Date of Request: 10/27/20

Requestor: Joe Terry

Request/Referral: Consider directing staff to develop and solicit requests for proposals for a consultant to aid in developing a transportation utility plan and financial evaluation.

Background information: The public survey about potential methods to fund public works street construction and maintenance has concluded. The responses indicated the public is in favor of a system that is predictable and fair for everyone. Based on the survey, the transportation utility was the most desired method to accomplish this.

Over time the decline in state aid due in part to a lack of a progressive gasoline fuel tax and improved fuel efficiency of vehicles has resulted in communities statewide relying more on assessments and local property taxes for these activities. During the same time, the property tax burden has shifted significantly to residential property owners. Funding a sustainable program under the current levy limit rules and state-imposed restrictions is currently not possible without unreasonably affecting other City services. Due to the many positive reasons outlined in the Special Assessment Evaluation of Alternative report and the results of the public opinion survey, staff recommends the development of a transportation utility as a fair method to fund a sustainable street maintenance program and to potentially lower property taxes.

The premise of the study was to consider alternatives to special assessments. While not specified as part of that discussion, it is understood that if a TUF is established special assessments will remain a tool to fund projects that are unique and benefit individual property owners but are not street maintenance related, such as dredging of creeks, special decorative streetscapes, or specific subdivision/neighborhood requests/needs.

Options available: Begin to prepare a transportation utility plan or continue to evaluate options.

Action you are requesting the committee take: Direct staff to prepare a RFP and solicit proposals to aid in developing a transportation utility plan and financial evaluation with the following considerations:

- A plan that removes street related reconstruction and repair from the General Fund including: reconstruction and maintenance of streets, curb and gutter, street signs,
traffic signals, pavement markings, sidewalks, multi-use trails and any other appropriate street maintenance activity.

- A plan that does not include snow and ice control services or costs related to new streets.
- A plan that will outline a fee structure for the immediate replacement of special assessment revenues.
- A plan that will outline a fee structure that funds a sustainable annual street maintenance program including up to 1.5 miles of complete street reconstruction, up to 2.75 miles of pavement rehabilitation/resurfacing, and street maintenance practices to sustain pavements and provide the best value.
- A plan that will evaluate options for a financial goal of eliminating debt for reconstruction and as debt is eliminated funding becomes focused on sustainable reconstruction.
- A plan that will include detailed methods of calculating a fee structure that appropriately charges all properties within the City based on traffic impacts of specific property use.
- A rate structure that considers those who have recent special assessments for street related reconstruction and repair improvements.
- A plan that will include a financial evaluation and illustrations to describe current and proposed distribution of costs and estimated fees based on the City’s defined scenarios.

**How will the item be financed?** $20,000 is requested in the 2021 Engineering budget.
Districts Represented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefer the CURRENT PROGRAM?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Yes or Neutral</th>
<th>No or Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral.</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefer the VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Yes or Neutral</th>
<th>No or Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral.</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prefer the TRANSPORTATION UTILITY?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference</th>
<th>Yes or Neutral</th>
<th>No or Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral.</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you prefer the CURRENT PROGRAM?

- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, somewhat.
- Neutral.
- No, not really.
- No, definitely not.

Do you prefer the VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE?

- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, somewhat.
- Neutral.
- No, not really.
- No, definitely not.

Do you prefer the TRANSPORTATION UTILITY?

- Yes, absolutely.
- Yes, somewhat.
- Neutral.
- No, not really.
- No, definitely not.
Do you prefer the GENERAL PROPERTY TAX INCREASE?

Yes, absolutely. 22.9%
Yes, somewhat. 18.1%
Neutral. 12.0%
No, not really. 20.5%
No, definitely not. 26.5%

Yes, absolutely or somewhat. 41.0%
No, definitely not or not really. 47.0%

Do you prefer the PILOT FOR WASTEWATER UTILITY?

