

Appendix C:

Public Participation Results

**Kick-Off Meeting
October 24, 2006**



MEETING NOTES

Date: 10/30/06

Landscape Architecture

To: Audrey Rue
Town Clerk

Urban Design

From: Kevin Firchow
Project: Brigham
Comprehensive Plan
SAA #: 2186

Community Planning

Civil Engineering

Re: October Public Meeting

Time/Location: 7:30 pm, October 24, 2006

Discussion: Kick-Off Meeting for the Comprehensive Plan

There were three agenda items for the evening. Each was discussed at length.

1. Introduction (15 Minutes)

Otis Nelson provided a brief introduction by welcoming Brigham residents and thanking them for coming. He then turned the presentation over to SAA.

Reed Dunbar from SAA walked through a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the purpose of the Comprehensive Plan and the new Smart Growth legislation. The presentation explained the role of the public and the responsibility the Town has in writing their comprehensive plan. A copy of this plan will be placed on the Town of Brigham Comprehensive Plan website.

Abby Kiefer of SAA explained the various ways the public will be encouraged and needed throughout the planning process. There will be four public meetings throughout the 18 month planning process. Those meeting will address the following subjects: Identify Issues (October 2006), Set Goals and Future Direction (February 2007), Evaluate Plan Alternatives (April 2007), Review Draft Plan and Recommendations (Fall 2007). In addition to four public meetings, the public is requested to join a Citizen Work Group that will help to write recommendations for each chapter of the plan. If citizens are interested in participating in one of these work groups, they should contact Audrey Rue at 608-924-1013.

SAA outlined that a group of residents have met twice in October in order to review questions that should go into the Brigham Household Survey. These meetings were open to all residents in hopes that the many views held within the Town will be represented in the survey. The survey will be go out to all households within the Town of Brigham in November.

2. Warm Up Exercise

In order to begin a conversation about the issues that exist within the Town, SAA encouraged members to write down their top three likes and their top three dislikes on note cards. Once completed participants were asked to share their thoughts with the other people at the table.

The note cards were collected and tabulated. They are included in a separate document. The likes and dislikes will be analyzed as a part of issue identification in the planning process.

3. Brigham SWOT Exercise:

SAA asked all in attendance to conduct a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) analysis for the Town of Brigham. Meeting participants took 20 minutes to write down as many strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats as they could think of. Each idea was written on a separate post-it note. Once completed, they organized their post-it notes on large pieces of paper on the tables that were divided into strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats. Once all of the ideas were organized by category, each participant received 12 sticky dots for voting. Participants were asked to vote for their top three priorities in each category. The results from the SWOT are included in a separate document. The issues identified and prioritized will help to determine what should stay the same within Brigham and what needs to be improved. This will be directly connected to the goals, objectives, and recommendations found within the Comprehensive Plan.

To conclude the meeting, participants were asked to share some of their top priorities with the entire group.

**MEETING NOTES – LIKES and DISLIKES
OCTOBER 24, 2006**

Likes

Rural character
Natural resources of local and statewide significance
Agriculture
Small quiet community
Beautiful area
Friendly neighbors
Natural landscape, rolling hills, woods intermixed with farm land
Good school system, fire and ambulance service
Progressive orderly growth with good and maintained roads
Friendly environment of the town
Beauty of the Town
Services offered
Friendly
Small community
Fall/spring garbage day
Much wide open and unused space
People actually wave to you
Scenery
Friendly neighbors
Peace and quiet
Good services
Good school
Great place to live
Proximity to Madison
Good schools
Diverse (ag/housing/wooded/open/etc)
School system
Local fire department
Local EMS
Agricultural base
Unique topography
Recreational opportunities
Open green space
Public library
Community owned grocery
Trash and recycle collection
Hoot (Barred) owls in spring nights
Coyote's night music
Good emergency services
Beautiful scenery
Friendly people

Rural setting
Twice a year clean sweep
Grocery co-op/laundry
Good emergency service
Open spaces and environmental abundance
Peace and quiet
Eclectic mix of people and professions
Local government – good town board
Land owners still have rights
Good school
Natural resources – woods, ag, terrain, etc
Friendly community – people
Location relative to larger cities
Fire department and EMT
Schools
Rural areas
Rural nature
Know neighbors
Close enough to large town if we need something we can't get here
School district, library, fire department
Hard working, honest citizens, very caring, share work
The local landowners are great stewards of the land
Scenic beauty, natural prairie habitat that many organizations are trying to preserve
Natural beauty
Roads are adequate
Proximity to culture and natural areas
Open space rural character
Relatively low population density
Preserved farmland
Natural landscape – driftless area beauty
Native species – areas of native prairies, wildlife areas, and sanctuaries
Rural area
Small town
Very little crime
Good roads
Rural setting – quiet and “uncluttered”
There isn't commercial on premiere agriculture

