

Town of New Glarus
Impact Fees Committee Minutes
Thursday, January 3, 2008
1:30 P.M.

Attendance: Gof Thomson, Keith Seward, Karen Talarczyk, Reg Reis (1:42), and John Wright,
Deputy Town Clerk

Not in Attendance: Carol Holmes

G. Thomson called the meeting to order at 1:33 PM.

1. Review Proper Posting—confirmed by G. Thomson and the Deputy Clerk.
2. Motion to Approve Minutes from 12/13/07. K. Talarczyk made a motion to accept the minutes from 12/13/07; seconded by K. Seward. G. Thomson recommended deleting text after the first sentence of paragraph two of item three and leaving the last two sentences of the same paragraph. Thomson also recommended deleting the final clause of the first sentence of paragraph four of item four. The minutes from 12/13/07 accepted as amended without objection.
3. Public Comments. R. Reis noted that water quality for the state is tracked by the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture. Reis agreed to further research water by quality and quantity. Deputy Clerk Wright briefly discussed his limited research into the fourth power law and referred to an op ed piece he had forwarded to members of this Committee.
4. Keith Seward Will Provide Feedback on the Adequacy of the Land Use Plan in Regards to Storm Water Management. K. Seward stated that the current plan in his opinion is not adequate. Seward cited the inadequacy of the provision for hillside protection, which applied to minimum slopes of 20%. Environmental protection requirements are too loose in his opinion, citing a statement prepared for a proposed subdivision that lacked a professional approach. The statement regarding storm water management does not mention detention facilities, which Seward believes are a keystone necessary for success. The Ordinance requires designs for a 10-year storm but sized so that a 25-year frequency does not cause flooding. In Seward's opinion designs should take into account storms of a hundred year magnitude. It was agreed that these items would require a change to the Land Planning Ordinance or the inclusion of a specific Storm Water Management Ordinance. K. Seward made a motion to include this item on the next Land Planning Commission agenda; seconded by K. Talarczyk. Motion passed without objection.
5. Update on 2007 Assembly Bill 341. This bill is still pending to appear before the Wisconsin State Senate. It was agreed that K. Seward will contact Representative Brett Davis of the 80th Assembly District and G. Thomson will contact Senator Jon Erpenbach of the 27th Senate District to let them know that they support this bill.
6. Discuss Pawlisch's Reply to the Questions Posed by the Impact Fee Committee. Pawlisch noted the following:
 - The draft Needs Assessment that the group reviewed at the last meeting is a rough draft that will continue to be amended
 - How a project is financed affects whether impact fees can be collected for the useful life of the project and the cost of borrowing the money can be included in the impact fee collection

Thomson questioned whether the Town could act as the banker if it had the money available to finance the project in the short term yet collect the money

over the useful life of the project. Thomson noted that restrictions imposed for financing through a bond house could prove more problematic than if borrowed short-term through a bank.

- Pawlisch noted that he had been in error; vehicles are no longer an eligible item for impact fees
- There is no conflict for collecting fees if the improvement is outside the municipality or is a shared facility that is being financed by multiple municipalities including the school district
- There is no problem for changing the heading for Item I of the Executive Summary to read **Parks, Town Hall and Joint Garage**
- The statement contained in 5.3 regarding no deficiencies for existing roads or no plans for capital improvement projects is to establish a baseline and was the information available when this draft was created
- Future development can be rolled into the cost of road improvements and can be assessed an impact fee
- The deficiency of the town garage of four stalls is a figure that K. Seward created to accommodate projected future growth
- The **Other Funding Sources** on table 5.3 refer to grants, private donations, additional impact fees, and shared revenues
- A statement about trip generation can be included that can affect the amount of fees collected; traffic count data could be used to determine rates immediately around a quarry but the concept of charging per truckload or by average inventory for a typical home based on a formula was a less certain methodology

Pawlisch stated that the next step necessary in order to complete the Needs Assessment study is to define projects and the cost for each; K. Seward recommended that Pawlisch meet with Gary Blazek of Vierbicher Associates who is working on future growth issues. Seward noted that Old Madison road has room for future development and inquired about a bike trail along the same. Pawlisch said that Impact Fees can be collected for that purpose. Potentially, Seward noted, bike paths could be a joint project between the Town, Village and School District. G. Thomson asked about widening a road to accommodate bicyclists and walkers, noting that Pioneer Road and County Highway O is an area for consideration. R. Reis asked about a bike trail to the edge of the Village for the Neuchatel development along Durst Road. It was decided that this was a route preferable to following Highway 39 and that cooperation with the Village would be encouraged.

Thomson asked if the targeted date for beginning the Old Madison project could be 2010 and if the fee could be determined immediately prior to starting the project so that the cost of materials could be more accurate. Thomson stated that the money could be borrowed before the proposed 2010 start date. Seward stated that Thomson's proposed strategy would forgo the collection of potential fees; a better strategy might be to estimate future costs and return any money in excess of actual costs, if any.

There was brief discussion about how many lots were still available for development along Old Madison road and the general need for an inventory of lots with the potential for development. R. Reis suggested that tracking driveway permit requests might be an indicator of actual instead of potential development. There was a brief discussion about the impact on growth in the area of the Blue Vista development with the completion of paving improvements along Pioneer Road. Talarczyk noted that growth in Spring Valley Estates to the north of Pioneer and Old Madison Road might also be impacted. Seward stated that the 1997 Ordinance was developed to slow growth and that the rate of new developments will be more modest.

K. Talarczyk noted that responses to the survey conducted by the Parks Commission indicated that land owners south of the Village around County H are interested in allowing an easement for a bike trail. Talarczyk did not believe the Parks Commission could take on this project without the assistance of another committee. R. Reis asked if widening roads might be a better solution to trails than imposing them on private properties. He also suggested contacting Warren Laube regarding the School District's future plans and how those goals might be achieved jointly.

G. Thomson asked for thoughts on how the Town could recover the costs associated with new road construction and the increased costs of repairing the existing roads leading into those developments due to increased truck traffic. K. Seward noted that developers are already charged for the inspection of building a road to Town standards. Thomson noted that he is proposing a fee for using existing roads to deliver materials to a new development. R. Reis asked if increasing the driveway fee would accomplish the same goals without requiring sophisticated calculations and costly monitoring. K. Seward noted that this conversation falls under the general issue of reviewing the fee schedule. Pawlisch was asked to speak to Tom Siebers of MSA and/or representatives of the WTA or League of Municipalities for their advice and precedence for such fees to recoup costs for road wear due to development.

Seward requested that time frames be discussed. Pawlisch asked if a project list could be completed within 2 weeks; enabling the Needs Assessment Study to be completed and approved by mid or late February by the Impact Fees Committee so it can go before the Town Board in early March.

7. Discuss WTA Resources Regarding Research on Roads as Requested by Keith Seward. Neither Keith nor Pawlisch pursued this to date.
8. Review of Draft Community Fee Comparison. Pawlisch stated that he had not gathered all the information together and would prefer that it be comprehensive. Thomson would like to see those studies that are nearly comparable to our situation; suburban and urban studies might tend to be skewed towards higher collection amounts.
9. Set next meeting date, time and agenda. The next meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, January 24, 2008 and Thursday, January 31, 2008 if needed at 1:30 PM. A meeting on February 21, 2008 to review the final draft of the Needs Assessment prior to the March 4, 2008 Town Board meeting. The agenda will include: Complete a List of Projects Including Estimated Costs and Review Draft Community Fee Comparison.
10. K. Talarczyk made a motion to adjourn; K. Seward seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM without objection.

Revised 080107