

SLAUGHTERVILLE'S GROWTH PLAN 2013

Historical Overview:

The idea regarding the growth plan materialized because Windridge Addition, which was a new subdivision located in the town, was allowed to be developed with only the approval of DEQ. In 2000, when Windridge was developed, the town did not have any rules and regulations pertaining to zoning or subdivisions. Developers had to comply with state regulations to develop property. DEQ essentially allowed thirty-four (34) homes built in close proximity to each other on thirty-eight (38) acres of land. The lots ranged in size from .89 acre to 1.48 acre. By far, the vast majority of the homes were built on approximate one (1) acre lots. Each home must have a water well and a sewage disposal system to accommodate the residents. There was no possible way that the town's resources could be protected given this enormous pressure of population in such a dense area. Moreover, town officials recognized that the 38 acre property was used for agriculture before the subdivision was developed. The agri-business resource of the town was not properly preserved by the regulations for the town or by DEQ's standards. Therefore, the town desired to provide better protection of its resources by adopting more strenuous regulations and by spreading the population in the agricultural areas that exist in the community.

After months of meetings and planning, the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance were developed and revised to create sub-areas A, B, and C within the residential and agricultural areas. In residential Area A and B, lot sizes were set at a minimum of 2½ acres per dwelling. Residential area C changed to a minimum of 5 acre lot sizes per dwelling. Agricultural area A and B changed to a minimum of 5 acre lot sizes per dwelling while Agricultural area C changed to a minimum lot size of 10 acre tracts.

The main goal of Slaughtererville has always been to maintain, protect, and preserve the rural atmosphere of the town. By establishing the sub-area classifications, growth by potential disinterested developers has been discouraged while at the same time, the town has encouraged and protected the agri-business and the natural resources for the town. The town passed ordinances which promoted these goals. These ordinances included: revisions to the zoning ordinance, sub-division regulations, sign regulations, manufactured home and RV park regulations (which also included regulating manufactured homes), tower regulations, solid waste disposal, and animal regulations.

The impact of these regulations has been dramatic. Since 2008, no uncontrolled development of subdivisions has been requested by disinterested land developers. Sixty-seven (67) different sites which contained old trash dumps, dilapidated homes, junk cars, and piles of tires have been cleaned up. Open trash burning has been reduced over the years to thirty-three (33) incidents since 2008. Firefighters report that when they first started working with the fire department years ago, many of the fire calls were from people who were burning their own trash and the fires got out of control. Although the statistical data is not readily available, the number has greatly decreased over the years. Sewage disposal system violations which did not purportedly meet the Department of

Environmental Quality standards were reduced to only one (1) reported incident, since 2008.

The Town of Slaughterville has been vigilantly involved in a recycling event which also has had a tremendous impact on the environment and the town's natural resources. Since 2008 the results are as follows:

Items collected	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	Totals
Phone Books	750	1050	650	610	not offered	3060
Car Batteries	72	83	26	35	23	239
Used Motor Oil (gal.)	494	835	275	770	230	2,604
Scrap Metal (30 yd bins)	7	11	1	2.3	1	22.3
Tires	664	1,583	218	1,151	561	4,171
E-waste-electronics (pallets)					5	5

Removing waste products which would ordinarily be discarded in a landfill has a positive environmental impact and is a savings to citizens to help reduce waste disposal costs.

STATISTICAL DATA (Population and Census Information):

The town's population growth is another factor in considering the impact of what occurred since 2008. In the 2008 growth plan, the town made the following projections regarding the population growth for the town:

<u>Previous Projected Population Growth of Slaughterville</u>	
<i>Year</i>	<i>Number</i>
2010	4010
2020	4310
2030	4550
(Projections provided by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce).	

