

**CALM Voter Information Guide
2002 Election**

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
			HD 66, Democratic Candidate			

1. The Urban Land Institute, which represents the real estate industry, studied taxpayers' costs for servicing homes with streets, utilities, and schools. The result: The average home 10 miles from downtown on a 1/3-acre lot costs taxpayers \$69,000 due to the long distances that roads, emergency services, and other services and infrastructure need to be stretched to service development. A home near downtown on a modest lot costs taxpayers half that, or \$34,500. Would you support requiring developers to pay for the full- cost of the services and infrastructure that they use?

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
I support the idea of paying for the cost of development by developers.	I think it is reasonable to assess an impact fee on developers to help cover the costs of infrastructure up front, passing the costs on to homeowners.	Actually, I am saving the state almost \$7000.00 by homeschooling my children. I also save the county by having my own sewer system which does not pollute the aquifer. Local neighborhoods should pay for upkeep of roads. How does the state pay for utilities?	Yes	Developers should pay for the impacts that their developments cause – including schools.	I support the concept of having the developer absorb the cost of extending services and providing infrastructure required to support new developments. The catch, however, is that those costs are simply added to the sale (or lease) price. This results in higher costs for housing. Historically, homes in a more rural setting were single family dwellings. However, in recent years, more and more of these developments are multi-family dwellings and, in some cases, housing developed for lower income families. Several of the latter types of developments have been completed in my district in the past two and one-half years. The real issue is an attempt to discourage urban sprawl and to provide incentives to fill in urban land before extending into undeveloped, agricultural land. It seems that a better approach is to provide owners of rural, undeveloped land tax incentives to reward property owners for selling to buyers who agree to not develop the property.	The question is over-simplified. It asks what is my position on asking developers to pay the full cost of the services and infrastructure they use. There are two distinctly different elements in this question. Developers should pay the capital costs of extending new infrastructure to developments. If this hasn't been done historically, this will raise the cost of the overall development and the individual unit costs of the homes or businesses created. If developments are going to be assessed the full cost of the services they require and demand, then it must be assessed equitably among all developments, both old and new. This will likely raise the property taxes on existing residential developments as residential land uses are typically revenue negative, that is, they do not pay the full cost on a per unit basis for the services they demand and require. It may lower the taxes paid by commercial and industrial developments. The figures cited above appear to presume all development costs are the same. Capital improvement costs are one time costs (roads, sewer, water and storm water systems and other infrastructure). Maintenance and operation costs are continuing costs over time. Policies that require new infrastructure to be built to a consistent standard of quality can significantly reduce costs over time and might affect the differential between those numbers. Also, new capital improvements in an infill scenario (closer to 'downtown' in the example) might actually be more expensive than capital improvement costs for outlying developments because they must be installed within existing streets, around existing utilities, etc. which must remain functional while construction is completed. Finally, it appears the scenario in the question assumes a city-center model of community development. Service level costs may be reduced by de-centralizing certain service delivery mechanisms such as policing, fire protection, etc. These are decisions that can be made irrespective of developers needs or desires.

2. Currently state actions to not need do conform to local land use plans. For example, even if a community decides that it wants to concentrate its growth within existing roads and service areas, the Department of Transportation can undermine that plan by building a large new highway that will move growth outside of towns. Do you support requiring that state agencies and actions comply with locally-developed land use, transportation, and capital improvement plans?

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
The state should be required to follow local development plans. I believe my voting record follows my belief.	I believe there needs to be a process allowing the two entities to work together. I need to study a "requirement" to comply by state agencies, as I believe some have federal standards that they must comply with, ie: highway construction.	I believe in local input and feedback. Has not the DOT worked with locals concerning the proposed HWY 93 project.	Yes	I'm for it.	Yes	<p>State agencies and other non-local government entities should be required to comply with local land use plans. This has to be done with a balance of interests however.</p> <p>Local land use plans should recognize the unique needs of certain essential public facilities and unpopular land uses and permit siting where necessary for efficient or functional operation rather than where local neighborhoods would wish them to be. I would distinguish between the ability of local plans to prohibit the siting of essential public facilities and the ability of local plans and citizens to affect their design, appearance, size, etc. I would not be in favor of local plans' ability to prohibit the siting of essential public facilities outright, but rather give a certain amount of local control to their site designs. I am in favor of a process that would objectively assess the environmental and community impacts of such facilities and require mitigation of such impacts that would benefit local neighborhoods.</p> <p>For example, if a sewer district needed to build a treatment and holding facility that could be designed largely underground, mitigation for that land use location might be the development of sports fields on the surface, so the land area doesn't go underutilized. If a state transportation department wants to develop a highway, the direct impacts should be mitigated by the design of the structure (noise attenuation walls, berms, buffering, and public art.)</p> <p>I also believe that when such facilities take up what would otherwise be land that could contribute to the local tax base if developed otherwise, that that impact be assessed and mitigated as well.</p>

