

## MINUTES

### Northern USA FUDA Steering Committee

September 14, 2011

Community Room, DeForest Library, Library St., DeForest WI

4:30 p.m.

Present: Scott Mink, Jim Simpson, Bill LeGore, Jeff Freppon, Bruce Stravinski, Shawn Haney, Kevin Richardson

Staff Present: Bridgit Van Belleghem, Steve Steinhoff, Dan McAuliffe, Rachel Holloway, Mike Centinario, Steve Fahlgren, Mark Roffers

Absent: Paul Blount, Alan Buchner, Rick Mueller, Greg Smithback

Others Present: Jon Becker (CRANES), Tim Simmon (Sun Prairie)

#### 1. Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda

Ms. Van Belleghem reviewed the agenda; there we no changes.

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from August 11, 2011 Steering Committee meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Simpson, 2<sup>nd</sup> by Mr. Mink, to approve the August 11 minutes.

Attendees suggested several minor edits to the minutes.

The motion carried 5-0.

#### 3. Public Comment

Jon Becker of CRANES appeared to speak. He shared a document with five requests for analysis and visioning in the "NUSA Pilot Sub-FUDA study area" (attached).

There was brief discussion of the CRANES recommendations, and what resources currently exist on environmental protection for use by villages and residents.

Mr. Simpson asked how the Steering Committee might follow up on the CRANES proposal. Mr. Steinhoff said because it was submitted as public comment, the committee can decide if they want to send it to staff for a recommendation. Mr. Richardson said it remains public comment today and if the committee wants further discussion it could go on the next meeting's agenda. Mr. Stravinski said if it is on the next agenda staff could prepare an analysis and recommendations, then the committee could make a decision then.

There were no other comments and the public hearing session was closed.

#### 4. Old Business

Ms. Van Belleghem discussed the public participation plan and the press release for upcoming public FUDA meetings, and the events calendar for doing outreach for the public meetings. Ms. Holloway passed around the calendar and asked Steering Committee members to sign up to help facilitate small group discussions at public meetings, and help with outreach if possible.

Mr. McAuliffe reviewed the supplemental materials for the Visual Preference Survey, including the "discussion boards" with VPS thumbnail images, and the changes made to the VPS images since

the last meeting. He asked for further comments and edits to specific images. A couple of final changes were made.

Mr. McAuliffe reviewed facilitator questions for leading the discussions at public meetings. He reviewed the demographic survey sheet that will be used to gauge who participates, which will be kept separate from the survey data. He asked the Steering Committee to look it over and submit written comments by Friday.

Mr. Steinhoff and Mr. McAuliffe discussed the needs for specific Steering Committee member roles at the meetings. Mr. Steinhoff requested that committee members engage with people during the small group sessions while staff takes notes.

Mr. Stravinski asked staff to send the calendar out in an email so that everyone could sign up.

Mr. Simpson asked if it is more important for committee members to participate or be station volunteers? Ms. Van Belleghem said station volunteers.

Mr. McAuliffe said the VPS survey is online now for preview before it goes public, and requested comments on that too.

[Mr. Centinario left at 5:04 p.m.]

There was discussion of the pros and cons of putting the VPS online prior to public meetings, since the goal is to get gut reactions when taking the survey. It was agreed that the committee did not want to limit the availability of the survey, and that it could be set up so that each individual takes the entire survey or none of it, in order to minimize someone previewing the images before taking the survey at a meeting.

Mr. Simpson suggested cards saying “thank you for coming” at the meetings, which people could take with them and share.

Mr. Steinhoff shared his plan for presentation at the meetings. He will present the overall FUDA process and how these meetings fit into that, followed by Dan presenting the VPS and then moving to groups at stations to discuss.

Ms. Van Belleghem said staff is also planning other activities that attendees can do during down time. These include a big future land use map, and maps for people to label with places they love and want to see preserved, or that they wish to see improved. The idea is fun activities for mingling and warm-up discussion.

Mr. LeGore asked is it appropriate to look at street types such as curb and gutter, or various types of surface applications. Mr. Richardson said in urban areas it is going to be asphalt, and the other questions of road style depend on density because of stormwater management needs. He said we do swales for low-density development, and curb & gutter for more dense developments; density drives the engineering of surfaces. Mr. Simpson said streetscape design seems to be a separate question from density.

Mr. Roffers said because sidewalks are an issue in DeForest it could be good to get input on that.

## **5. Update on the Environmental Conditions Report**

Ms. Van Belleghem said she sent everyone the latest working draft, which has all pieces except the review of municipal comprehensive plans and the appendices on wetlands, since those are already

finalized. She requested comments back by Oct. 12, especially for better readability and clear communication. She noted it is meant to be a technical background document to inform FUDA planning. She pointed out the latest Composite Map for scenario planning that shows environmental corridors, stewardship areas, and amenity areas.

