Hacker, Marsha

From:

Fries, Greg

Sent:

Monday, August 03, 2009 7:46 AM Pien, Janet; Hacker, Marsha

Subject:

FW: Zwerg/Glenway storm sewer assessment

Correspondence regarding public hearing for Hillcrest this Wed. Can you include in file?

Thanks

Greq

Greg Fries, P.E. Principal Engineer City Engineering Room 115 City/County Building 210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd. Madison, WI 53703

P-608-267-1199 F-608-264-9275

----Original Message----

From: Susan Werther [mailto:shwerther@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, August 01, 2009 5:05 PM

To: Fries, Greg

Subject: Zwerg/Glenway storm sewer assessment

Dear Greq Fries,

It was good to speak with you over the phone earlier this week, to discuss the proposed Zwerg/Glenway storm sewer project. I have written a short statement that I would like to have included at the hearing on August 5th.

Many thanks for your help.

Susan Werther

I am writing in regard to a letter we received from the City Engineering Division dated July 24, 2009, which addressed the proposed Zwerg/Glenway/Hillcrest/Franklin storm sewer project.

As citizens and taxpayers, we often help to cover the cost of projects that do not directly benefit us, and at other times, we receive benefits that others have helped pay for. This is a necessary part of belonging to a community, which entails both benefits and responsibilities.

However, I think that we should rethink that method by which the costs have been distributed. First, since the estimated assessments are based on the percentage of the lot that drains to the watershed, the two properties that are most affected (3704 Hillcrest, and 3709 Zwerg) are actually assessed at a lower rate than many others that would not stand to gain any advantage from having the work done.

The total assessment for the project is \$12,373. If this cost were divided between the 18 homes that drain into the watershed, the cost per household would be \$687. Whereas the 3704 Hillcrest property is assessed at \$681, and the 3709 Zwerg property is \$706-- very close to the average--other homes have been assessed at much higher rates: \$1,126; \$993; \$970 being the three highest. In fact, there are 6 other homes with higher assessments than the two interested parties.

Therefore, it seems that the fairest approach would be for the owners of these two lots to cover the greatest cost, with other households contributing much smaller amounts. For example, if the owners of the two most affected properties were to pay \$3,000 each, the balance of \$6,373 could be divided among the remaining 16 households at \$398 each.

With the city already pledged to pay 1/2 of the total bill, and if the other neighbors covered 1/4, then each of the interested parties would pay 1/8 of what they would need to pay if they alone were responsible for the cost. This seems to me a reasonable solution to the problem.

Thank you. Susan Werther 139 Glenway St. 233-3932