Yes, absolutely or somewhat. 4.8%
Yes, somewhat. 18.1%
Neutral. 22.9%
No, not really. 24.1%
No, definitely not. 30.1%

Yes, absolutely or somewhat. 22.9%
No, definitely not or not really. 54.2%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streetname</th>
<th>Do you prefer the CURRENT PROGRAM to offset street construction and maintenance costs?</th>
<th>What is the reason for your response to the CURRENT PROGRAM?</th>
<th>Do you prefer the VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE to offset street construction and maintenance costs?</th>
<th>What is the reason for your response to the VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE?</th>
<th>Do you prefer the TRANSPORTATION UTILITY to offset street construction and maintenance costs?</th>
<th>What is the reason for your response to the TRANSPORTATION UTILITY?</th>
<th>Do you prefer the GENERAL PROPERTY TAX INCREASE to offset street construction and maintenance costs?</th>
<th>What is the reason for your response to the GENERAL PROPERTY TAX INCREASE?</th>
<th>Do you prefer the PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILOT) FOR WASTEWATER UTILITY?</th>
<th>What is the reason for your response to the PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES (PILOT) FOR WASTEWATER UTILITY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2020 16:45:13</td>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2020 16:54:37</td>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/18/2020 19:19:28</td>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/19/2020 11:36:42</td>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>Could be a reasonable alternative.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>Not comprehensive enough.</td>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>Thought it might take awhile to set up, a transportation utility seems more equitable. The list of pros is long, but the benefit is very tangible.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>Tax exempt properties are not an issue for 19th Ave. S, but this could be a big issue somewhere else.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>The many &quot;cons.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 5:06:30</td>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 8:39:19</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>We have no control over who uses the roads we pay additional fees for. The property is owned by the city, not the citizens.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 9:11:08</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>We have no control over who uses the roads we pay additional fees for. The property is owned by the city, not the citizens.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 9:36:59</td>
<td>Yes, absolutely.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 10:06:02</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 10:36:04</td>
<td>No, definitely not.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 10:56:50</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/2020 15:06:24</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>The current program pats too much on individual property tax.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>It would directly address those who use the streets being maintained.</td>
<td>Yes, somewhat.</td>
<td>I could be used in part (not in full) to offset the cost of street work that benefits all city residents.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>You'd have a hard time selling this option, so I won't just accept it. People might not even be aware of it.</td>
<td>No, not really.</td>
<td>In combination with another option, it addresses the need to dig up streets in the first place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a fairly large issue and I would be in the best interest of the City that the assessment comes in the Citizens more directly. I doubt that not just one but a series of hearing sessions take place. There sessions need to happen on varied dates of the week and at varied times to get the most number of folks the opportunity to come down and review and question the process. I’m taking meetings, morning, weekdays, and weekends.
Shane Blaser made a big deal about not raising taxes during his mayoral campaign. He expressed dismay over how Vruwink was funding a number of projects. This option is back pedaling and dishonest in my opinion. No, definitely not. 

I don’t think the majority of residents are financially prepared to pay an extra assessment once the work is complete. While the resident does receive benefit from the work they’re doing, aren’t they property owners benefitting from their property taxes? They aren’t the only resident that receives benefit from the work that’s being done. As taxpayers, we all use the roads within our community and therefore, like the idea of sharing the cost among all taxpayers. For those residents who choose not to pay the assessment in full and later on portal of time, this is a factor that gets the neighborhood frustrated about paying for things that they didn’t agree to. 9/21/2020 12:36:25 No, not really. 

I think registration fees are for driving on roads. Fees are high enough already. Neutral. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t think the idea of splitting up the cost amongst all drivers is the right way to go. It’s too costly for my property tax bill. Yes, somewhat. 

I recently had a special assessment and it was a lot but I also benefited and increased my property value. Yes, somewhat. Those that use the roads should pay for them. Neutral. No, not really. My tax is already too high. I can’t afford to pay higher property taxes. Neutral. No, not really. 

This idea allows residents to the ability to pay for this cost during their monthly/semi annual budget. It sounds like the method for a very labor intensive on the front end and yet it allows for the work to be spread equally across the businesses and residents; however, I learn like this option will allow city officials to determine exactly the amount of funds necessary for current and future projects to ensure they have the funding they need. Business and residents looking to to get a better pricing when it comes to the cost. Neutral. No, not really. 

It seems “fair” that the homeowners directly impacted by the repairs carry the brunt of the funding but I recognize the limitations of the current structure the better. Thank you for your time and dedication to this topic! 9/21/2020 10:36:06 Yes, somewhat. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t wish to pay more on our monthly utility bills. We already watch our usage to keep our bill as low as possible. Neutral. No, definitely not. 