The actual population growth for the year 2010 is 4137 as reported by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce and the U.S. Census. Moreover, the Oklahoma Department of Commerce has estimated that Cleveland County will have an annual growth rate of 1.60%. The population growth for the town has been the following:

<u>Actual Population Growth of Slaughterville</u>	
<i>Year</i>	<i>Number</i>
1970	158
1980	1953
1990	1843***
2000	3609
2010	4137
*** the reduction was most likely caused by the de-annexation that occurred in 1985.	

The projected growth, using the County estimated annual growth rate of 1.60% totals are as follows:

<u>Projected Population**</u>	
<i>Year</i>	<i>Number</i>
2020	4797
2030	5457
2040	6117
<i>**with the current regulations slowing growth, these estimates may be high.</i>	

The 2010 census regarding housing shows the following breakdown:

	<i>Nationwide</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Cleveland Cty.</i>	<i>Slaughterville</i>
Occupied	88.6	87.7	93.8	90.7
Percent Vacant	11.4	12.3	6.2	9.3
Owner Occupied	65.1	67.2	66.5	80.7
Renter Occupied	34.9	32.8	33.5	19.3
Population in Owner Occupied	Not Available	66.6	66.7	78.9
Population in Renter Occupied	Not Available	30.4	29.1	21.1
Others**	Not Available	3.0	4.2	0
<i>**those individuals who are not renters or homeowners would be those in care and other facilities or homeless</i>				

Cleveland County and the Town of Slaughterville exceed the state and national statistics for occupied housing units and owner occupied housing units. In fact, 80.7 percent of residents in Slaughterville own their own homes. This exceeds the national average by 15.6%, the state average by 13.5%, and the County average by 14.2%. Obviously the town's growth plan should focus on the vast majority of the citizens for the town, who are property owners.

The gender and the age categories as shown by the 2010 census reveal the following data:

	<i>Nationwide</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Cleveland Cty.</i>	<i>Slaughterville</i>
Male	49.1	49.5	50.0	51.1
Female	50.9	50.5	50.0	48.9

	<i>Nationwide</i>	<i>Statewide</i>	<i>Cleveland Cty.</i>	<i>Slaughterville</i>
Under 18	24.0	24.8	23.1	27.1
18 & Over	76.0	75.2	76.9	72.9
0 -17	17.5	24.8	23.1	27.1
18-19	N/A	2.9	4.1	3.0
20-24	9.9*	7.2	10.4	4.7
25-34	26.6**	13.5	15.5	11.6
35-49	N/A	19.3	19.3	21.1
50-64	26.4***	18.8	17.4	20.9
65 & over	13.0	13.5	10.2	11.6
<i>*at the federal level the statistics include 18 through 24 year olds</i>				
<i>** at the federal level the statistics include 25 through 44 year olds</i>				
<i>*** at the federal level the statistics include 44 through 64 year olds</i>				

The largest age groups who reside in Slaughterville are children and those between the ages of 35 – 64.

STATE LAWS THAT IMPACT THE TOWN:

The State of Oklahoma created new laws which had an impact on the town’s regulations. The State developed a new arm of government, known as the Oklahoma Uniform Building Code Commission (OUBCC) which was designed to regulate builders and contractors building structures throughout the state.

Slaughterville is a very unique community since the town does not have a “building inspector”. The town simply does not have the fiscal resources necessary to hire individuals who can inspect the proposed building plans, the foundation, the electrical, the plumbing and all other aspects of building homes and commercial buildings. What Slaughterville does is to make sure that all aspects of the zoning ordinance are met, which include lot size, number of dwellings on a proposed building site, proper use of the land, setbacks are met, DEQ regulations are met regarding water and sewage disposal systems, and all other aspects necessary for zoning compliance. Therefore, in 2010 the town changed the zoning ordinance to show what the town actually does. The town no longer issues “building permits”; instead, the town issues “zoning compliance permits”.

