

**Veldran, Lisa**

---

**From:** Clear, Mark  
**Sent:** Friday, October 17, 2014 3:18 PM  
**To:** All Alders  
**Cc:** Allen, Heather; Mayor; Viste, Doran; Schmiedicke, David; Eddy, Marla; Knepp, Eric  
**Subject:** Urban forestry special charge update

Dear Colleagues,

When you receive the Council agenda tomorrow, you will see an item for reconsideration of the urban forestry special charge (Legistar 35038). I asked Ald. King to make this motion, which he is eligible to do as he was absent at the Oct. 7 meeting.

I'm not usually a fan of reconsideration unless circumstances have changed. In this case, several things have changed that merit our revisiting this issue.

First, we've all had some time to review and receive briefings on the Mayor's budget, which had been released just hours before our last meeting.

Second is the information in the attached memo. Many of you expressed concerns about the uncertainty of implementation, so I worked with staff over the past week to provide a more fleshed-out plan for the preferred apportionment option of linear street frontage. (An actual implementation plan, ready for council review and approval, will take probably a couple of months, so could not be prepared in time for our meeting. And obviously we don't want to commit the staff time to preparing such a plan unless we know it will move forward.)

Third is that the level of public awareness and concern over EAB has increased, even in just the past week, probably in response to the Mayor's budget. At Parks Commission this week we had several speakers on EAB, pleading for more to be done to preserve trees in parks, even though the topic was not on the agenda. Though the purpose of this legislation is not EAB-specific, the significant demand for resources caused by EAB can't be uncoupled from this proposal.

I very much appreciate your willingness to review these materials and revisit the issue on Tuesday.



apportionment  
for urban forest...

Mark C.



## Office of the Common Council

### Alder Mark Clear, District 19

---

City-County Building, Room 417  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
Phone (608) 266-4071  
Fax (608) 267-8669  
[district19@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district19@cityofmadison.com)  
[www.cityofmadison.com/council/district19](http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district19)

To: Common Council, Mayor Soglin  
From: Alder Mark Clear, Chair, Alternative Revenue Workgroup  
Heather Allen, Common Council Legislative Analyst  
Doran Viste, Assistant City Attorney  
Date: October 17, 2014  
RE: Estimates of proposed urban forestry special charge

The purpose of this memo is to delineate a preferred option and several alternatives for implementation of the proposed Urban Forestry Special Charge.

At its meeting of October 21, 2014, the Common Council will be asked to reconsider a motion to adopt Legistar 35038, an ordinance amendment to enable an Urban Forestry Special Charge. This motion failed 8-11 at the meeting on October 7, and reconsideration has been requested by Ald. King, who was not present at the Oct. 7 meeting. A correlated report of the Council Ad Hoc Workgroup on Alternative Sources of Revenue was accepted by the Council on Oct. 7.

During the discussion on Oct. 7, a number of Council members expressed concerns about the uncertainty of implementation of the special charge, and about the relationship between the special charge and the operating budget, which had been released just that afternoon.

**NOTE: Adoption of the ordinance under reconsideration does not indicate the council's preference for or preclusion of any of the options listed (or not listed) in this memo.**

#### Implementation Process

The process to create and implement the charge follows:

1. Council adopts an ordinance establishing the special charge
2. The City Forester, supported by the City Attorney and Finance Director, prepares a draft "urban forestry special charge policy" that establishes the method of calculating and apportioning the charge;
3. Council adopts the urban forestry special charge policy by resolution;
4. Council sets a charge rate by resolution (similar to setting the stormwater rate, which is adjusted annually but could be modified more or less often).
5. Charge is applied to the monthly Municipal Services Bill.

Step two will take some time. In creating the policy, staff and then the council will want to consider how to account for corner lots, condominiums, State property and other issues.

#### Budget Impact

The Executive 2015 Operating Budget anticipates revenue from the urban forestry special charge of \$527,500. One-time administrative costs for implementation (modifying the municipal services bill) are estimated at \$20,000 to \$30,000. Based on these figures this memo provides estimates to approximate the rate of the charge, and its affect on various example properties, to fulfill the budget expectations and administrative costs of \$557,500. Depending on the exact month of implementation on the municipal services bill, the monthly rate can be prorated by the number of remaining billing cycles in 2015.

**Apportionment Scenarios Summary**

<b>Method</b>	<b>Rate (annual)</b>
Linear street frontage (764 miles or 8,067,840 feet)	\$0.0691 per foot
Per street tree (96,074)	\$5.80 per tree
Per resident (240,323)	\$2.32 per resident
Per parcel (73,793)	\$7.55 per parcel
Per municipal services bill (66,000)	\$8.45 per bill

**Apportionment Scenarios Detail**

**Linear Street Frontage Method (Preferred option)**

The city of Madison has 764 miles of linear road frontage for a total of 8,067,840 total feet, including both sides of the street. This measurement includes only the frontage of the street on which the property is addressed, so that corner lots are not unduly penalized. Each linear foot would be charged at \$0.0691. By way of example, a typical urban residential lot of 40 feet width would be charged \$2.76 per year; a more suburban lot of 80 feet would be charged \$5.53, and a large commercial parcel such as the state DOT property on Sheboygan Avenue (1308 feet) would be charged \$90.38.

This method would impact all property owners subject to special charges including tax-exempt properties. This method has no relationship to the number of street trees adjacent to the property, as the urban forest provides benefits to all properties. The City uses a linear road frontage method when specially assessing the costs of street improvements, which includes special provisions for multi-frontage lots.

This method was recommended by the Alternative Revenue Work Group, and is presented here as the preferred option.

**Cost Per Street Tree Method**

The City of Madison has 96,074 street trees and could impose charges based on the presence of a street tree adjacent to a property. Using this method, the cost per street tree under the scenario proposed above would be \$5.80. There are several challenges to this method of apportionment:

- Areas of the city with more street trees will face higher charges, potentially creating inequities
- The amount charged to an individual property would not accurately reflect the shared benefit of the entire urban forest including trees in public parks, cemeteries and other public buildings
- Property owners could be disincentivized to "host" a public tree adjacent to their property
- This method could convey some sense of private ownership over the City's street trees

**Cost Per Resident Method**

Madison is home to 240,323 residents. If the charge were apportioned on a per resident basis, the charge would be \$2.32 for each resident. This method does not reflect the type of residence, age of individual, or other distinguishing characteristics. It would also be very difficult to determine how many residents resided at each property. In addition, this method would not apply to companies, institutions or other beneficiaries of the urban forest and, rather, increases the financial burden on individual residents.

**Cost Per Parcel**

Madison has 73,793 parcels of property. If the charge were apportioned evenly across all parcels, each parcel would pay \$7.55. This charge would include non-profit institutions and tax-exempt properties, and would be the same regardless of the size of the parcel. A downtown condo owner would pay the same charge as a commercial property with four blocks of frontage. This method would shift some of the burden of the program to smaller parcels from larger parcels, which would impact single-family residences disproportionately.

October 17, 2014

Page 3

**Cost Per Utility Bill**

The City of Madison delivers 66,000 municipal services utility bills to residents, businesses and property owners. If the urban forestry special charge were allocated according to utility bills, the cost would be approximately \$8.45 per bill. While administratively this method may seem straightforward, the municipal services bills do not necessarily correspond to the taxable property which is served (for example, an apartment may have several water meters, but only one tax bill). This could lead to complications in administering the charge to ensure that it could still be collected on the tax bill as unpaid special charges become a lien on the property.