I don’t think the majority of residents are financially prepared to pay an extra assessment once the work is complete. While the resident does receive benefit from the work they’re doing, aren’t they property owners benefitting from their property taxes? They aren’t the only resident that receives benefit from the work that’s being done. As taxpayers, we all use the roads within our community and therefore, like the idea of sharing the cost among all taxpayers. For those residents who choose not to pay the assessment in full and later on portal of time, this is a factor that gets the neighborhood frustrated about paying for things that they didn’t agree to. 9/21/2020 12:36:25 No, not really. 

I think registration fees are for driving on roads. Fees are high enough already. Neutral. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t think the idea of splitting up the cost amongst all drivers is the right way to go. It’s too costly for my property tax bill. Yes, somewhat. 

I recently had a special assessment and it was a lot but I also benefited and increased my property value. Yes, somewhat. Those that use the roads should pay for them. Neutral. No, not really. My tax is already too high. I can’t afford to pay higher property taxes. Neutral. No, not really. 

This idea allows residents to the ability to pay for this cost during their monthly/semi annual budget. It sounds like the method for a very labor intensive on the front end and yet it allows for the work to be spread equally across the businesses and residents; however, I learn like this option will allow city officials to determine exactly the amount of funds necessary for current and future projects to ensure they have the funding they need. Business and residents looking to to get a better pricing when it comes to the cost. Neutral. No, not really. 

I don’t think the majority of residents are financially prepared to pay an extra assessment once the work is complete. While the resident does receive benefit from the work they’re doing, aren’t they property owners benefitting from their property taxes? They aren’t the only resident that receives benefit from the work that’s being done. As taxpayers, we all use the roads within our community and therefore, like the idea of sharing the cost among all taxpayers. For those residents who choose not to pay the assessment in full and later on portal of time, this is a factor that gets the neighborhood frustrated about paying for things that they didn’t agree to. 9/21/2020 12:36:25 No, not really. 

I think registration fees are for driving on roads. Fees are high enough already. Neutral. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t think the idea of splitting up the cost amongst all drivers is the right way to go. It’s too costly for my property tax bill. Yes, somewhat. 

I recently had a special assessment and it was a lot but I also benefited and increased my property value. Yes, somewhat. Those that use the roads should pay for them. Neutral. No, not really. My tax is already too high. I can’t afford to pay higher property taxes. Neutral. No, not really. 

This idea allows residents to the ability to pay for this cost during their monthly/semi annual budget. It sounds like the method for a very labor intensive on the front end and yet it allows for the work to be spread equally across the businesses and residents; however, I learn like this option will allow city officials to determine exactly the amount of funds necessary for current and future projects to ensure they have the funding they need. Business and residents looking to to get a better pricing when it comes to the cost. Neutral. No, not really. 

I don’t think the majority of residents are financially prepared to pay an extra assessment once the work is complete. While the resident does receive benefit from the work they’re doing, aren’t they property owners benefitting from their property taxes? They aren’t the only resident that receives benefit from the work that’s being done. As taxpayers, we all use the roads within our community and therefore, like the idea of sharing the cost among all taxpayers. For those residents who choose not to pay the assessment in full and later on portal of time, this is a factor that gets the neighborhood frustrated about paying for things that they didn’t agree to. 9/21/2020 12:36:25 No, not really. 

I think registration fees are for driving on roads. Fees are high enough already. Neutral. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t think the idea of splitting up the cost amongst all drivers is the right way to go. It’s too costly for my property tax bill. Yes, somewhat. 

I recently had a special assessment and it was a lot but I also benefited and increased my property value. Yes, somewhat. Those that use the roads should pay for them. Neutral. No, not really. My tax is already too high. I can’t afford to pay higher property taxes. Neutral. No, not really. 

This idea allows residents to the ability to pay for this cost during their monthly/semi annual budget. It sounds like the method for a very labor intensive on the front end and yet it allows for the work to be spread equally across the businesses and residents; however, I learn like this option will allow city officials to determine exactly the amount of funds necessary for current and future projects to ensure they have the funding they need. Business and residents looking to to get a better pricing when it comes to the cost. Neutral. No, not really. 

