

FINAL MINUTES

Northern USA FUDA Steering Committee

July 14, 2011

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

4:30 p.m.

Present: Greg Smithback, Paul Blount, Bruce Stravinski, Bill LeGore, Jim Simpson, Alan Buchner, Jeff Fripon

Staff Present: Steve Steinhoff, Bridgit Van Belleghem, Dan McAuliffe, Mike Centinario, Mark Roffers, Kevin Richardson, Shawn Haney, Mike Kakuska

Absent: Scott Mink, Rick Mueller

1. Introductions

Mr. Simpson convenes the meeting at 4:32pm.

Mr. Jeff Fripon is a newly appointed representative from Town of Vienna. Another new Vienna appointee, Rick Mueller, will not make it today.

2. Review and approve June 8, 2011 meeting minutes

Mr. LeGore asked staff to edit the “present” list and add his name. Note that he was then minutes late.

Mr. LeGore motions to approve the minutes with the above changes. Mr. Smithback: 2nd. Motion carries 5-0.

The last meeting did not have quorum and the committee still needs approve the May minutes. This will occur next meeting and needs to be included on that agenda.

3. Public Comment

None

4. Update on the Environmental Conditions Report

a. Review and Comment on ECR sections

Mr. Steinhoff informed the group that staff sought feedback on the ECR sections and that staff will present the composite map the committee requested.

Land demand

Mr. McAuliffe updated the group on changes to the Land Demand and Supply and handed out a “Supplement” to the ECR section that explains the methodology for the demand and supply calculations. The supplement describes the demand projections for each community. Rural development is now separated out from urban service development within the towns to have more accurate projections of the urban service

area portion and the area outside the USA in the town. He assigned percentages to the urban/rural split based on past trends.

Mr. McAuliffe explained that now there is a total land demand of 1,300 acres (pg 11 NUSA ECR Land Demand and Supply assessment), slightly less than in the previous draft. Mr. Richardson concluded that therefore some of the demand in the previous calculation would be considered taken up in the rural area. Mr. McAuliffe confirms.

Mr. Steinhoff asked for the total projected demand. Mr. McAuliffe answered 1,326 acres

Mr. Steinhoff asked how much of this can be met through planned redevelopment? Mr. McAuliffe answered 53 acres, leaving 1274 acres of demand. Mr. Steinhoff asked how many acres are available in the USA are developable? Mr. McAuliffe explained that excluding floodplains, wetlands, and steep slopes, within all three service areas (NUSA, Morrisonville, and a portion of the CUSA) 2,173 acres. This figure does not include what is already planned to develop.

Mr. Simpson noted that some of the areas marked developable are floodplain and some other areas are already designated as stormwater. Can this be adjusted? Mr. McAuliffe explained that the next step incorporates this concern and can hopefully ameliorate it. Mr. Steinhoff added that is there were any errors on the map, to please communicate those to staff. Mr. Roffers suggested that local staff perform the map checking.

Mr. McAuliffe concluded that there is a fair amount of excess supply to accommodate demand for the population growth that has occurred and is expected between 2005 and 2035. Also, noted that some development has occurred in the developable areas since 2005. When the 2010 Land Use Inventory (LUI) data is complete and available it will greatly simplify and update the results as the newest development can be considered.

Mr. Richardson sought to clarify and asked if the new excess supply is 474 acres as documented in table 15. Mr. Simpson didn't believe this figure told the whole story, and thinks it is inflated. Mr. Richardson agreed that some assumptions have to be changed.

Mr. McAuliffe added that there are shortfalls. The largest shortage is in transportation, although this would occur side-by-side developing other land uses. Also a short fall in utilities, institutional, and transportation resources.

Mr. McAuliffe concluded that the bottom line is 553 acres of excess supply. Mr. Richardson emphasized that Mr. Simpson would like to make sure that the developable lands are not over represented. Mr. Roffers informed the group that these communities are in this situation already and had to make the case for the last amendment that there was a 'special need' to go beyond he demanded amount.

Mr. McAuliffe added that staff can remove recreation, agricultural and open land to reduce the number. Mr. Simpson requested making the developable land all one color?