There implementation of ordinances – retaining ag lands (1, 2, and 3) and driveways at 10% or less
Rural attitude
Housing not industry
Not in Dane County
Natural resources
The fact that agriculture is still being practiced in the Township
Rural
Farming emphasis
Open areas
Little industry/commercial
Low taxes without much expense
The fresh air and nature
Fire department equipment
Township democracy

Scenery
Rural character
Interesting people
Bike trail
Low population density
Lots of wood land
Bio-diversity
Wooded hillsides
Family farms
The quiet
Prairie remnants
Rural landscape
Wildlife
Open, rural atmosphere
Country style roads
Lack of housing density

Dislikes

5 acre minimum lot size
Too much vehicular traffic
Nothing in general
Lack of some modern conveniences – shopping areas (this requires a lot of traveling)/restaurants/hi-speed internet
Possibly a little close to Madison which is coming this way pretty fast
Have to watch to maintain our rural character not let development eliminate the family farms
Lack of planning in development
Under appreciation of natural resources (taken for granted)
Increasing development pressures
Soil type map (where you can build a structure)
Town board having to know exactly what type of house you will build
Fee amounts (driveway)
Inconsistencies
Not adapting to change
Lack of sun
Tree hugger
People who move to Township and buy 40 or less acres of land and then don't want anybody to build houses near by
High taxes
People trying to tell landowners how to run their business

People who have their paradise and not wanting anyone else to move here
People who don't use our local businesses who want all of our municipality services
Little downtown development
Need DSL/Cable access for computers
Confusion of town officials about zoning and ordinance (lack of clarity)
Poor communication
I'm afraid of so many 5 acres minimum housing developments
Arrogance of those who have lived here all their lives
Unwillingness to hear all points of view
Development mentality that seems to permeate the political landscape
People move in then want to govern all
The lack of effort to engage community on issues
Disparity on or lack of clarity in ordinances
Isolation and lack of job opportunities in Brigham
Increase in houses in rural area
Houses all seem to go in on hilltops
Turning from rural to suburb in nature
Interstate bisects Town – lose character, identity of north vs. south
Village of Barneveld's decisions will have a huge impact on town character
Emergency warning system

Speed limits on rural roads
Minimum lot size of 5 acres while all
surrounding towns limit density to 1 house per
30 or 40 acres
Development pressure
Town Board interested in developing land,
subdivisions
5 acre minimum!
Polarity of citizens
Need for DSL (internet)
Concerns re: subdivisions, development
CWD
Disappearance of whip-poor-wills and ruffed
grouse
Can't think of anything else
City people moving in and then wanting to tell
us what to do
Bike riders that go through the roads of
Brigham
Lousy internet service
Bikes on road

Not completely complying with land use plan
The absolute belief that growth is needed
Lack of public input and there appears to be
too much bias
Division of people
Farmers versus others
Lack of respect of land and future generations
Taking the area for granted
Board doesn't like public input
Board doesn't usually listen to people,
regardless of group size
Board is very biased toward/against some
Town doesn't understand if development does
or doesn't bring in net money to tax base
Long distance telephone calls to Madison
Invasive plants
Ticks
I'm too new to dislike anything yet
Turning onto highway
Invasive species
Sprawl businesses along 18/151 corridor

**MEETING NOTES – SWOT ANALYSIS
OCTOBER 24, 2006**

Strengths

- Good fire/emergency dept (6)
- Natural landscape (6)
- Scenic beauty – keep rural (6)
- Rural area wildlife/farming/good enough tax base (6)
- School/library (6)

- School (5)
- Good school (5)
- Enjoyment of outdoors/nature/woods/wildlife/solitude (5)
- Agriculture base (5)

- Fire & Ambulance (4)
- Good local services (4)
- Open spaces/rural character/relatively low population density/small town feel/nature (4)
- Rural atmosphere/county roads with _____ _____ for wildflowers (4)
- Good services – Fire Dept/EMS/schools (4)

- Location (3)
- Rural atmosphere (3)
- Trash/recyclable pick-up—Fire Dept in Barneveld/Brigham (3)
- Wildlife/Dark skies/few lights/not too much traffic/physical beauty/peace and quiet/Flora and Fauna (3)
- Military Ridge Trail (3)
- Good scenery (3)
- Beauty/interesting art work/unity of residents (3)
- Our present setting – not subdivisions /commercial on 1-2-3 soils (3)
- Bio-diversity (3)
- Big expanses of wood lands (3)
- Fire Dept/EMT's (3)
- Rural character/smart land use decisions (3)