I don’t think the majority of residents are financially prepared to pay an extra assessment once the work is complete. While the resident does receive benefit from the work they’re doing, aren’t they property owners benefitting from their property taxes? They aren’t the only resident that receives benefit from the work that’s being done. As taxpayers, we all use the roads within our community and therefore, like the idea of sharing the cost among all taxpayers. For those residents who choose not to pay the assessment in full and later on portal of time, this is a factor that gets the neighborhood frustrated about paying for things that they didn’t agree to. 9/21/2020 12:36:25 No, not really. 

I think registration fees are for driving on roads. Fees are high enough already. Neutral. Yes, absolutely. 

I don’t think the idea of splitting up the cost amongst all drivers is the right way to go. It’s too costly for my property tax bill. Yes, somewhat. 

I recently had a special assessment and it was a lot but I also benefited and increased my property value. Yes, somewhat. Those that use the roads should pay for them. Neutral. No, not really. My tax is already too high. I can’t afford to pay higher property taxes. Neutral. No, not really. 

This idea allows residents to the ability to pay for this cost during their monthly/semi annual budget. It sounds like the method for a very labor intensive on the front end and yet it allows for the work to be spread equally across the businesses and residents; however, I learn like this option will allow city officials to determine exactly the amount of funds necessary for current and future projects to ensure they have the funding they need. Business and residents looking to to get a better pricing when it comes to the cost. Neutral. No, not really.
This also appears to be an equitable and cost effective alternative that will spread the costs among all residents. As the tax exempt properties are already not contributing toward the taxes, this would create a more equitable spread across the board. This seems to be a more equitable spread across the board. While this option appears to be the most equitable overall, I do have concerns regarding what, if any, checks and balances will be put into place, so that the costs are not arbitrarily increased on a constant and continual basis.

I came from a town where taxes were spent for special interests of city hall. Usually the taxpayers money didn’t get to the correct project. Because obviously it’s not working when there is a huge section of black top cut out with dirt showing at the corner of Spencer and 17th and there is a huge pot hole that you need to swerve around to miss. I just purchased a new car this year and don’t need to replace struts. This isn’t clearly explained. Again as all the other choices there’s no meeting. While this option appears to be on the most equitable overall, I do have concerns regarding what, if any, checks and balances will be put into place, so that the costs are not arbitrarily increased on a constant and continual basis.

I was confused by the explanation. It seems to require a lot more work to get going Neutral. The cost to the home owner is unreasonable considering it is a public road. I would have to take a loan out to pay for a public road which receives funding from taxes already. Love that you are asking residents for their feedback, and reaching out on FB and other online sources, however the WR website doesn’t work well with phones I had to go on a desktop. Love that you are asking residents for their feedback, and reaching out on FB and other online sources, however the WR website doesn’t work well with phones I had to go on a desktop.

In conjunction with a street utility, I think it would be acceptable. Neutral. It seems to require a lot more work to get going Neutral. Neighbors and family are on board. Neutral. Neighbors and family are on board. Neutral. Neighbors and family are on board.

My inability to pay the ghastly amt. I’ve been assessed. Yes, somewhat. My inability to pay the ghastly amt. I’ve been assessed. Yes, somewhat.

Do not know how you would figure payment Yes, absolutely. Do not know how you would figure payment Yes, absolutely.

While the tax exempt properties are already not contributing toward the city budget, I consider that to be a violation. This would make sure that more people are invested in the public road system, and lower cost for everyone. Not fair and equitable No, definitely not.

This is more fair than the tax payers have to pay for something they have no say in getting done. This is not right to stick a homeowner with a bill for something they have no say in getting done. Love that you are asking residents for their feedback, and reaching out on FB and other online sources, however the WR website doesn’t work well with phones I had to go on a desktop.

The cost to the home owner is unreasonable considering it is a public road. I would have to take a loan out to pay for a public road which receives funding from taxes already. Love that you are asking residents for their feedback, and reaching out on FB and other online sources, however the WR website doesn’t work well with phones I had to go on a desktop.

