. Page 10, line 16: after "standards" insert "if the livestock facility will have
19 500 or more animal units"

Insert 10-16-A

20 ✓18. Page 10, line 16: after that line insert:

21 (e) Notwithstanding ss. 59.69, 60.61, 60.62, 61.35, and 62.23, a political
22 subdivision may not enact a requirement that a person obtain a special exception or
23 conditional use permit for the expansion of a livestock facility that exists when the

Insert 10-23 16-B



1 requirement takes effect, except that a political subdivision may enact a requirement
 2 that a person obtain a special exception or conditional use permit for the expansion
 3 of a livestock facility that exists when the requirement takes effect if the requirement
 4 applies only when the number of animal units that the livestock facility will have
 5 after expansion will exceed by more than 20 percent the largest number of animal
 6 units that were at the livestock facility for at least 90 days in the 12-month period
 7 before the requirement takes effect.

8 (f) For the purposes of this subsection, the number of animal units that a
 9 livestock facility will have is the largest number of animal units that will be fed,
 10 confined, maintained, or stabled at the livestock facility on at least 90 days in any
 11 12-month period.

end of insert
10-16-13

12 ✓19. Page 11, line 23: delete "the site at which".

13 ✓20. Page 11, line 24: after "facility" insert "that".

14 ✓21. Page 11, line 25: delete that line and substitute "of a livestock facility that
 15 is proposed to be sited or expanded."

Insert 11-25

16 ✓22. Page 12, line 11: after that line insert:

17 (bm) Upon receiving a request under par. (b), the board shall notify the
 18 political subdivision of the request. The political subdivision shall provide a certified
 19 copy of the record under sub. (4) to the board within 30 days after the day on which
 20 it receives the notice.

Insert 12-11

Insert 12-12

21 ✓23. Page 12, line 12: delete "a request under par. (b)" and substitute "the
 22 certified copy of the record under par. (bm)."

23 ✓24. Page 12, line 18: after "quality." insert "The board shall make its decision
 24 within 60 days after the day on which it receives the certified copy of the record under

Insert 12-18



1 par. (bm), except that the board may extend this time limit for good cause specified
2 in writing by the board.

3 **✓25.** Page 13, line 25: delete that line and substitute "created by this act, and
Inclt one member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 5. of the statutes, as created by
13-25 this act, for terms expiring on May 1, 2009.

6 **✓26.** Page 14, line 2: delete that line and substitute "created by this act, and
Inclt one member appointed under section 15.135 (1) (a) 5. of the statutes, as created by
14-28 this act, for terms expiring on May 1, 2010.

9 **✓27.** Page 14, line 3: substitute "One member" for "The member".

10

(END)