Number of Permits Issued by the Town of Slaughterville

<i>Year</i>	<i>Mfgd Home</i>	<i>New Construction</i>	<i>Commercial</i>	<i>New/Replaced</i>	<i>Total*</i>
2001	16	13	0	Unknown	29
2002	43	15	3	Unknown	61
2003	33	31	0	Unknown	64
2004	44	23	0	Unknown	67
2005	30	14	2	36 new / 10 replaced	46
2006	38	16	0	45 new / 9 replaced	54
2007	16	11	1	18 new / 10 replaced	28
2008	19	13	0	17 new / 15 replaced	32
2009	17	4	2	15 new / 8 replaced	23
2010	20	6	0	15 new / 11 replaced	26
2011	19	11	0	16 new / 14 replaced	30
2012	22	27	1	22 new / 28 replaced	50

** Remodels, shops, barns, additions and expired permits are removed from totals because they do not show "growth." These numbers only affect the growth or the New/Replaced column from the chart above.*

Information that is also useful is to ascertain where the growth occurred within the town. The data shows:

Overall Growth in the Town of Slaughterville

<i>Year</i>	<i>Area A</i>	<i>Area B</i>	<i>Area C</i>	<i>Total</i>
2005	19	14	13	46
2006	13	25	16	54
2007	8	14	6	28
2008	13	9	10	32
2009	7	9	7	23
2010	11	8	7	26
2011	6	9	15	30
2012	9	34	7	50
<i>Totals</i>	<i>86</i>	<i>122</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>289</i>

** Remodels, shops, barns, additions and expired permits are removed from totals because they do not show "growth." These numbers only affect the growth or the New/Replaced column from the chart above.*

Where was the development? Looking at the planning areas where the permits were issued and reviewing whether the permits were issued for establishing a new home or replacing an existing home, should show the examiner where the growth has occurred within the town. However, this information may be deceiving. Since the land mass of Area C is greater than the land mass of Area A and B combined, the examiner needs to

look at the Zoning Map to make sense of the raw data provided to fully understand where the growth has occurred in the town. The zoning map is attached to this plan as Appendix A.

When all of this information is analyzed, there is no doubt, Areas A and B are the portions of the town that are growing faster. The largest age groups who reside in Slaughterville are children and adults who are between the ages of 35 to 64 years. Therefore, the town should expect and plan for commercial growth in those areas that are growing faster than the rest of the town and, if services are provided, to provide services to those age groups who reside in the town.

The town needs to make sure that we cater to our existing citizens; which mainly consist of children and adults between 35 and 64 year (usually beyond child bearing years) and those who are homeowners. Keep in mind that children will most assuredly have other children in 20 years. Also, the growth patterns for the town show that Area B is growing faster than all of the other portions of the town. The Town should consider what services are needed or suited to support the growth in the 3 planning areas.

At first, the town did not have any types of regulations pertaining to mobile homes coming into the community. However, this changed after the last growth plan. There was a large correlation between the town's fiscal resources for Code Enforcement being used to attempt to fix problematic areas dealing with old dilapidated mobile homes. Therefore, something had to be done. Trustees decided to focus on used mobile homes and limit those coming into the town by the condition of the unit as well as by implementing the use of the industry construction standards for manufactured homes. In 2012, for the first time since permits have been issued, new construction has surpassed manufactured homes in Slaughterville.

FINANCIAL DATA:

The town's budget is based on a fiscal year as opposed to a calendar year. The year runs from July 1st through June 30th of the following year. Therefore, a year to year comparison would be from July of the reported year through June of the next year.

The town's budget is based on two (2) different funds: the General Fund and the Street and Alley Fund. The General Fund is used to operate the town including the Fire Department. The Street and Alley Fund is reserved and earmarked for the Street Department and cannot be used for the general government operations. The town receives revenue from the following sources:

2% City Sales Tax (which is the lowest in the State of Oklahoma)
2% Use Tax
Cigarette Tax
3% OEC Franchise Tax
Alcoholic Beverage
Permits & Fees
Fire Department Charges & Fees

Interest Earned

Commercial Vehicle Tax – earmarked for Street and Alley use

Gasoline Excise Tax – earmarked for Street and Alley use

The vast majority of the town's revenue is derived from the city sales tax and the OEC Franchise tax. The city sales tax is the lowest of any town/city in the State of Oklahoma. Another source of revenue was interest earned, but that has greatly diminished over the years. Another major source of revenue received by the town is from grants. These funds have been used for capital outlay as they were received and made available. In the past, if the town did not receive the grant, the asset was not purchased. The commercial vehicle tax and the gasoline excise tax must be specifically used by the town to maintain the roads.