This creates a more equitable spread of the costs of current and future road maintenance, repair, and rebuilding. This creates a more equitable spread of the costs of current and future road maintenance, repair, and rebuilding. This would make sure that more people are invested in the public road system, and lower cost for everyone. Neutral. I was confused by the explanation. It seems to require a lot more work to get going Neutral.
Because the real root of the problem in this city is not very aggressive in attracting industry and businesses to build up our tax base, and what gets the bill the homeowner or the vehicle owners, you just iron road shops, no new revitalizing in the night, small restaurants like little Camerons, hardens, etc., this is the tax base to do all the improvements around this city, we have to drive to Willow or Point or any decent shopping. When your boats get to a certain point, I will have no other alternative but to sell and move the rest of our residents are strong. Beautifully the River and repaying efforts to be made to get our tax base to be as clean as you can clearly see, or not. No, definitely not.

Our streets are city PUBLIC city streets, not the responsibility of the individual. Current residents who have to pay tax to fix these real estate and any cost associated. This is an overall responsibility of the city, not just they should to clean or beautify it. The city is not very aggressive to attract industry. Comes a point when we cannot pay more taxes and must sell and businesses to build up the tax base. So, who gets the hit the homeowner or not the vehicle owners, you just retail stores and repaving streets at our expense doesn’t bring in new tax base. No, definitely not.

I don’t think this makes sense and is specific to a type of project (wastewater project). The bigger picture is that the city needs to be responsible for paying the city’s current and future projects. This is the only community that has ever billed me for a sidewalk, which is sneaky and wrong. I didn’t choose to have a sidewalk, nor do I have $1000 to blow on a new sidewalk because my existing sidewalk has a small crack, the tax base and businesses of the city is turning into a ghost town, and there is never any good news to come out of the council meetings. I had my every month election to open more money on consultants for this project or the projects I have to do all these projects doesn’t have to be put on the homeowner or the vehicle owner. We want to sell and businesses to pay for this. No, definitely not.

Our taxes are already quite high compared to surrounding area and our neighborhood and also paid by all. Not just city residents. I have a full-time job for sidewalks repair. I was a full-time job for sidewalks repair and I have to pay for my driveway. If the sidewalk repair wasn’t added to my bill. I also don’t agree with the city. We have a hard time believing that usage of vehicles would be accurately reflected in this bill. Also, don’t agree with the city. Our property taxes are higher than other communities in the surrounding area. It is a lot easier to raise the tax rate than it is to raise the fee. The city has the highest tax rate around. No, not really.

Our property taxes are already higher than other communities in the surrounding area. This is the only community that has ever considered the cost of maintaining city streets. I believe a county recommendation; this measure would charge a fee that actually coincides with usage of the road. I would also suggest that certain roads get substantial usage from non-residents and to put the burden on the resident is unfair. Neutral. No, definitely not.

Our taxes are already quite high. Since homeowners are not responsible in any way for road maintenance, it makes no sense to tax the residents of the city. Yes, absolutely.

Our taxes are already quite high. Since homeowners are not responsible in any way for road maintenance, it makes no sense to tax the residents of the city. Yes, absolutely.

The city is in a fiscal crisis and ineffective. They spent 10 hours repairing 10 feet of road outside my house, but forgot to add a couple feet. I had to call the city highways, who sent another crew to put the work from the two fronts. We have to do it on our own and pay for it. Looks like you need to remain your vehicle at the end of the road. No, not really.

We need to raise our vehicle registration fee. Yes, somewhat.

Our streets are city PUBLIC city streets, not the responsibility of the individual. Current residents who have to pay tax to fix these real estate and any cost associated. This is an overall responsibility of the city, not just they should to clean or beautify it. The city is not very aggressive to attract industry. Comes a point when we cannot pay more taxes and must sell and businesses to build up the tax base. So, who gets the hit the homeowner or not the vehicle owners, you just retail stores and repaving streets at our expense doesn’t bring in new tax base. No, definitely not.

Our taxes are already quite high compared to surrounding area and our neighborhood and also paid by all. Not just city residents. I have a full-time job for sidewalks repair. I was a full-time job for sidewalks repair and I have to pay for my driveway. If the sidewalk repair wasn’t added to my bill. I also don’t agree with the city. We have a hard time believing that usage of vehicles would be accurately reflected in this bill. Also, don’t agree with the city. Our property taxes are higher than other communities in the surrounding area. It is a lot easier to raise the tax rate than it is to raise the fee. The city has the highest tax rate around. No, not really.

