

MINUTES

Northern USA FUDA Steering Committee

October 12, 2011**Community Room, DeForest Library, Library St., DeForest WI****4:30 p.m.**

Present: Jim Simpson, Bill LeGore, Jeff Freppon, Bruce Stravinski, Alan Buchner, Greg Smithback, Rick Mueller

Absent: Scott Mink, Shawn Haney, Paul Blount

Staff Present: Bridgit Van Belleghem, Rachel Holloway, Mike Centinario (5:03pm), Steve Fahlgren (4:40pm), Mark Roffers, Kevin Richardson (4:40pm)

Others Present: Jon Becker (CRANES) , Bob Wipperfurth

1. Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda

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

2. Approval of Minutes from September 14, 2011 Steering Committee meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Stravinski, 2nd by Mr. LeGore, to approve the September 14 minutes. The motion carried 6-0.

3. Public Comment

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

4. Staff response to public comment

Ms. Van Belleghem noted the document with staff comments on the Environmental Conditions Report in everyone's meeting packets, and asked them to take a few minutes to review them before commenting.

[Mr. Richardson arrived 4:40pm, Mr. Fahlgren arrived 4:40 p.m.]

Ms. Van Belleghem summarized staff's comments for the Committee.

Mr. Roffers added more information about staff comments.

Ms. Van Belleghem mentioned the field work that Jason Granberg is conducting at the RPC. She said a build-out model is more likely, that we won't have population projections out to 2050 but would have to develop another model for that. She requested comments and questions.

Mr. Simpson asked about viewsheds, and is there any viewshed that we are interested in protecting? Mr. Richardson said these would typically be on a ridge line so that you could see out, and couldn't think of anything except Highway C that you can see far from the road. Other areas were suggested but are not within the study area. Mr. Roffers said the view from Windsor road looking east is maybe not dramatic, but the lay of the land is very nice; there is local commitment to protecting that, though most people may not know it.

Mr. Becker said the committee should think of what means they have to protect views beyond the boundary of the USA, because it is possible for someone to build a tall tower on the edge of the

township. Mr. Roffers said in New Glarus the high points were outside the village, so the question was if we develop the hillside outside of town, what will the view be from the village? It's an issue of thinking of the character of the community tomorrow.

Ms. Van Belleghem suggested oak stand areas as a potential viewsheds.

Mr. Simpson asked about the process we are entering for the ECR, are we getting close to an end product?

Ms. Van Belleghem said we hope to be done sooner than the end of the year, and hopefully the FUDA plan could be started in December and done by the end of March. The specifics would be up to the steering committee. She hopes to present a draft ECR at the next meeting and make few changes after that, then we could move forward with scenarios and the FUDA plan.

Mr. Simpson said he would like to know which edits are made since the document is long.

Mr. Becker pushed for doing micromesh studies since other forms of analysis can be inaccurate. He suggested that if there isn't money for a study maybe add language that if an area is to be added to urban areas for development, that a study must be done. He described a cheaper method to analyze an area using thermal analysis. He said the study area is an enormous area for springs, and people living nearby have deep pylings and sump pumps; he wouldn't want residents using methods that are more harmful than good.

Mr. Simpson asked what is the difference between micromesh studies and other methods?

Mr. Richardson explained the analysis of soil types and their permeability. There was brief discussion of analysis methods.

Ms. Van Belleghem asked for clarification on the next steps needed with respect to the CRANES document.

A motion was made by Mr. Simpson, 2nd by Mr. Buchner, to consider the draft final and present it to CRANES.

[Mr. Centinario arrived 5:03pm]

Motion passed 6-0.

5. Draft Environmental Conditions Report Comments

Ms. Van Belleghem asked Mr. Roffers to summarize his comments on the ECR. He had focused on the projections section because it had been the biggest topic of discussion. He wants to see elaboration on methodology and why it was done the way it was, subject to DNR law; he also said there may be opportunities to mention that projection methodology is inherently challenging. He noted sticky things about human behavior like willingness to farm, and suggested adding comments that some flexibility is needed in order to meet land demand. He offered to provide his comments to anyone who wants them on CD.

Ms. Van Belleghem suggested putting parentheses or brackets for comments with the commenter's initials.

Mr. Simpson also submitted comments, included in the packet. He said a couple pages of the ECR were missing.

Ms. Van Belleghem said we will include the map and description. She said it's a good idea to clarify the buffer ideas because that section was written before the terms were finalized.

Mr. Roffers said in the urban land demand projections, there seem to be no urban land projections for the Town of Vienna, which is surprising since there is sewer area and this would affect projections. He said some areas in the ECR seem to be making recommendations, and it's ok to say "best practices suggest" but giving recommendations mixes up the purpose.

Mr. Simpson said boundary agreements limit how much housing can be in the towns. He questioned the projections showing more new units in the towns and proposed putting those units in the urban service area, unless he is overstepping because he represents the village.

