

MINUTES

North Mendota FUDA Steering Committee

December 3, 2010 Council Chambers, City Hall, 7426 Hubbard Avenue, Middleton WI 8:00 a.m.

Present: Derek Hungness, Duane Barmore, Ken Sipsma, Mark Trotter, Don Hoffman, Sherri Endres, Gary Hertzberg, Tom Liebe

Staff Present: Steve Steinhoff, Bridgit Van Belleghem, Kamran Mesbah, Eileen Kelley, Abby Attoun, Todd Schmidt, Kevin Even, Tom Wilson

Also Present: Andy Inman, Mike Slavney, Van Nutt

1. Introductions

The meeting convened at 8:05 a.m.

City of Middleton

Derek Hungness, Plan Commission member
Duane Barmore, Plan Commission member

Town of Westport

Ken Sipsma, Town Board member
Mark Trotter, Plan Commission member

Town of Springfield

Don Hoffman, Town Chair
Sherri Endres, Clerk/Treasurer/Office Manager

Village of Waunakee

Gary Hertzberg, Village Trustee
Tom Liebe, Village Plan Commissioner

CARPC Staff

Steve Steinhoff, Bridgit Van Belleghem, Kamran Mesbah

Middleton Staff

Eileen Kelley, Abby Attoun

Waunakee Staff

Todd Schmidt, Kevin Even

Westport Staff

Tom Wilson

Others

Andy Inman, T. Wall Properties
Mike Slavney, Vandewalle & Associates
Van Nutt, Chamber of Commerce

2. Changes to the agenda

None

3. Overview and Discussion of FUDA Planning

Mr. Steinhoff referred committee members to the summary handout titled, “Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Future Urban Development Area (FUDA) Planning.” The summary document informs about the four page detailed description.

Mr. Steinhoff noted that when CARPC was reestablished, communities acknowledged that the USA process is ineffective for more deliberative long-term planning and asked CARPC to begin the FUDA process to deal with regional water resources issues pertaining to NR 121, land use, efficient development, and farmland preservation.

Mr. Steinhoff informed the group the Environmental Conditions Report (ECR) would encompass a 25-year projected growth area. The report will include inventory and assessment of (1) natural resources and (2) community characteristics and conditions in greater detail than current plans. Creating the ECR could be an ending point for the process if the community decides adequate planning has already been completed or if the community is not ready. Otherwise, FUDA planning will occur to fill in the gaps of existing efforts.

This process will be guided the following principles:

- A locally driven process with CARPC as a resource
- Intergovernmental

Mr. Mesbah added that this process will help reduce the levels of uncertainty and add stability so that discoveries of natural resources, such as spawning grounds for trout, can be made and disclosed in advance to the urban service area expansion request review process. This would not necessarily indicate no development, rather inform professionals of what methods may be necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on the known resources.

Mr. Wilson stated that Middleton recently completed the Bishops Bay USA and is on the CARPC Policy and Criteria Advisory Group with Ms. Kelley. These communities can build on this success to work on FUDA. Because our communities are at the headwaters, we have a duty to protect the water. Still it is all connected and impacts come from both directions, so it is best that this group serve as an example and a leader in the community. Now the groups has help from CARPC staff and money to complete the task through the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant. He notes that this effort also aligns with the timing for the comprehensive plan update.

Ms. Kelley seconded Mr. Wilsons comments, especially in that this process was undertaken for the intergovernmental agreements that they have established, and now it can be communicated more clearly to CARPC and others.

4. Overview of Sustainable Communities Grant

Mr. Steinhoff referred committee members to the summary handout titled, “Capital Region Consortium: Sustainable Communities Regional Planning.” Mr. Steinhoff informed the group that this grant comes out a federal partnership program with HUD, EPA, and DOT. The money is intended to help locals prepare or execute a regional plan for sustainable development. The twenty-five member consortium’s award is for \$2 million over the next three years. Half of the funds go to staff and technical capacity including three and one-

half positions, urban growth scenario, DNR carrying capacity, and transit modeling. The intended outcome is to have an update to the comprehensive plan as an amendment and incorporated into other regional plans.

Mr. Sipsma asked if other communities were involved. Mr. Steinhoff answered that DeForest and Windsor were also going through FUDA, and Verona began and has paused the process. Ms. Kelley asked what paused the Verona project. Mr. Mesbah answered that the Verona SW USA request was not recommended so that they ended the process. Verona believes that they completed the FUDA process and that the denial indicated that completing a new process would be a waste of their time. Both parties are waiting for DNR to determine the future of the project, once complete, the FUDA process could continue.

Mr. Hoffman asked why a more isolated area, such as Marshall, be required to complete a FUDA for sewer extensions. Mr. Mesbah answered the charter states if no FUDA is completed, the commission would not entertain urban service area requests for that area, yet the agreement does not have force of law, nor is DNR bound by this. As such, FUDA serves as a screening process. Mr. Steinhoff added that FUDA will add value to existing work, FUDA is not a mandate, and CARPC is only moving forward with interested communities.

5. Steering Committee Role and Schedule: Discussion and Approval

The group went around the table and each person shared their hopes, fears, and expectations for this process.

