

**TOWN OF HOLLAND
SPECIAL BOARD MEETING**

February 9, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT	Chair Steve Michaels, Supervisors Ben Filter, Jeff Herlitzke (via zoom), Steve Mieden, Jerome Pedretti
STAFF PRESENT	Clerk Marilyn Pedretti
OTHERS PRESENT	Lukasz Lyzwa (General Engineering Company), Kathy Warzynski, Bob Stupi, Jeff Osgood, Steve Lindvig, Jeff Lindvig, Jeanne Keyser

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Michaels called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Notices were posted.

STORMWATER UTILITY WORKSHOP

Lukasz Lyzwa, Project Engineer with General Engineering Company, noted the process for the evening would go over the four classification options, discuss the draft budget and review the commercial usage. He started with Option 1 which would charge \$45 for parcels within subdivisions (880 parcels) and \$22.50 for those in rural area (691 parcels), generating \$55,282 in revenue.

Steve Lindvig, W6248 County Road V, asked how his 5.02 acre parcel would be classified. Lyzwa reported it would be charged \$22.50 as a rural property. Lindvig asked why he would need to pay because his property is on a county road and could receive no services. Lyzwa explained there are cases in which stormwater maintenance would be required by the Town in rural areas. Lindvig asked if the Town would pay for re-ditching if the property owner was at fault. Lyzwa stated not generally and that the Town would set policy through the ordinance, yet to be developed.

Jeff Osgood, W7515 Sylvester Road (Plan Commissioner), asked if the Town could add stormwater fees to the building permit process. Lyzwa explained that could be a problem based on Wisconsin State Statute.

Chair Michaels asked Lyzwa to give background on how the money will be utilized. Lyzwa reviewed the draft budget of \$63,000, noting the suggested three categories as follows:

1. Administration = \$5,000
2. Maintenance/Operation = \$35,000
3. Capital Expenses = \$23,000

Bob Stupi, N7517 County Road XX, asked how the Town could budget for “equipment fund” if the Town is not allowed to build up funds. Lyzwa explained the fund could be used for services rendered through the stormwater utility and the equipment specifically used for stormwater. Stupi questioned the lack of detail in the budget. Lyzwa explained the draft was for initial discussions to assist in choosing the classification option and will be fleshed out later.

Kathy Warzynski, W7728 Meadow Way (Plan Commissioner), asked about the commercial properties. Lyzwa referred to the draft page outlining the commercial charges totaling \$3,181 and clarified they are not included in Option 1-4 totals.

Lyzwa continued with the remaining classification options as follows:

- Option 2: 1 acre lot size, residential (904 parcels) at \$45 and rural (667) at \$22.50 for potential \$55,687 revenue.
- Option 3: 2 acre lot size, residential (1175 parcels) at \$45 and rural (396) at \$22.50 for potential \$61,785 revenue.
- Option 4: 3 acre lot size, residential (1243 parcels) at \$45 and rural (328) at \$22.50 for potential \$63,315.

Jeanne Keyser, N7143 Erann Court, asked how her neighborhood of ½ acre parcels would be charged. Lyzwa noted that under all the options it would be \$45 for residential properties with any building valued over \$20,000 but if the lot were vacant there would be no charge.

Mieden asked for confirmation that any fund balances would remain within the stormwater utility. Lyzwa confirmed that the money could not be diverted to the general fund. He noted that it is important to develop a 5 and 10 year plan in order to be fiscally responsible to the residents. Lyzwa stated the use of a stormwater fee would free up the general fund for other purposes.

J Pedretti suggested Option 1 would be the easiest to administer. Lyzwa stated that once a formula was established it would be relatively easy to update any of the options each year and that each option has negative and positive aspects.

Filter expressed concern that if the parcel was not within a subdivision plat, like those parcels in the coulee, it would be missed. Lyzwa explained the difference between Option 1 and Option 3, in which all parcels with a building over \$20,000 would be charged, but some parcels would be at different rates.

Jeff Lindvig, N8889 Moen Road, asked if the Town would be paying to fix a ditch filled in by the homeowner. Discussion followed concerning ditching, culvert maintenance and culvert replacement. Lyzwa noted that the Town would set the policy of whether the Town or resident would pay for the work.

Lyzwa explained the process for setting up a stormwater utility committee with recommending powers only. He discussed enforcement options at either the committee, board or building inspector level.

PROPOSAL RECOMMENDATION

Mieden suggested using Option 3 but reduce the \$45 fee to \$40, which would provide \$55-60,000 budget. Lyzwa provided an example of a property on Old NA, showing the difference in charges under Option 1 vs Option 3. Discussion followed.

NEXT STEPS

Lyzwa suggested the next task would be to put together a 5-10 year plan. He noted that the five year road maintenance plan could be utilized. Discussion followed on process. It was the consensus to seek suggestions from the Plan Commission and Town Board at the March meeting cycle. The next workshop was scheduled for Tuesday, March 23rd at 6:30 p.m.

ADJOURN

Motion by Mieden/Filter to adjourn. **MOTION** carried unanimously. Adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marilyn J. Pedretti, Town Clerk