Mr. Stravinski asked how that fits into our town plan that limits the number of splits per parcel? He said some farmers have no intention to use their splits, and we don't want to limit ourselves by the FUDA plan.

Mr. Richardson said the report is saying that there is *some* demand that will be met by the rural area that isn't met within the USA, and it seems like an effort by staff to accommodate that fact. He said we are more concerned with what will happen in the urban service area, though some development will take place in rural town areas.

There was brief discussion of how many splits are allowed in towns, some of which is done through deed restrictions in order to promote clustered development and prevent checkerboard-pattern development across ag lands.

Mr. Stravinski asked how do you account for development that might take place in the town but outside of study area, and does it change anything?

Ms. Van Belleghem said for purposes of land demand estimates it didn't limit itself to the urban boundary; it would incorporate those developments whether they are planned housing or vacant at this time. She said the study area was mostly for her as staff, to limit the amount of farmland data she had to work with.

Mr. Stravinski said the area by Hwy 51 is so different from the area by County CV; he expressed concern that using those #s for the growth area might result in skewed numbers because in the past the constraints on growth varied and might not be the same as those going forward.

Mr. Richardson described this concern as we don't want to be constrained by past trends, but use scenario planning to guide future growth.

Mr. Roffers said he typically recognizes the flaws of any projection methodology, to catch that.

Ms. Van Belleghem asked Mr. Stravinski to remember that point when we are making and reviewing scenarios, so we can check them against these various factors.

Mr. Legore said to put comments about the projection methods in the executive summary.

Mr. Becker said it seems CARPC takes into account that adjustments occur in demand and growth, so there is time to adjust that and doesn't seem to warrant concern.

Mr. Richardson explained that at past meetings for Urban Service Area amendments it has sometimes been very difficult to get even a small parcel added. Mr. Stravinski said we don't want the FUDA document to say we have surplus lands so that we have to argue for hours at RPC meetings to fight for a USA expansion.

Ms. Van Belleghem asked everyone to send comments in writing, so that they can be included in any FUDA documents in the future.

Mr. Simpson asked does staff plan to say what they are doing or not doing, with respect to our comments?

BV said she can make a note on the comments, also track changes, whatever the committee needs.

There were no other comments.

6. Scenario Planning Community Engagement

Ms. Van Belleghem pointed out the community goals survey in the packet, that was used at FUDA meetings. She explained that overall respondents agreed with the goals, and there weren't dramatically different responses between communities. People in the rural areas preferred less density, she said it may be possible people were thinking more about where they live rather than the nearby urban area?

Mr. Roffers agreed, saying the statements that were rated more neutral included financial incentives to developers to meet economic development goals, enforce design standards, look at other transportation options as demand grows. The highest rated included maintaining a sense of separation from Madison, expanding 51 to four lanes, broaden local shopping and restaurant opportunities, and pursuing additional ways to collaborate for mutual benefit.

Ms. Van Belleghem described the agenda for the scenario planning meeting in DeForest the next night. It involved a presentation, display boards showing maps of agricultural data, the built environment, and natural resources; most of these things will be in the ECR and/or included in the FUDA plan. People will be able to mark up maps with comments and drawings, and work in small groups to find points of agreement. She said the first scenario planning was in Middleton, with low turnout due to a Brewers game. She noted that for the VPS online survey, the North Mendota area has about 1000 respondents so far, compared to about 30 here in the Northern USA.

Mr. Simson said is it possible people are seeing this as a second go-around of Blueprint DeForest?

Mr. Richardson noted that in Waunakee they have ground signs on all high traffic intersections.

Ms. Van Belleghem said Mike Centinario just put up some signs here for tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Simpson asked about postcards. Staff mailed them out to DeForest residents, about 3,600 people or anyone with a water utility account.

Mr. Simpson asked about agenda item #5 "review constraints and opportunities maps"; he was concerned that that activity might be too leading.

Ms. Van Belleghem said the maps show people which areas they might want to consider, IF they are concerned with a given subject, such as agriculture. Staff will show a few variables on the maps that people draw on, so that they have something to work with.

Mr. Roffers said there are other things that people may hold as important, so we don't want to emphasize certain other factors. Ms. Van Belleghem said we can try to address this in our facilitation and when introducing the activities.

Ms. Van Belleghem said she will send out another revision of the ECR and any comments sent to her by steering committee members by October 21st. At the November meeting we will probably talk about the scenarios and staff can share what they have for analysis tools.

Mr. Simpson suggested for the next meeting we may want to ask Bob to see if he'd like to be considered staff; Mr. Stravinski agreed.

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

Mr. Buchner moved, 2nd by Mr. Mueller, to adjourn; motion passed 7-0.

Meeting adjourned at 5:54pm.

Recorded by Rachel Holloway