

FINAL MINUTES

North Mendota FUDA Steering Committee

December 16, 2011 Council Chambers, City Hall, 7426 Hubbard Avenue, Middleton WI 8:00 a.m.

Present: Jan Barman, Tom Liebe, Derek Hungness, Mark Trotter, Gary Hertzberg, Duane Barmore

Staff Present: Bridgit Van Belleghem, Dan McAuliffe, Jason Granberg, Eileen Kelley, Tom Wilson, Abby Attoun, Mark Roffers

Also Present: Elliot Long, Jon Becker, Caryl Terrell, Dawn Myer, James Piper

Absent: Ken Sipsma, Don Hoffman

1. Introductions

Mr. Liebe, co-chair, chairs the meeting. The meeting convenes at 8:05 am. In reviewing the agenda, the committee approved to remove the CommunityViz demonstration from the agenda. Briefly, Mr. McAuliffe explained that CommunityViz is a computer-based tool to build scenarios using GIS layers and data, and allows us to compare impacts, such as population proximity of housing units to amenities, for various scenarios

2. Review of the minutes from the November 18, 2011 meeting

Mr. Barmore motions to approve the minutes. Mr. Hungness seconds. Motion carries.

3. Public Comment

Mr. Jon Becker asked staff to add historical and current springs. Staff responded that they could do this. CRANES request for scenarios of affordability benefits per household in 2035 and a similar analysis out to 2050. The MPO projects out to 2060 and this can be applied here. Finally, he reminded the committee of a previous request to include a scenario with the build out population applied to the current USA. Mr. Liebe asked Mr. Becker if the formulas for projecting population out to 2060 are clear or accurate. Mr. Becker replied that the projections are generally pretty good, about +/-6 percent given unknown variables.

Ms. Dawn Myer representing the Friends of Pheasant Branch spoke next about opportunities to protect and potentially expand the Pheasant Branch Conservancy in Middleton as the urban area grows. In particular, she noted that Frederick Springs is a valuable resource, and is concerned with development around the spring. She added that the conservancy is a regional recreational and education resource and could be connected to Governor Nelson Park with commuter trails. She showed an unofficial draft document with a series of connector trails created by Elliot Long. Ms. Myer will submit a finalized map with proposed connections to staff at a later date.

4. Revised Stewardship/Amenity Areas

Mr. Granberg referenced a series of maps provided to members and attendees. Mr. Granberg explained that the Wetland Quality map is on a nominal scale based on Rapid Assessment and a Minnesotan methodology (MnRAM). Red indicates areas of greatest quality and for greatest potential for restoration, orange having lesser quality and some potential for habitat, and yellow indicated the lowest habitat, most degraded and most difficult to restore. The yellow areas include small and isolated resources, typically with a high concentration of invasive plant species, including reed canary grass and hybrid cattails.

Referring to the second map in the series, Mr. Granberg pointed out Grassland and Prairie Preservation Areas greater than 2.5 acres in size. He explained that these areas provide adequate habitat for song birds and internal space for populations to persist. If an area is too small, the population will be too small to allow enough genetic diversity for long-term survival. He also noted that a good amount of this resource exists as private land.

Referring to the third map in the series, Mr. Granberg explained that Woodland areas decreased to make way for agricultural and exurban development. Tree stands need to be 5-10 hectares or 12.35 acres. Currently, no legal restrictions exist for woodlands unless an endangered animal species population (not plant) is present or a local ordinance exists.

Mr. Granberg added that the oak tree composition has decreased significantly over the past fifty years and are becoming rarer. He recommended that the remaining oak trees be incorporated into the design and not cut down.

Mr. Granberg presented two Composite Maps. The first map represents the potential natural resource protection under "scenario 1," the most protective scenario. The numerical buffer designations are spelled out in other references and will be included. Mr. Liebe asked how distinctions are made between prairie and oak savannah. Mr. Granberg answered that prairies need and catch fire, keeping large trees or otherwise from establishing. Plant community succession occur outwards from the prairie, where fire is less prevalent, and trees or larger plants can establish themselves. Mr. Liebe asked staff to emphasize this point. Mr. Hungness questioned where the buffer distances came from. Mr. Granberg answered that the figures reference numerous publications, including the NRCS manual on buffers. The manual is supported by over 1,200 references. Second version is more of a design map and the first is more of a planning map.

The second map is a design map and provides more detail for site analysis and where small changes in layout to a development can enhance or maintain the existing resource. Mr. Barmore asked if the map can be scaled up. Staff confirmed. Mr. Hungness asked if the public can view it and look at it. Mr. Granberg was not certain. Mr. Trotter suggested a .pdf.

Mr. Roffers asked what CARPC staff's intention was for sharing this data with Dane Co. LIO? Ms. Van Belleghem answered that they did not have these plans and staff will look into it.

Mr. Granberg detailed the buffers in the second, less protective scenario as high quality wetlands requiring 300ft, medium quality wetlands 300ft, low quality wetlands 100ft, grassland 30ft, and streams 100ft. Mr. Liebe asked if this is beyond current legal standards and requested staff prepare a key explaining what the differences between existing policy and potential new policy are. Mr. Hertzberg agreed. Ms. Van Belleghem reminded the members of a previous document handed out the original, not yet refined map, explaining the different buffer area, corridor area, stewardship area, and amenity

area, differences. Mr. Liebe requested getting all of these pieces together in an easy to read and understand format. Staff agreed. Mr. Granberg added that most community preferences on buffers can be considered at the design phase after FUDA occurs.