Mr. Roffers cited a few recent cases, such as Prairie Creek, where the actual boundaries of the out lot are actually larger than what was planned for. Mr. McAuliffe informed that group that these are based on the plans that the MPO receives and compiles.

Mr. Stravinski added that the map analysis does not take into account the impact of expanding Hwy 51 into four lanes. The expected growth is going to change based on this because there are other circumstances out there. Mr. Simpson agreed and also adds that with the boundary agreements and AEA much of the rural demand might actually be moved. Mr. Steinhoff, provided context to the numbers, and explained that this is a numerical analysis based on historic trends. Taking this approach, we should understand what the numbers say and use them instructively to the extent they are useful as we move forward.

Mr. Steinhoff added that as far the concern for new USA expansions, the DNR made it clear that it is not within CARPC authority to deny a proposal based on land demand. Mr. Roffers pointed out the NR 121 language has a link that USAs should be based on 20-year projections. Mr. Simpson expressed that even so, that is not necessarily how CARPC members vote. Mr. Steinhoff reiterated that DNR has recently clarified to the Commissioners.

Mr. Stravinski expressed that he did not want the local committee to reinforce this excess supply, and may not agree with the numbers because of the changes to transportation in the area. Mr. Roffers explained the assumptions are “based on past trends” and it is possible the future may not resemble the past. He added that these could be factors that are considered in scenario planning.

Mr. Kakuska clarified that NR 121 does provide guidance for 20 yr planning horizons and anything above and beyond that prompts the ‘special need.’ Staff can get more clarity on this and will get back to the committee.

Mr. Roffers expressed that he was not sure what action is expected on the ECR and acknowledged that the communities do not wish to make some type of decision now, which will work against them in the future. Mr. Steinhoff explained that we are not seeking approval of the ECR at this point. The ECR is aimed at informing the scenario planning and will remain a working document.

Mr. Roffers sympathized with CARPC staff, noting that he doesn’t envy them as having to serve two masters. Recognizes that it is a working document. Mr. Simpson asked if the ECR would need to be approved before scenario planning? Mr. Steinhoff suggested that the ECR could be adopted with the FUDA plan at the end, and ultimately it is up to the will of the committee.

Mr. Simpson asked if we hoped to get to a scenario they agree with? Mr. Steinhoff confirmed this and added that this exercise is to help define the existing trends and then the group will begin to develop alternatives in the next agenda item.

Ms. Van Belleghem described changes made to agricultural section. Mostly language changes to make the document more clear. She has not been able to find information yet on Arlington Prairie and will call Ag Extension.

Mr. Kakuska explained that the Natural Resources is so far unchanged, however, staff will be spending more time on it because the new Restoration Ecologist is assessing restoration potential of natural resources.

Mr. Roffers pointed out that the boundary agreement language was edited/written funnily.

Mr. Simpson noted that an island of proposed non-USA land in the ‘Countryview’ area was brought in to USA and the maps should reflect this.

Ms. Van Belleghem will see to this change, yet because the area is small and mostly wet she will not recalculate the agricultural land data should it be affected by this change.

Mr. Smithback added that the area at the NW corner of Hwys 19 and 51 should be commercial.

Mr. Roffers noted some inconsistencies with what is shown as developed regarding what is platted but not developed and will take time to clean up the data and maps with CARPC staff.

b. Map exercising synthesizing Natural and Agricultural Resource Variables

Mr. Steinhoff overviewed the purpose of the exercise noting that at the direction of the other project staff put together the elements in the ECR into a compilation map. Ms. Van Belleghem operated a GIS mapping exercise on the laptop that was projected for all to see. The presentation focused on establishing retention areas, stewardship areas, and amenity areas, where only retention areas are no build-areas based on existing laws, plans, and policies. The Retention area includes steep slopes over 20 percent grade, steep wooded slopes 12-19 percent grade, floodplains, and wetlands, lakes, and perennial streams with a 100-foot perimeter. For a visual presentation and more detailed explanation of these area definitions please see the attached documents *Draft Scenario Planning Base Map text.doc* and *draft map*.

Mr. Kakuska explained that the Stewardship area is an extension of feature boundaries in the Retention Area generally, including floodplain. Unlike the Retention Area, the Stewardship Area is not a no-build area. Ms. Van Belleghem explained the core habitat features in this area as a focus for preservation, restoration, or other enhancement.