- Nature conservancy preserves and concerns (2)
- Excellent location/access to city but not its problems (2)
- Great community to raise kids (2)
- Rural character (2)
- Roads (2)
- Present local government (2)
- Families living in area for many years (2)
- Natural resources and productive farms (2)
- Unique ecosystems (2)
- Community involved in local government (2)
- Preserve and promote recreational outdoor activities (2)

- Greg Oimoen (2)
- Public participation/transportation corridor/community interest in preserving rural character and natural resources/low crime/Ag. Infrastructure nearby/extraordinary large amounts of cultural resources and rare plant communities (2)
- Sparse population (2)
- Rural character (2)
- Significant natural resources/wildlife habitat (2)

- Not a lot of traffic on county/township roads (1)
- School/farming community (1)
- Peace and quiet (1)
- Small and friendly (1)
- Preserve and promote unique landscape (1)
- Preserve agricultural business base (1)
- Having school system containing only one township of one Village (1)
- Good emergency services (1)
- Community interaction (1)
- Blue Mounds Park (1)
- Engaged citizens (1)

- Land owner opportunity/rural character (0)
- No trailer parks (0)
- Cooperation w/township of Barneveld – efficient (0)
- Natural resources (0)
- Rural setting (0)
- Spring fed streams (0)
- Maintain rural (0)
- Great (local people) are stewards of the land (0)
- Churches/hunting & fishing areas/parks/family farms (0)
- Strong Ag. (0).
- Good roads (0)
- Have a lot of talented people in township (0)
- Stubborn heritages (0)
- Birtah Lake (0)
- Recreation (0)
- Golf Deer Valley (0)
- Nature and beauty
- Rural character/good friendly people (things I would like to happen, maintain rural character/keep good sources/orderly development and maintain productive farmland (0)
- High quality of life (0)

Weaknesses

- Unresponsive Town Board on certain issues (7)
- Lack of professional town management – i.e. Town Manager (7)
- Rules/regulations too complicated, lack of common sense (7)

- Lack of business (6)

- Ordinances don't seem to apply evenly to all citizens (5)
- No DSL (5)
- Development pressures (5)
- Town Board already has their mind made up on issues/ignore public input (5)
- Need fair consistent development (5)
- Development on Ag. land (5)

- Systematic regulations that respect landowner (4)
- Five acre minimum for housing divisions (4)
- Job opportunity (4)
- Lack of tax base (4)
- Not enough small local businesses (4)
- Poor communication between Town Board and residents—new residents (4)
- Five acre per housing density rule while all surrounding minimum of 30 to 40 acres per house/short sightedness/rush to develop and lose open land/farmland forever (4)
- 5 acre lots poor vision planning (4)

- Job opportunities in Brigham – people leave for jobs (3)
- Website lacks _____ and polish (3)
- No audible emergency warning signal (3)
- Plans to protect w/o unnecessary limitations on residents (3)
- Farmers should have more say on land issues than someone that owns 5 acres and a house (3)
- 5 acre minimum lot make us a magnet for development (3)

- Inability to consider development options beyond _____ minimum (2)
- Current lack of overall plan guiding development and subdivisions (2)
- Internet/telephone (2)
- Senior care facilities (2)
- Try to get people to participate – newsletter etc. (2)
- Planning processes function as if our resources will never run out and the world and keep consuming more and more/it is time to downsize ASAP! (2)

- Missed opportunities to consider unique resources and economic benefits (1)
- County zoning and township zoning do not work to mitigate land use conflicts i.e. Ag. vs. Non-Ag. (1)
- _____, ineffective town changing (1)
- People afraid to speak out at public meetings because Board Chair allows loud mouths to insult people with opposing views (1)

- Not listening to public/development without planning (1)
- Not enough people at the meetings – thus they really don't know what's going on (1)
- Land use planning so far (1)
- High taxes (0)
- Village growth that doesn't necessarily take township into account i.e. schools (0)
- Mowing along roads needs improvement – tree removal (0)
- Political divisions among town residents (0)
- _____ community for people daily commuting to Madison (0)
- Conservation areas