Expenses of the town have been covered by the revenue that has been received and the Town of Slaughterville has never sought a bond to finance any portion of the town's expenses. Through careful and disciplined spending and planning, the town has been able to save money by not spending all the revenue that is received on a year to year basis. A breakdown of the unaudited information, rounded to the nearest dollar is provided for each department as follows:

<i>Actual Income for General Government Fund</i>							
<i>Year</i>	<i>Sales Tax</i>	<i>Franchise Tax</i>	<i>Interest</i>	<i>Grants</i>	<i>Permits</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
2000	\$56,639	\$59,242	\$19,019	\$40,123	\$ 165	\$ 8,933	\$184,121
2001	66,805	62,207	22,304	11,789	1,445	10,002	174,552
2002	63,844	60,084	13,695	44,231	3,050	9,670	194,574
2003	71,719	68,438	17,333	42,798	3,900	14,876	219,064
2004	77,063	72,253	12,419	82,664	3,039	9,357	256,795
2005	80,669	83,251	15,986	53,018	6,181	14,231	253,336
2006	85,442	112,284	19,642	8,381	13,195	13,441	252,385
2007	88,896	97,420	21,746	61,670	12,450	13,324	295,506
2008	93,099	96,971	17,220	57,451	12,148	14,430	291,319
2009	110,673	91,541	10,655	25,883	12,890	26,464	278,106
2010	118,074	98,003	16,360	27,582	13,119	30,786	303,924
2011	125,868	100,063	13,307	13,994	13,940	16,653	283,825

<i>Actual Expenses for General Government</i>					
<i>Year</i>	<i>Personnel Services</i>	<i>Materials &Supplies</i>	<i>Other Services</i>	<i>Capital Outlay</i>	<i>Total</i>
2000	\$25,270	\$840	\$11,629	\$300	\$38,039
2001	26,423	1,652	21,380	76,026	125,481
2002	51,472	1,241	15,813	0	68,526
2003	61,896	3,828	15,316	89,324	170,364
2004	87,107	5,460	20,739	32,153	145,459
2005	90,721	4,600	20,559	4,822	120,702
2006	83,142	3,365	22,068	13,527	122,102
2007	90,127	4,150	24,716	4,320	123,313
2008	98,465	4,048	32,578	5,490	140,581
2009	85,261	9,079	44,303	0	138,643
2010	89,559	8,041	42,256	0	139,856
2011	90,343	14,972	42,536	0	147,851

<i>Actual Expenses for Fire Department</i>					
<i>Year</i>	<i>Personnel Services</i>	<i>Materials &Supplies</i>	<i>Other Services</i>	<i>Capital Outlay</i>	<i>Total</i>
2000	\$ 2,847	\$7,096	\$7,106	\$45,435	\$62,484
2001	2,404	6,337	6,394	111,386	126,521
2002	3,333	6,132	7,292	84,017	100,774
2003	5,930	7,620	7,003	43,982	64,535
2004	5,479	7,806	7,293	77,859	98,437
2005	5,586	10,458	7,347	51,821	75,212
2006	7,474	6,546	6,243	12,495	32,758
2007	7,306	8,256	7,170	157,939	180,671
2008	7,933	9,832	7,683	40,142	65,590
2009	3,445	13,634	11,167	0	28,246
2010	3,650	26,153	12,631	0	42,434
2011	2,140	26,339	10,609	0	39,088

It should be noted that capital outlay varies and skews the data. Grants have traditionally been used to finance the large capital outlay items. The examiner should consider this information when analyzing the data provided.