Mr. Kakuska emphasized that the core habitat area a where more in-depth analysis of constraints and opportunities would be warranted in site design phases. He was wary of extending the same perimeter to both perennial and intermittent streams as they currently shown.

Ms. Van Belleghem introduced the Amenity area concept. Highlighting the land within 700 ft of the natural resource reveals interconnections and potential to establish E-ways, open space networks, parks, and trails. The Amenity Area is full of natural resource assets. Mr. Roffers shared that the village is trying to take advantage of the resources in the north side and this is reinforced in DeForest Parks & Open Space Plan adopted this summer

Mr. Simpson wanted to assure that the committee was not looking at an overlay zoning? Staff did not foresee this course of action.

Mr. Roffers liked the concept and pointed out the importance of framing the discussion properly. Mr. Simpson suggested that Amenity Areas could be useful for parks. Mr. Kakuska seconded this as one way to capture a resource as an amenity.

Ms. Van Belleghem explained that this map is the jumping point for scenario planning because it identifies where non-developable and where constraints/opportunities may exist. Ms. Van Belleghem presented contiguous agricultural blocks as a key tool for determining where a community will choose to grow. Purple and blue blocks are the largest expanses of agricultural land where the green and yellow blocks are the

smallest, closest to the urban area, and are most likely better suited for development. OF the largest areas the community will need to determine which blocks are least threatening to begin developing and how. She emphasized that agricultural preservation is a value-based decision at this level. She added that it is not useful to show prime farmland because that would effectively cover up all of the other land not already covered. Finally, the opportunity to look at agricultural criteria in the scenarios when figures on land consumption can be calculated.

Mr. Roffers asked if areas outside of study area not included in scenario planning? Ms. Van Belleghem clarified that the in scenario planning we will only considering area in the study area.

Mr. Simpson thought an area that is well suited for development might be the Northeastern corner of Westport. This area drains back to DeForest. Ms. Van Belleghem added this area will definitely be discussed in the other FUDA project. At this time Westport is concerned with community separation. The processes can inform each other.

Mr. Roffers mentioned the DAWN cooperative agreement, and that when it was being developed and the resulting push to develop towards Westport more than Windsor, Westport took notice and started to talk about a boundary agreement. This could resurface. Ms. Van Belleghem added that the Westport Area being discussed is part of the largest agricultural block in Westport and believes Westport wants to preserve it. Mr. Richardson added that a large site in that area was reserved for a satellite sewage treatment plant that is no longer on track.

Mr. Roffers asked CARPC staff to incorporate recent approvals modifying environmental corridor boundaries and added that it is important to keep up with these changes so as not to anger people. Some recent changes included enlarging the corridor NW of 19/51 and shrinking the NE quadrant (pending) based on wetland/woodland delineation studies recently completed. Staff will look into this.

5. Preparing for Public Outreach and Scenario Planning

Mr. Steinhoff also presented a FUDA process Gant chart, noting that the group was half way into the timeline and on track.

Mr. LeGore commented that because we are entering the public part phase, he would like to see some of the conclusion and recommendations developed more clearly because people will want to know these first. Mr. Simpson commented that committee had a lot of paper work and that it would be good to have a packet that is complete enough to give to the public, suggesting we call it a public draft instead of a final draft. Additionally, we can set a deadline for this comment.

Ms. Van Belleghem presented the mail chimp distribution list and a list of the land owners in the study area. She also presented August, September, and October calendars to document community events for outreach and even carrying out scenario planning. She asked members and other staff to help provide any further information to fill out and complete these documents.

Mr. Haney pointed out that staff needs to add Vienna officials, meeting on the calendars, and in general be update new elected officials. Mr. LeGore pointed out that the need to change the emails for Windsor to "Town" of Windsor.

Mr. Simpson suggested the DAWN list be added. Mr. Roffers will provide the DAWN email list to CARPC staff. Ms. Van Belleghem added that Mr. Centenario will forward outreach materials to the DeForest E-governance list.

Mr. Simpson is available to meet in August, although he is not sure the committee will have quorum for an official meeting and suggested a work session instead. Staff supports this effort. He suggested that September/October is a good time, and by mid November we will start losing people.