3. The timber industry agreed not to log or operate heavy machinery within 50 feet of streams in order to protect water quality. Building near waterways dramatically increases erosion and sedimentation, and eliminates the vital buffer vegetation needed to filter water runoff from parking areas and seepage of septic systems. Would you support legislation that would require that all development be at least 50 feet from streams, rivers, floodplains, and wetlands in order to protect water quality and human health?

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
Developing in the floodplain would cost all citizens and should be prohibited.	I support such regulation.	I agree. Let the state provide tax incentives for such projects.	Yes, or more than 50 feet.	Good idea.	Yes. Existing developments would likely need to be "grandfathered" to secure enough support to pass.	<p>Land use development and design plans must recognize the competing needs of a variety of interests when regulating land use. Setbacks, buffers and similar measures should be based primarily on the scientific needs of the resource in question. Cultural, community and economic needs should be considered after that.</p> <p>50 feet is a minimum distance in most cases. Certain very high value streams, varying topography in the watershed, streams with associated wetlands and other flood storage capabilities might warrant additional or variable setbacks.</p>

4. Unplanned and uncontrolled growth is causing working families to move outside of towns to find affordable housing and is paving over one of our most important resources, our prime farm and ranchlands. Would you support a 1% tax on second homes to help pay for the conservation of prime farm and ranchlands, wildlife habitat, land use planning, and to help low-income families be able to afford their own home?

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
I would support such a tax.	I think we need to support conservation and land-use planning, but I'm not sure I agree with this recommended source for funding it.	Remove the property tax and that will help. Remove onerous rules/regulations on construction – this will lower the cost of homes.	Yes, or even more than 1% would be even more effective	The problem is real. I'd rather see a sliding scale on any real estate transfer tax.	Is the "1% tax" a tax on the purchase of the second home? Generally, yes.	<p>Taxation, for whatever reason, should be considered very carefully and critically. Particularly in the realm of taxation to achieve community planning and land use goals, I believe a clear nexus must be established between the elements being taxed and the goal sought to be achieved by such taxes. Without greater analysis, I am not certain such nexus exist between the sale (the ownership) of second homes and the goals outlined in the question.</p> <p>For example, the burden to help pay for the conservation of farm and ranch lands and the burden to help low income families may not be rightly shared by owners (buyers and sellers) of second homes.</p>

5. Unplanned growth promotes very inefficient development patterns that waste land, taxes, and natural resources. Would you support requiring that fast growing cities and counties to create community plans that: a) designate where most future growth will be directed and how they will direct that growth; and b) designate which prime farm and ranchlands, wildlife habitat, and floodplains will be protected from development.

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
The state should require all communities to have plans that guide growth.	Support – should be done as part of process in producing a comprehensive growth plan.	People move from cities to urban to flee onerous rules and high taxes. Promote less government.	Yes	Strongly support. Without urban growth boundaries, the rest of the growth management tools are less effective.	Yes	<p>I am an advocate of comprehensive land use planning and community visioning. I believe it is the proper role of government to initiate and guide a process with the citizens that will address the issues of community' development and change. I am in favor of a requirement that all communities assess their needs and verbalize their vision for achieving desired results from the changes that naturally occur as a by-product of our free market society. Nothing in our community happens by magic.</p> <p>Every piece of a community's built environment is the result of someone's intentional action and/or the unintended consequence of someone's inaction.</p> <p>I believe this requirement should be the same for all cities and counties, not just fast growing ones. Land use planning is not only effective and important for fast growing communities. Slow growing (and declining) cities and counties, must plan for the changes that will come as well. A well planned community, whether expanding dramatically or not, is a more livable, more efficient community.</p>
	Support – But must be sensitive to existing owner's rights.	Remove property tax on farms. Encourage perpetual farming by tax incentive. Encourage private wildlife ownership as a means of protecting them.	Yes	Strongly support.	Yes	

6. Septic systems and water wells from unplanned growth are depleting and polluting the groundwater that families and communities rely upon for drinking water. Would you support a proposal to require that and provide funding for local governments study groundwater capacity and the cumulative impact of growth on those ground water supplies before development proposals are approved?

Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
I would support such a proposal.	I support this and feel that it is already part of the process, I think the state needs to enforce requirements for adoption of comprehensive growth plans.	Out here in Target Range, there is no evidence that private systems pollute. Much of this comes from broken lines and systems by the city. Provide alternative systems to private property owners.	Yes	Good Idea	Yes	<p>I believe local governments should be knowledgeable about the conditions that comprise their communities. If the drinking water supply originates as groundwater then understanding the capacity and extent of such a resource is critical.</p> <p>Septic systems and water wells from unplanned growth can impact water resources in a community. Impacts from the use of septic systems and water wells for residential and commercial land uses are not inherently adverse however. In the proper ecosystem, at a proper density, with appropriate soils and other factors, they can quite suitably meet the needs of a community or population. Greater adverse impacts and higher community costs can be the result of prematurely extending public water and sewer systems into areas that are not ready for more intensive development levels.</p>

Question 7. Uncontrolled growth is using land, water and taxes very inefficiently while it erodes hometown quality of life and the ability of farmers and ranchers to stay on the land and for working families to find affordable housing Please indicate your level of support (1-5) for the following statements about growth and growth management in Montana. 1 = Strongly support, 3 = Neutral, 5 = Strongly oppose. Please explain if necessary.

Question: Growth should . . .	Tom Facey	Rosie Buzzas	Pascal Redfern	Gail Gutsche	Ron Erickson	Dave Wanzenried	Judith B. Smith
a. Promote well planned, mixed-use, and mixed-income neighborhoods that helps ensure that everyone has a choice of affordable housing and transportation options.	1 – Support	1 – Support. We need to do this to the greatest extent possible without regulating choice.	5 – Oppose. Definition of mixed income is vague. Less government provides more housing – too many rules/expensive regulation.	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	1 – Well planned neighborhoods insure that communities achieve their desired appearance, effect and cost efficiencies. The effect this can have on issues such as transportation, public safety and security, affordability, environmental quality and overall livability is substantial and should be promoted.
b. Use tax dollars, land, existing infrastructure, and water as efficiently as possible.	Not Asked.	Not Asked	Not Asked.	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	Not asked.

c. Protect prime farm, forest, and ranchlands, critical wildlife habitat and corridors, streams, wetlands, and groundwater recharge areas from development.	1 – Support: Once lost, it is hard and costly to reclaim.	1 – Support. Must also take into account property rights of farmers and ranchers, but I believe there can be effective incentives to accomplish the desired end result.	1 – Support. I'm for protecting these; therefore, remove the property tax and inheritance taxes.	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	<p>2 – Land is a fixed quantity asset. There is only so much of it practically available for human use. There is an ever-growing list of interests competing for the same area of land. Communities must balance their desire to guide growth and protect landscape elements such as those outlined in the question with the economic and market needs of landowners.</p> <p>For example, if preservation of prime farmland, critical environmental areas and groundwater recharge areas are goals of a local community, then communities must be willing to accept different, more directed land development patterns such as higher density housing and mixed residential/commercial land uses so that they can continue to meet the needs of the free market without sacrificing what has been identified as important. There has to be compromise. There has to be priorities set. In doing so, it must be known and accepted that someone's priority will not be at the top of the list.</p>
d. Protect human health by directing development away from potential hazards including steep slopes, floodplains, and high fire risk areas in the urban-wildland interface.	Not Asked.	Not Asked.	1 – Support. Provide incentives – reward the property owner for sound conservation policies.	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	<p>2 – Development proposals that understand, recognize and accommodate the essential interests of a developed and modern society should be encouraged. These issues are not absolute and cannot be regulated as such. Again, communities must balance their desire to guide growth and protect land elements such as those outlined in the question with the economic and market needs of landowners. If these elements are deemed to be a high priority community asset, it must be understood that certain other wants and desires must be subordinated in order to achieve success in implementing such plans.</p> <p>For example, all steep slopes are not inherently unsuitable for development. Steep slopes with specific surface and subsurface soil characteristics that present a probability of hazardous failure should be avoided.</p> <p>Living in the urban-wildland interface should not necessarily be prohibited, but should come with a known set of risk factors that one must bear by virtue of a decision to live where fires are more likely to occur. One area in particular would be in clearly communicating the limitations of fire service levels that can be afforded those who choose to live in high-risk areas. If it is determined that putting a home in a high fire risk area raises the risks to others in the community (such as making fires more likely, more intense or otherwise more damaging), such risk elevation may not make it worthwhile, on a community level, for the few who will enjoy living in the woods. In this type of case, a community might consider a different land use pattern, one that does not raise such general community risks.</p>
e. Build vibrant downtown business districts and promote local businesses by ensuring that multinational corporations do pay full	Not Asked.	Not Asked.	Not Asked	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	No Answer