Mr. Hertzberg stated that Dane County purchased a lot of land in Waunakee without adequate funds to maintain the land, leaving Waunakee with the burden. He will like to address issues like these.

Mr. Liebe stated that he wants to ensure that we do a good job communicating with the public, noting that process matters and that we want public buy-in.

Mr. Hungness wants more than a gathering and to ensure that practical outcomes He is also especially interested in TOD/Transit oriented development.

Mr. Trotter would like to see stringent controls with regard to water quality and success in maintaining rural character in rural areas.

Mr. Even noted that the lions share of this work is already completed under a different name.

Mr. Wilson echoed his previous sentiments.

Mr. Sipsma echoed Mr. Even's remarks and wants to ensure that the work they complete carries weight and sees FUDA as the first step in USA review.

Ms. Kelley would like to get credit for work already done and that they are very proud of.

Mr. Barmore thinks this is important for codifying process and to bring all of the partnerships/agreement together with more structure. He is especially concerned about water quality.

Mr. Hoffman hopes to maintain and carry out agreements through this process.

Ms. Van Belleghem looks forward to meeting the people and places of the county.

Ms. Endres does not want this plan to collect dust on a shelf. She noted that we all depend on each other and need to move forward together - not as islands. This group will be an example to together communities.

Mr. Schmidt anticipated learning a lot. He is interested in seeing broad connections for non-vehicular recreational activities and has also sent a letter to the DOT regarding a Hwy 19 by-pass to plan it properly and collaboratively.

Mr. Mesbah hopes to identify land that should be preserved and align these in the *Parks and Open Space* and *Water Quality* plans.

Mr. Steinhoff echoed peoples concerns and desires.

Mr. Steinhoff referred committee members to the handout titled, "Steering Committee Role and Schedule." Mr. Steinhoff noted that "be a liaison between CARPC and local communities" was left off the bulleted list.

Mr. Hertzberg asked if a template had been created. Mr. Steinhoff informed the group that their roles was to create a template. Mr. Wilson suggested to add the role "be advisory to the plan commission," and wondered about involving community committees to examine the work. Mr. Steinhoff thought that this concern for stakeholder outreach and representation was important and should be a point of discussion at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Wilson pointed out Westport has a public participation plan from the comprehensive plan. Is this good enough or will they need something new? If new, will it need to be approved by the Commission? Mr. Steinhoff suggested an assessment of the existing plans be included in the ECR.

Mr. Hertzberg asked if this would have to take place in every community involved? Simultaneously? He recommended that we get the state journal involved to educate the public and provide credibility to the process and outcomes. Mr. Leib suggested the local daily papers, chambers, and schools can be used to manage expectations and relieve some fear. Mr. Steinhoff answered that the public participation process will be determined by how far the committee wants to go. If it is simply to codify existing plans/agreements, this could occur in a few meetings, whereas extended scenario planning would be a more involved process.

Mr. Slavney noted that the relationship between this and comprehensive planning can be subtle and reminded the group of the "consistency" requirement. He did not expect this to be adopted as a comprehensive plan amendment and if so it may carry other requirements and limitations. He also noted that 5 different development scenarios were conducted in the N. Mendota Parkway process and the differences are not so obvious in the map, so we will need to supplement this with micro-scale elements (design, cost of services, water, etc.).

Mr. Wilson thinks it can be an amendment or at least an appendix confirming and strengthening what is already in place. Mr. Even pointed out that the document would have more weight if it was adopted locally. Mr. Wilson also noted that this dovetails into a staff advisory group to put together a recommended public participation plan. Mr. Mesbah noted that from CARPC staff perspective it is best if the document carries weight, has local guy-in, and local drive, and the best way to accomplish this is through the comprehensive plan. Still, there is flexibility to end this process after the ECR and not

continue to create an amendment. The group agrees that a staff group should be created and generally supported the comprehensive plan amendment possibility should the group move in this direction after reviewing the ECR. The group would like transparency and involve as many stakeholders as possible.

Mr. Sipsma pointed out that public outreach won't necessarily make others enthusiastic about this process and asked staff to be responsible to tell them if CARPC is getting pressure to do things differently than what has developed here and bring any static to their attention.

Mr. Mesbah was grateful for the trust in the staff, noting that staff is always in the middle and getting hit from all sides. Ms. Kelley seconded that she had great trust in CARPC staff and appreciated their support in the USA process.

Mr. Schmidt asked if any other faction should be at the table that are currently missing? The County? Mr. Mesbah answered that the steering committee should maintain ownership and not be bogged down by distant interests without proper preparations in place. Interests will be invited and will be given presentations.

Mr. Wilson reminded the group that the steering committee will make presentations to CARPC so they will be aware. Also, he sits on many committees and when the county is involved nothing ends up happening or the project gets folded away.

6. Next steps

Mr. Steinhoff noted that the schedule was fairly ambitious and may take more time. Additionally, some resources associated with the grant may take longer to access, so we may need to make updates when they are completed. Ms. Van Belleghem asked Mr. Steinhoff if he could highlight the tools and resources that may have this impact on the project. The group will need to select a chair at the next meeting.

7. Set future meeting dates and times

Mr. Steinhoff will schedule the next meeting over Doodle.com.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.

Recorded by Bridgit Van Belleghem