Mr. Steinhoff sought feedback from the committee members on how the process was going and emphasized that this is a pilot phase and CARPC staff hope to learn from the members on how to improve this process in future projects.

Mr. Simpson commented that sometimes a presentation was unaccompanied by the corresponding written document making it challenging to make comments in a timely manner. He suggested better coordinating the written and presentation materials. Along with this too, he added, especially in natural resource section, a lot of the text is informative of greater Dane County and not the local important stuff. He asked staff if there was a way to highlight the local information, such as boxing it out or changing the text.

Mr. Steinhoff asked the group, how much of a check-in do you want to do with the community, are the plans still in good order and therefore focus on details, or should we step back from there to make adjustments?

Mr. Roffers replied that a FUDA plan maybe ready in March for adoption. If still on track nearer then, the village planning and zoning could potentially delay the amendment process a few months to incorporate FUDA recommendations. He commented that the Village should consider a broader update because there is enough new information between FUDA, other discussions, and the 2010 census. Mr. Roffers may suggest this be public participation process to update the Comprehensive Plan and that we consider this in advertising and messaging so that this is not so esoteric.

Mr. Simpson added that this effort could also update other plans. Mr. Roffers noted that aligning these efforts could save the Village time and money. Mr. Stravinski asked how this could be impacted if the committee does not adopt the FUDA plan. Mr. Steinhoff clarified that at this time we are only speaking of the background documents. Later in the process, when the FUDA planning recommendations are complete, the steering committee members would recommend adopting the plan, in whole, or in part, to their respective communities. Mr. Roffers stated that he assumes communities will likely recommend parts as opposed to adopting the whole plan document. Mr. Simpson offered that the committee come to a recommendation and this recommendation stands regardless of what the individual communities do with it.

Mr. Steinhoff prompted the group to move forward with defining alternative scenarios. He explained that we could start with existing plans and have stakeholder input through a visual preference survey. The committee and staff can identify different parts of the growth areas and people can discuss what type and form of development in these areas/districts. This feedback will shape the alternative scenarios we would propose and estimate the development impacts of current trends and other scenarios. CARPC staff is currently researching a variety of models to help us with scenario modeling and analysis. Then we can get in another round of feedback with the scenarios.

Mr. Roffers clarified that Mr. Steinhoff is suggesting having one set of events around the visual preference survey and another set revealing the scenarios based on this and the ECR data.

Mr. Simpson stated that the community did this with the comprehensive plan. Mr. Roffers believed this activity occurred before he came on. Mr. Simpson suggested talking to Julie Wills. Mr. Simpson added that they also had a large group meeting with 5 people to a table with maps with different colored sticky notes as a 40 with low medium and high and were tasked to place them for future growth.

Mr. Roffers recalled the second activity and wondered if the communities would want to repeat that or go forward from the existing map, so as not to rehash what had already been resolved.

Members suggested taking it further, for example drawing arrows for direction or establishing priorities, identifying new areas to consider, or tweaks around the edges for what has been planned for.

Mr. Steinhoff commented that if this effort is gearing towards a more comprehensive update then maybe a recheck is suitable.

Mr. Simpson suggested that with the planned expansion of HWY 51, the Comprehensive Plan may need to be reconsidered. Mr. Roffers suggested scenarios with HWY 51 development, with DeForest as a regional destination, environmental protection, ag preservation to different degrees.

6. Update on the Capital Regional Partnership for Sustainable Communities

Mr. Steinhoff informed the group that he sends out regular updates about the grant happenings and can add committee members' emails to the list to take the place of the verbal update. The updates are also on www.capitalscrpg.org.

7. Next steps

Group members will provide feedback on documents.
Staff will send out a feedback and review schedule.
The group needs to develop a framework for scenarios.
Approve these and May minutes.
Mr. Haney to get CARPC staff new email addresses for Vienna members.

8. Set future meeting dates and times

August 11th @ 4:30pm. If lack of availability prevents quorum the meeting will be held as a work session and no actions can take place. Mr. Centenario has already reserved the room.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Stravinski motioned to adjourn, Mr. Smithback seconded. Motion carries. Meeting adjourns at 6:32 pm.

Recorded by Bridgit Van Belleghem