The next map in the series, builds upon the previous to include woodlands and steep slopes to show potential interconnections between natural resource features and areas. The last map shows government owned lands, noting that they are unlikely to develop a more intense use. Mr. Liebe inquired if we have private protected lands. Mr. Becker noted that a UW Site. Mr. Granberg assured members that this site is included because it is publically owned. Mr. Becker noted that Picnic Point is not highlighted. Mr. Granberg answered that he obtained UW ecological site data from UW arboretum scientists. Because they did not include Picnic Point, it is likely not ecologically significant despite being open space. Mr. Hertzburg asked staff to verify that the local conservancy is on the map. Mr. Granberg said he could do a new map with the resource and ownership combined.

5. Scenario Development

Referring to the fifth page in the meeting packet, Mr. McAuliffe noted the five scenarios that CARPC staff is currently developing. The first is the 'current trends' scenario and established the base line projections from historic trends and DOA population projections. The residential density figures in the document represent a net density and do not include development associated with residential, such as roads, parks, and other institutional uses. This scenario includes baseline redevelopment according to adopted plans. The corridor area is the only area considered for natural resource protection.

The second scenario is the 'adopted plans' scenario and uses density values and designations prescribed in local Comprehensive Plans and other relevant adopted plans. For the urbanizing portions of Westport, density values characterizing the town portion of the Bishops Bay development.

The third scenario will mirror current trends and be adjusted for community preferences for density and natural and agricultural resource protection expressed in the public participation events.

The fourth scenario is more compact than both 'current trends' and 'adopted plans' with a residential density of 12 units an acre, the accepted minimum density needed to support high-frequency transit. Mr. McAuliffe passed out a map showing transit corridors developed by the MPO. The scenario will increase the amount of redevelopment by fifty percent and adds new sites not currently planned for. This scenario will also assume extending boundary agreements to the time horizon for the plan where this has not already occurred. This scenario will also consider the highest amount of natural resource protection possible.

The fifth scenario is the lowest residential density scenario with natural resource corridor area protection only. Redevelopment will be minimal.

Mr. McAuliffe pointed out that there are different numbers of housing units between the compact and less compact figures because on the more compact scenario there is more multi-family. Multi-family has a lower household population typically; therefore it will require more units to fit the same number of people.

Mr. McAuliffe distributed the Fiscal Impact Analysis handout and reviewed the analysis process. Mr. Liebe asked if the scenario analysis will be able to consider that not all

schools have sidewalks leading to them. Mr. Liebe took a moment to welcome guests and remind the group of the ground rules for participation.

Mr. McAuliffe said that we can tweak the analysis to include these types of considerations. Mr. Becker noted that municipal cost-benefit analysis is good, but what is done all the time is what it costs to average household cost-benefit analysis. Mr. McAuliffe asked for clarification on what Mr. Becker intended. Mr. Becker answered that San Francisco and Austin did this analysis, and all of the formulas are peer reviewed so they cannot be tweaked by planners. For example a transit efficient house will have a lower cost of living. This would be good information to relay to the citizens. Mr. Hertzburg noted that the analysis would have to consider the cost of infrastructure too. Mr. Becker agreed and offered to show the members a slide on his laptop. The slide was from a PowerPoint presentation from Calthorpe & Associates out of Ventura, CA, using the Rapid Fire Model to assess regional impacts.

Mr. Roffers asked why redevelopment values are different for the adopted and preference Mr. McAuliffe answered that the overall amount of useable space is the same and the acres are different because the higher density preferred by the public results in more multi-family than the other. As mentioned before that will take up for space because there are less persons per household. Mr. Roffers noted that no redevelopment is unlikely and even the most conservative scenario should include some redevelopment. Ms. Van Belleghem suggested reducing the probability value.

6. Community Engagement

Ms. Van Belleghem reviewed the strategic engagement plan for Phase 4. The first document shows the original plan and the second page shows the revised Phase 4, based on lessons learned from previous phases and Phase 5. Phase 4 will now include physical polling stations in identified locations, schools libraries, senior centers, others. Mr. Liebe suggested the Summit Credit Union. Ms. Van Belleghem noted that she would like to have fliers ready for January to post around town and catch people in the municipal halls when they come in for tax information. She added that she will also draft publicity for community newspapers similar to what was done in Austin, Texas (passed around Imagine Austin publication).

Ms. Van Belleghem added that the physical stations will be complimented with an online presence and that public meetings will ideally align with existing community meetings instead of having FUDA specific meetings.

Community members will be polled at the physical stations and online. Ms. Van Belleghem explained two polling options, (1) instant run-off voting, where participants designate their 1st choice, 2nd choice, etc. If a person's number one choices, comes in last place overall, the top choice is eliminated and their second choice is elevated to their number one choice. (2) Point allocation could also be used where each participant gets a fixed number of points can allocate points amongst the options according preference. For example, if one has ten points to distribute, one can give all ten points to one option, or split the points between multiple options. Members generally liked ranking 1,2,3 options.

Mr. Wilson noted that community staff had not seen this yet and would like to review it before the committee takes any action. Ms. Kelley added that the timeline may be tight, and is more likely to start in February or March. Ms. Van Belleghem accepted this, noting that she was not expecting action, and wanted to share what she had thus far because she will need to begin putting the publicity together shortly. A member suggested having

the stations set up for the April election. Food stores would also be a good place for exposure.

Ms. Van Belleghem informed the group that the document contained details about what station could look like and asked members to review the document for the next meeting.

7. Next steps

The group will begin to examine the proposed scenarios and develop new scenarios. The group will select 3-5 scenarios to present to the public and determine the best methods for engaging the public. The scenarios will be incorporated into the FUDA, local, and regional plans.

8. Set future meeting dates and times

Mr. Liebe reminded the group that the next meeting is January 20th.

9. Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Hungness. Second by Mr. Trotter. The meeting adjourns at 9:10am.

Recorded by Bridgit Van Belleghem