Opportunities

- Promote recreation – bike trail (8)
- Opportunities to develop a number of cottage industries related to food production for example (6)
- Purchase of development rights (6)
-
- Better representation of township mentality on Town Board (5)
- School size (5)
- Ability to plan future growth (5)
- Military Ridge/Prairie/Heritage Area/Grassland Area (5)
- Limit non-tax paying groups from buying land (5)
- Natural resources and agricultural tourism base economy (4)
- Job/Madison (4)
- DSL/cable for Internet access (4)
- Creation of a small scale, sustainable local economy – small farms/homesteads growing food for local consumption (4)
- Not fully developed yet/have not built roads, houses, businesses land (4)
- Large commercial entering the township (4)
- Develop market for local products like farmer's market (4)
- Natural resources of local/state/regional significance (4)
- Activities for kids (3)
- Controlling future growth (3)
- Preservation of scenic vistas and scenic beauty (3)
- Renewable energy (3)
- UW system locations – close proximity—job opportunity (3)
- Good paying jobs (3)
- Farmer's Market (3)
- Maintain growth – slow and according to all ordinances (3)
- The comp plan should have the chance to maintain the rural setting (3)
- Support organic farming (3)
- Nature based recreation (3)
- More small commercial opportunity (3)

- Grass-fed organic new family _____ (2)
- Expansion of preservation areas with public access (2)
- Maintain/support the family farm (2)
- Plan for maintenance of rural atmosphere (2)
- Recreation/tourism (2)

- Eco-friendly development that includes tourism (1)
- Agricultural easements purchased by town/conservatory agencies (1)
- Population explosion (1)
- Genuine interest of landowners, NGO's, State/Federal Agencies to pressure natural resources and agricultural lands (1)

- Preservation of "green space" (0)
- To be the township that doesn't make the "Mt Horeb" mistake (0)
- Do we want the tax base to increase?
- Conservation land being "farmed" by locals (0)
- Conservation land held to good maintenance/standards (0)
- Carefully planned development (0)

Threats

- Increasing development and pressure (9)

- Stopping all growth (6)
- Unregulated housing development/rampant growth/uncontrolled growth (6)
-
- Development without guidelines (5)
- Change zoning regulation (5 acre minimum) to allow mix of residential lots of normal size with viable agricultural (cropland) and forest land/see Ford Foundation Report (1957) "A Farm to Nurture Man and Nature" (5)

- Subdivision that threaten farm operations because of the city expectations (4)
- Over suburban development due to 18/151 and closeness to Madison (4)
- Losing farms (4)
- Losing property to annexation/tax base (4)
- Ground water (4)
- Losing our youth (4)
- Loss of property rights (4)
- Increasing number of housing developments – five acre minimum/suburbia/developers interested in subdivisions and making Brigham a town (4)
- Subdivisions/more traffic/more light pollution/loss of peace – solitude (4)
- Subdivisions/annexation of town land by Village of Barneveld (4)
- Too much land taken off of normal tax rate/too much development in wrong areas/DNR buying up so much land (4)

- Too restrictive on development (3)

- Drunken driving (3)
- Losing property to non-taxable entities (3)
- Loss of school (3)
- Too many regulations (3)
- Losing some control of land issues as a farmer (3)
- Loss of property rights (3)
- Grassland habitat fragmentation (3)
- Water quality (3)

- Threat of random development that might restrict or reduce ag. Base (2)
- Getting too crowded (2)
- Farm land fragmentation/related rising taxes associated w/sprawl (2)
- Right of landowners overly restricted (2)
- Crown retch – bad weed (2)
- Loss of unique ecosystems (2)
- Outside influence forcing outside agendas (2)
- Expansion of existing road systems (2)
- Unguided ridge-top development/subdivision of parcels into smaller parcels e.g. Blue ___ Primrose/lose of prime farmland, prairie and oak savannas (2)
- The rural setting won't be maintained/prime soil won't be preserved (2)
- Dane county growth/we don't need to grow to “survive” (2)
- Land ethnicity will not be considered/line of discussion w/town often cut off/cut and run attitudes (2)
- Subdivisions thinking it helps schools tax base, but may not (2)
- Light pollution from billboards/businesses (2)

- Development that is without thought and threatens the rural beauty that is Brigham (1)
- Loss of hunting and fishing opportunities (1)
- Not being able to rebuild our home if a catastrophic event occurs because our land doesn't meet the code! (1)
- Drainage off farmland out roads and river (1)
- High speeds not enforced on rural roads (1)
- Losing agriculture (1)
- Corporate farms (1)
- Rapidly increasing property taxes (1)
- Excessive development (1)
- Big box retailers (1)
- Pollution from large farms/pest-control/groundwater contamination (1)
- Ethanol ___ in town of ___ will pollute our air (1)
- Invasive species (1)

- Hwy 151 corridor development outside village service area (0)
- Individual rights (0)
- Madison growth along interstate (0)
- Invasive species left to grow wild (0)
- Loss of rural sense of community (0)

- Too much control or not enough control by local government/there need to be a middle ground that allows for some development, but within reason (0)
- Poorly planned, excessive development (0)
- Over development (0)
- Doug Cieslak drift less area land conservancy (0)
- Corporate farms (0)