The “percentage of difference” represents the actual income received vs. the actual expenses that were incurred for the Fund thus providing a percentage showing the difference.

<i>Surplus/Deficit for General Fund***</i>			
<i>Year</i>	<i>Surplus</i>	<i>Deficit</i>	<i>Percentage of Difference</i>
2000	\$83,598		46%
2001		\$77,450	-45%
2002	25,274		13%
2003		15,835	-8%
2004	12,899		5%
2005	57,422		23%
2006	97,525		39%
2007		8,478	-3%
2008	85,148		30%
2009	111,217		40%
2010	121,634		40%
2011	96,886		35%
Overall Average Yearly Surplus			18%
***Includes the Fire Department			

<i>Actual Income for Street Department</i>					
<i>Year</i>	<i>Motor Vehicle Tax</i>	<i>Gasoline Excise Tax</i>	<i>Interest</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
2000	\$15,526	\$3,942	\$689		\$20,157
2001	24,952	7,129	473		32,554
2002	25,633	7,480	550		33,663
2003	25,618	7,340	552		33,510
2004	25,610	7,382	2,972		35,964
2005	25,611	7,608	5,885		39,104
2006	25,610	7,257	3,929		36,796
2007	25,611	7,310	4,519		37,440
2008	25,752	7,376	4,887	100	38,115
2009	25,752	4,431	3,756	500	34,439
2010	25,931	7,649	2,183		35,763
2011	28,304	7,821	3,106		39,231

<i>Actual Expenses for Street Department</i>						
<i>Year</i>	<i>Personnel</i>	<i>Materials & Supplies</i>	<i>Road Maint</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Capital Outlay</i>	<i>Total</i>
2000	\$8,382	\$794	\$13,994			\$23,170
2001	10,331	315	0		\$479	11,125
2002	11,026	459	15,173	955		27,613
2003	10,288	450	15,000			25,738
2004	2,345	773	15,000		618	18,736
2005	10,884	2,009	15,000		854	28,747
2006	9,679	2,281	0		388	12,348
2007	5,242	1,322	17,500		469	24,533
2008	7,599	1,455	0		23,216	32,270
2009	7,606	2,830	0		1,325	11,761
2010	10,779	22,392	0		1,325	34,496
2011	8,426	1,687	0			10,113

<i>Surplus/Deficit for Street & Alley Fund</i>			
<i>Year</i>	<i>Surplus</i>	<i>Deficit</i>	<i>Percent of Income</i>
2000		-3,013	-15%
2001	\$21,431		66%
2002	6,051		18%
2003	7,772		23%
2004	17,227		48%
2005	10,358		26%
2006	24,449		66%
2007	12,907		35%
2008	5,845		16%
2009	22,679		66%
2010	1,268		4%
2011	29,118		75%
Overall Average Yearly Surplus			36%

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN:

In 2004, the town approved a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which is a complete listing of the town's assets and an attempt to determine the life of each asset so that

proper budgeting and planning can be implemented for asset replacement. It is a detailed inventory and analysis of all of the buildings, equipment, vehicles, and all other items that are owned by the town that may need to be replaced in the future. It provides a planned time table for asset replacement. It is very important to understand the ongoing operational needs and anticipated asset replacement costs of the town.

Adopting and maintaining the CIP is vital and necessary for the town to obtain grants for capital outlays for the fire department and general government.

ZONING PLANNING:

Currently, Slaughterville has no industry requiring a separate zoning and therefore, no Industrial Use zones exist within the town limits. Since it is possible that some industrial business may desire to locate in the town, town areas that are suitable or uniquely unsuitable for industry should be identified for this type of future growth.