Our taxes are already quite high. Since homeowners are not responsible in any way for road maintenance, it makes no sense to tax the residents of the city. Yes, absolutely.

Our taxes are already quite high. Since homeowners are not responsible in any way for road maintenance, it makes no sense to tax the residents of the city. Yes, absolutely.

The city is in a fiscal crisis and ineffective. They spent 10 hours repairing 10 feet of road outside my house, but forgot to add a couple feet. I had to call the city highways, who sent another crew to put the work from the two fronts. We have to do it on our own and pay for it. Looks like you need to remain your vehicle at the end of the road. No, not really.

We need to raise our vehicle registration fee. Yes, somewhat.

Our streets are city PUBLIC city streets, not the responsibility of the individual. Current residents who have to pay tax to fix these real estate and any cost associated. This is an overall responsibility of the city, not just they should to clean or beautify it. The city is not very aggressive to attract industry. Comes a point when we cannot pay more taxes and must sell and businesses to build up the tax base. So, who gets the hit the homeowner or not the vehicle owners, you just retail stores and repaving streets at our expense doesn’t bring in new tax base. No, definitely not.

Our taxes are already quite high compared to surrounding area and our neighborhood and also paid by all. Not just city residents. I have a full-time job for sidewalks repair. I was a full-time job for sidewalks repair and I have to pay for my driveway. If the sidewalk repair wasn’t added to my bill. I also don’t agree with the city. We have a hard time believing that usage of vehicles would be accurately reflected in this bill. Also, don’t agree with the city. Our property taxes are higher than other communities in the surrounding area. It is a lot easier to raise the tax rate than it is to raise the fee. The city has the highest tax rate around. No, not really.

Our taxes are already quite high. Since homeowners are not responsible in any way for road maintenance, it makes no sense to tax the residents of the city. Yes, absolutely.
For a city-owned utility, I'm inherently opposed to increasing taxes. No, definitely not.

This looks very much like the "report your miles driven" deal. The setup required to initiate this is massive, and relies on everyone checking in every vehicle with an odometer reading every year. No, not really.

I watched the Washington Street repave project happen this summer/fall, and was amazed at the duration of the project. The street remained unpaved for a long period of time, having to be re-graded, repacked, re-watered so the same day, no cure time. Having been part of a parking lot pave project last year, I can see we'll need to repave again pretty quickly. So, the project did not appear to be handled efficiently at all, and more efficiently should be the first place to look, rather than tapping into the pockets of the city residents. Special assessments aren't great, but that's better than the status quo.

Wheel taxes have not improved roads in any areas they've been enacted. The money gets collected, but the roads continue to be terrible in those areas. We've also talked with other people who have had them, especially when the "roadway" gets thrown in the mix, as if it all still in the same parking lot. This looks very much like the "report your miles driven" deal. The setup required to initiate this is massive, and relies on everyone checking in every vehicle with an odometer reading every year. No, not really.

Many people using our streets are not City residents or don't drive during the day, or one resident may have many vehicles, while another has none. The current program is less discriminatory than the alternatives.

Admitted, I think this might be the fairest way to go in the long term. If we don't properly understand the balance of this program, I'm assuming that just about everybody pays under this program. No, not really.

There would be very few who would be exempt from this program. Even though most of my life has been in the non-profit sector, I still think this sector should be helping to carry the load. Neutral.

I don't quite understand how this would work. Thank you for providing this survey. It is well done!

I'm not a property owner and I only pay property taxes through the rent (pay for my apartments). However, I always have thought that the current program is unfair, because it is not the property owner who is being assessed that gives the most benefit from the construction or maintenance. It is the general public who benefits. For example, why should the property owner pay for the sidewalks, when they are used by the public and benefiting the general public? I also feel walking down the sidewalks and feel the need to repave due to the need to repave. The current program is less discriminatory than the alternatives.

Yes, somewhat. Neutral. I don't quite understand how this would work.

The current program is unfair to residents that reside on corner lots, which the City has failed to identify in your trial descriptions of each program. Corner lots do not hold any more assessed value than an interior lot, but they may be paying the special assessments on their yards and driveways. This looks very much like the "report your miles driven" deal. The setup required to initiate this is massive, and relies on everyone checking in every vehicle with an odometer reading every year. No, not really.