Mr. Stravinski said he had missed some recent meetings, and had a problem with the description of land demand projections in the ECR that suggests an “over-supply” of land for development based on the continuation of past trends. He said he thought an error was made in village and town land demand projections and would not support the document language if it came to a vote as is.

[Mr. LaGore left at 5:45 p.m., quorum was lost]

Ms. Van Belleghem clarified that the town projections were only within the Urban Service Area (USA), and the numbers used are from the Dept. of Administration because CARPC is required to use their data for analyses of USA amendments. She noted the ECR is simply data of historic trends in order to have a “baseline” for comparisons, not necessarily an accurate prediction of what will or must happen. She said that in scenario planning, communities could identify alternative scenarios with varying growth levels..

The committee discussed the accuracy of predicting population growth using the number of building permits, the years for which data is available, the accuracy of DOA data, and the impacts of shrinking average household sizes.

Mr. Roffers said he has been working with DOA estimates for over 20 years and thinks they tend to overestimate population growth in low-growth areas (such as rural parts of the state and the city of Milwaukee), and underestimate in high-growth areas where there is momentum in population (such as the Fox Valley or Madison-type areas). He asked if CARPC has taken a historic look at these data to check against actual population growth? He said in defense of using DOA data, all communities think they are going to grow faster than they do.

Ms. Van Belleghem said that Barbara Weber handles this at CARPC, and she will ask her to comment on this.

Mr. Stravinski said he was concerned that if the analysis shows a surplus of developable land, CARPC might use that against the local governments in their reviews of USA amendments.

[Mr. Mink and Mr. Simmon left at 6:02 p.m.] Mr. Simpson noted that quorum was lost at 5:45 p.m.

Mr. Richardson noted that because there are USA areas that are not very developable, the total acreage doesn't tell the whole story. He said it makes more sense for development to follow urban services and utilities.

There was brief discussion of the RPC using a “flexibility factor” in which Urban Service Areas are increased in size by a given percentage to account for uncertainties in projection accuracy, development constraints within the USA, and unforeseen circumstances..

Mr. Steinhoff said one reason for using DOA numbers is to maintain a control for accuracy at the regional level. He noted that CARPC had commissioned a review by UW Professor Kurt Paulson of the RPC's methodology. Paulson compared it to other “better” practices around the country and concluded that 25 to 50% is a more common flexibility factor, that 100% is excessive compared to nationwide and 0% is at the other extreme.

Mr. Roffers said it is a standard practice to look at least 20 years out for land suitable for development, and also to use appropriate controls for the form of development such as compact, contiguous to existing development, etcetera. Mr. Steinhoff noted that the FUDA process is also meant to address these questions about the form of development.

**6. Next Steps and Future Agenda Items**

At the next meeting, CARPC staff will come with the materials for public meetings more finalized (which will be shared beforehand), and discuss the Environmental Conditions Report and edits needed. Ms. Van Belleghem will email the ECR ahead of time with executive summaries.

**7. Adjourn**

The meeting ended at 6:20 p.m. No formal adjournment was made due to lack of quorum.

Recorded by Rachel Holloway

(attachment)

## **CRANES**

### **Preliminary Requests for NUSA Pilot Sub-FUDA ~ 15 SEP 2011**

1. There should be an effort within the NUSA Sub-FUDA study area to identify the larger remaining unfragmented or roadless parcels of natural lands and their potential for expansion to achieve ecological stability or sustainability, as well as an analysis of how to protect the viewsheds and soundscapes of these areas. There should also be an analysis of infiltration/recharge areas, similar to the micro-mesh study done for Pheasant Branch. I.e., for natural areas, there should be analyses similar to the effort by the RPC Pilot Sub-FUDA staffers to analyze and map agricultural lands for basic soils, farming types (e.g., appropriateness for row crops vs livestock) and contiguity.
2. Similar to #1, there should be an analysis of cultural landscapes and protection of their viewsheds/soundscapes. During the public participation phase, there should be an invitation to nominate additional areas of the study area for protection of their viewsheds/soundscapes. Local Example: Mt. Horeb (Vandewalle Associates).
3. Public participants should be offered a scenario that accommodates the DOA's 2010 USA census-based population forecasts for 2035 within the existing NUSA footprint. Similarly, there should be another scenario accommodating the predicted population for 2050. Both of these backcasting scenarios should include the resulting residential and commercial densities, as well as cost/benefit analyses with data broken out for both municipalities and household.
4. There should also be an analysis of foreclosures and shadow stock, as well as realty demand by type, based on demographics trends and market studies. Additionally it should be established whether or not fuel prices are affecting residential realty or commercial/business site decisions in the outlying municipalities of the Capital region, such as DeForest. Additionally, there should be a USA 2010 census-based analyses of commuter traffic flow to/from the NUSA, for Dane and counties.
5. There should be a cost/benefit analysis of the proposed expansion of HWY 51 when compared with transit options (e.g., commuter rail, BRT, etc.) including the commuter rail option from DeForest to the Airport to Downtown, as proposed in the Dane Transportation 2030 study.