THIS PLAN:

This plan is intended to show the efforts of the town and the thought pattern behind the changes which may be implemented to meet the future needs and the growth of the town. Simply put, the Town does not currently have the infrastructure, in a public water system, a public sewage system or adequate roads for the population growth. Town officials do not desire to increase taxes to create the infrastructure for public utilities. Therefore, the town must control growth in order to not change the rural characteristics and ultimately the identity of the town. "Rural" signifies characteristics of country living and Town officials want to maintain the identity of Slaughterville as the locality with open country and acreages.

This also falls in line with the Goals which have been adopted by the Board of Trustees. A Goal Committee was formed many years ago, and goals were established. The goals were reviewed approximately ten (10) years later and were revisited and revised to meet the changing needs of the town. A vision statement was also derived to show what the town desires and the goals were divided into short term and long term. The current goals and vision statement are as follows:

VISION STATEMENT FOR TOWN:

To preserve the rural atmosphere of the Town of Slaughterville
To improve the public safety and security of the citizens
To protect the environment
To maintain town services
To address the long term infrastructure needs of the town

2012 SHORT TERM GOALS:

1. Adequate funding to maintain necessary town services
 - a. charge for follow up inspection when a permit is involved
 - b. increase sales tax
2. Monitor feasibility of regulations to maintain rural environment

- a. be cautious of over regulation
 - b. review and update ordinances as needed
- 3. Citizen awareness about:
 - a. sales tax collection based on point of delivery
 - b. weather warning system options
- 4. Develop a brochure to promote the Town of Slaughterville
- 5. Develop a future land use map
- 6. Citizen Involvement
- 7. Continue to address dog problem

LONG RANGE GOALS:

- 1. Square up Town boundaries
- 2. Municipal Court - being able to issue fines and penalties
- 3. Community Safety:
 - a. First Responder / EMS
 - b. Law Enforcement
- 4. Develop a financial plan to coordinate with the county to maintain roads (2030)
- 5. Secure property for future town facilities such as community center, park, walking trails, bike trails, sports fields and etc.

Flood Plain Issues:

Other issues of concern focus on the floodplain and discouraging growth in areas prone to flooding. It is vital to continue to administer the flood damage prevention regulations so that citizens are able to obtain flood insurance. The town desires to minimize loss of life and property caused by flood hazards.

Water Resources:

The only water resource that is available to the town is the Garber Wellington Aquifer. The town does not have a public water facility. Each resident and business that has water must rely on privately owned water wells. In addition, sewage disposal is primarily performed by each business and each home through privately owned sewage disposal systems. The town does not currently provide a municipal sewage disposal system, nor are there financial resources available to the town to build or operate such facilities now or in the near future. Considerations include the fact that the town does not have a public utility system and cannot afford a public utility system. There are budgetary constraints that must be considered.

Given the fact that the citizens use individual sewage disposal systems and water wells, an increase in the population and the proximity of the same in relation to all the other water wells and sewage systems in a given area would affect the land and the town's water resource. There are tremendous concerns about the quality of the water that goes into the Aquifer. According to the information available through the Garber Wellington Association, there is adequate recharge for the Garber Wellington at this time. However, the state is going through a drought and this could change.

National averages show that an average household uses 150 gallons of water per day, which calculates to .10 gallon per minute. The Planning and Zoning Commission as well as the Town Board of Trustees for Slaughterville desire to protect these resources for the benefit of the citizens for the present and the future. At present the Town is active in the Garber Wellington Association and other State agencies to monitor the conditions which influence the town's water resources. Another concern is the pollution from possible contamination of ground water through household hazardous waste and other dangerous substances being dumped onto the ground that can penetrate into the Garber Wellington. The town actively participates in programs pertaining to protection of the ground water. Future focus should have these concerns in mind.

Sewage Disposal:

The Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) is the State agency that is responsible for water wells and the adequate disposal of sewage. The town, through the permit process, has had an opportunity to work closely with DEQ. The standards employed by DEQ, which are currently adopted by the Town are lacking in that historically, there have been State budgetary cutbacks and financial constraints which have, in the town's opinion, limited DEQ's effective enforcement of the environmental laws. The town, by passing ordinances involving proper disposal of waste, has attempted to prevent negative impact on the ground water and the town's resources as a whole.