The current program is unfair to residents that reside on corner lots, which the City has failed to identify in your trial descriptions of each program. Corner lots do not hold any more assessed value than an interior lot, but they may be paying the special assessments on their yards and driveways. Neutral.

Yes, somewhat. Neutral. I don't quite understand how this would work.

I'm not convinced property owners would have any real input. Also, I do not believe this is fair. This looks very much like the "report your miles driven" deal. The setup required to initiate this is massive, and relies on everyone checking in every vehicle with an odometer reading every year. No, not really.

I'm not conviced property owners would have any real input. Also, I do not believe this is fair. Neutral.

This seems like the fairest idea, but it doesn't allow for the people that use our public roads...too costly for homeowners, given the current special assessment method.

This seems like the fairest idea, but it doesn't allow for the people that use our public roads...too costly for homeowners, given the current special assessment method.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. If the City expenses should be distributed evenly to all city property owners, neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.

I would like the program to benefit all of the other options, but I still have some concerns. Neutral.
Assessments are a huge expense for homeowners that can blindside them. Many homeowners in our community are on a fixed income, currently unemployed or generally not able to afford this large expense. No, definitely not.

Definitely want the current special assessment system replaced. The vehicle registration fee seems the easiest and minimal fees to implement. Would hope that any special assessments remaining on the books when a new system is implemented would be limited to a maximum of $800,000 but don't like that it will raise as roads get replaced. Only vehicle owners of less than 8000 lbs. contribute. Many people use the roads, sidewalks & other improvements. This is not a fair & equity way to pass along the cost. Yes, somewhat.

As a homeowner I would gladly pay a little more each year based on the property value of my home instead of getting hit with this huge assessment fee. It is true that some can easily be transposed and budgeted for. As a homeowner I would gladly pay a little more each year based on the property value of my home instead of getting hit with the huge assessment fee. This seems the most fair. Neutral.

Yes, absolutely.

Definitely want the current special assessment system replaced. The vehicle registration fee seems the easiest and minimal fees to implement. Neutral.

Funds would be spent with administrative costs. No, definitely not.

Neutral.

The special assessment is too harsh on the individual property owner. Things to keep in mind when a new system is implemented would be: The special assessment is too harsh on the individual property owner. No, definitely not.

Anything to offset the cost to the home owner, way to expensive to have to pay 11,000.00 to the city for them to redo the sidewalks and street repair, curb and gutter. Why don't repairs get done in a little at a time instead of slapping a huge bill on us. Yes, absolutely.

Almost anything to offset the cost to the home owner, way to expensive to have to pay 11,000.00 to the city for them to redo the sidewalks and street repair, curb and gutter. Yes, absolutely.

Would make our property taxes higher than surrounding communities, making our city look unfavorable to future residents. Yes, absolutely.

The majority of damages to roads are from industrial use. Neutral.

The street in front of my home was recently done and I feel everyone uses this street, not just the people that live on it. Neutral.

Like that it raises $800,000 but don't like that it will raise as roads get replaced. Neutral.

Money are already there to do what's needed. No, definitely not.

The street in front of my home was recently done and I feel everyone uses this street, not just the people that live on it. Neutral.

Funds would be spent with administrative costs. Neutral.

Neutral.

With the Wisconsin legislature gone, the City of WR could get tax-free allocating money for streets, and then raise/cut very few monies for other improvements, such as water, gas, library, parks, etc. Neutral.

I do not understand this program. Neutral.

Regardless where money comes from we need better roads. My water is high our bills are high. People can barely afford 200 to register qe cant afford anymore. Neutral.

Just another type of tax that isn't needed. Neutral.

Neutral.

Just another type of tax that isn't needed. Neutral.

This option appears to be much more equitable with the current method. Although it may be a disincentive to replacing aging infrastructure. Yes - I live at 1830 Chase St. When will I find out about the costs of the Chase Street project and how much will be assessed to me. Neutral.

A special assessment is an expensive way to offset the cost to the homeowner. Way to expensive to have to pay 11,000.00 to the city for them to redo the sidewalks and street repair, curb and gutter. Why don't repairs getting done a little at a time instead of hitting us with a huge bill all at once. Neutral.

Neutral.