and fair taxes and do not receive subsidies in the form of cash, tax breaks, infrastructure, or service from state or local governments that give them a competitive edge over local business.							
f. Ensure that all developments pay the full cost of infrastructure and services that they demand while providing incentives for affordable housing and land conservation.	1 – Support.	1 – Support. I think local and state incentives are a way to accomplish this.	5 – Oppose. What incentives? Most demand is by government.	1 – Support	1 – Support. I have tried (twice) to include schools in the calculation of impact fees.	1 – Support. Would support application to commercial development. Have concerns about how this might apply to residential development. See #1.	3 – If the statement is accurate and the desire is to 'ensure that ALL developments pay the full cost of infrastructure and service' then the community must be willing to raise the rates or lower the service levels for existing as well as planned developments. In a typical tax-for-services system, residential land uses, particularly low-density single-family suburban development, do not pay the full cost of the services they demand or require. If the desire is for new development to pay the full cost of the services they demand, then existing residents should be willing to understand and pay for the level of service they receive as well. In addition, development regulations should be designed to maximize service efficiencies in order to keep costs as low as possible.
g. Ensure an open development review process that promotes smart growth and discourages sprawl.	Not Asked.	Not Asked.	Not Asked.	1 – Support	1 – Support.	1 – Support	No Answer
h. Require that state funds are used to renovate existing infrastructure before new or expanded roads or new schools are built or “Fix it First”.	1 – Support.	3 – Neutral. I don't believe its quite this simple. There may be several justifiable exceptions to the ability to renovate an existing structure. The key to me is to ensure public involvement in the process of growth planning.	3 – Neutral. How can we pay for this with a proposed deficit of 250 million for next session. I agree with the proposal but how?	1 – Support	3 – Neutral. I have some problems with the way this is stated. I'm not sure that “state funds” should be tied to where schools are built.	1 – Support	4 – New and existing services should not be pitted against one another. State and local budgets should be developed with replacement or 'fix-it' schedules built in. Every new and existing capitol improvement should come with a statement of value depreciation (or appreciation if appropriate), and a schedule of repair and eventual replacement. Budgets should be reviewed and appropriated with these realities in mind.

Kay James and Jon Ellingson also returned late questionnaires- their answers are summarized here- see above for questions text:

Jon: SD 33 543-5605; jonelling@aol.com
Question 1: I generally support this concept

Question 2: I think there must be coordination among governments and local input must be given serious consideration.

Question 3: I'd like more information.

Question 4: I'd like more information.

Question 5 a: favor
B favor

Question 6: favor

Question 7: a-1
b-1
c-1 protect human health
d-2 developments pay full cost
e-2 renovate school and roads first

Kay: HD 58 turahmom@mcn.com
Question 1: they should pay up front

Question 2: they should comply

Question 3: we need to protect these areas and 50 feet seems a minimum to protect our water.

Question 4: support.

Question 5 a: favor
B favor

Question 6: favor

Question 7: a-1
b-1
c-1 protect human health
d-1 developments pay full cost
e-1 renovate school and roads first