The Roads:

Another factor for the town's consideration is to focus the growth of the community and the populace based on the condition of the roads. It is the desire of the town, through the Planning and Zoning Commission as well as the Town Trustees, to encourage the population to grow in the areas that are maintained by roads that can support the growth patterns.

The town has a contract with Cleveland County for specific road projects; however the County is primarily responsible for the construction and maintenance of the roads within the town. This will continue until the town's population reaches 5000. According to current state laws, once the town reaches a population of 5000, the town will be responsible for road maintenance. Although contracts can still be negotiated with the County, the town would ultimately be financially responsible for maintaining the roads. The current cost for road maintenance is approximately \$22,000 per mile for materials to oil and chip roads. These statistics are provided by the Cleveland County Commissioners who are familiar with the costs regarding the same.

Each town receives funds through gasoline excise tax and commercial vehicle tax which are earmarked for use on roads. Since the year 2000, the town has contributed a total of \$104,022.00 towards specific road projects. Given the costs for materials, since 2000, the Town would have paid for the materials to oil and chip only just over 4½ miles in the town. This is wholly inadequate since the town consists of approximately 71½ miles of county section line roads within the town. It should be noted that the calculated road miles includes both sides of the road even though only one side is in the incorporated area and one side is in the unincorporated area of the town. Future road maintenance will have to be a shared project with the County in these areas.

It is obvious that the growth of the town will greatly impact the fiscal responsibilities for the town. The population statistics and projections give the town some relief in that we may not be responsible for the roads for 20 years from now. If the citizens were asked to pay for these road costs, the town would need to develop a way to increase revenues.

The Oklahoma Department of Transportation (ODOT) has provided plans, purchased property, moved utilities and is taking action to widen State Highway 77. Town officials had the foresight to establish greater setback requirements along the Highway 77 corridor to minimize the impact of the highway expansion on newly established businesses.

Through negotiations with ODOT, the town has acquired the property that is located west of the Town Hall. The town now has an opportunity to expand the town hall facilities to allow for additional space, meeting areas, parking, and facilities to accommodate citizens and staff. Again, financial feasibility is always an issue and must be considered. Funds must be available for the expansion before the project proceeds.

CONCLUSION:

If the town officials decide to provide more services, certain questions must be asked. What services are needed? How will the services be funded? How will future Trustees maintain these services? More services will certainly require more staffing with the required expertise to meet the need. A city planner may be necessary to develop strategies needed to properly plan. Educated planners are available for employment, but this obviously will cost more money.

Slaughterville is faced with a massive future obligation which is road maintenance. It would cost the town 1.573 million dollars for materials to oil and chip all the roads located within the town; and this assumes oil and chip continues to be priced at current values (which will not happen) and that asphalt and other road materials will not be utilized. The point is that Slaughterville must explore potential resources that will help the town fulfill this need. If there are grants or other programs available for financial assistance, the town needs to make sure that it understands the process and takes all steps necessary to qualify for assistance.

It is important that Slaughterville strive to keep open communication and good working relationships with County, State and Federal officials and agencies.

Slaughterville needs to continue to be fiscally responsible to ensure that necessary town services are maintained. Ordinances should be updated as needed to ensure that natural resources are protected.

The economic uncertainty that our country is facing affects every town and every citizen and Slaughterville is no exception. This uncertainty causes a “wait and see” approach. Meanwhile, highways bring greater volumes of traffic, which encourage more populace, who demand more commerce and more town services. This is usually the growth pattern that leads towns to become bigger cities. Most city governments want this to occur. Slaughterville is different and unique in that this is not necessarily what our citizens want. Maintaining the “rural” quality of life is more important than becoming a big city.