

AGENDA

Meeting of the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

August 11, 2011

City-County Building Room 351, 210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Madison WI

7:00 p.m.

RPC Meeting Policies and Deadlines

Registering and Speaking at RPC Public Hearings and Meetings: Persons wishing to speak must register and give the registration form to the meeting recorder before the corresponding "Public Comment..." or Public Hearing item is taken up. Oral comments will not be heard for individual agenda items not designated for public hearing, but will be heard under the "Public Comment..." agenda item. The time limit for testimony by each registrant will be 3 minutes, unless additional time is granted at the discretion of the Chair. However, for public hearings on USA/LSA amendments, applicants are granted a maximum of 15 minutes to testify, and other groups of registrants may pool their time of 3 minutes each up to a maximum of 15 minutes. Commissioners may direct questions to speakers. The RPC may alter the order of the agenda items at the meeting.

Deadlines for Written Communications: Written communications intended to be provided to the Commission and considered as part of the information package for a public hearing or agenda item should be received in the RPC office no later than noon, 7 days prior to the meeting. Written communications received after this deadline will be reported and provided to the Commission at the meeting.

RPC Action Scheduling: If significant controversy or unresolved issues are raised at the public hearing, the RPC will usually defer or postpone action to a future meeting.

1. Roll Call
2. **Approval of minutes of the July 14 and August 2, 2011 meetings (*actionable item*)**
3. Review of agenda
4. Public comment for items *not designated* for Public Hearing
5. **Election of CARPC Chairperson and any other vacant offices (*actionable item*)**
6. **Consideration of disseminating Draft 2012 Budget to local units of government to solicit comments at September 8 public hearing (*actionable item*)**
7. Discussion of Draft 2012 Work Program and 2012-2017 Overall Program Design
8. Report and Discussion on FUDA planning process
9. **Discussion and potential consideration of moratorium on consideration of sewer service area amendments until adoption of FUDA plans (*actionable item*)**
10. Discussion of the Report on the Recommendations of the Policies and Criteria Advisory Group
11. **Discussion and potential consideration of CARPC retreat to discuss PCAG recommendations and other items (*actionable item*)**
12. **Discussion of SSA Application Review Fees and Consideration of Recommendation to the CARPC Budget and Personnel Panel (*to be deferred pending additional information*)**
13. Introduction of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-17 amending the CARPC Bylaws to clarify the status of the Budget & Personnel Panel and to identify Commission budget certification procedures
14. Presentation on Envision Utah project by Calthorpe Associates (20 minutes)

15. **Approval of August disbursements and Treasurer's Report for July 2011 (*actionable item*)**
16. **Consideration of a motion to convene into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted with respect to possible litigation with Dane County over the certified 2012 budget charge. The Commission intends to re-convene into open session immediately following this closed session item (*actionable item*).**
17. Communications
18. Report of Chair / Discussion
19. Report of Deputy Director / Discussion
20. Future agenda items (next meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2011)
21. Adjournment

NOTE: If you need an interpreter, translator, materials in alternate formats or other accommodations to access this service, activity or program, please call the phone number below at least three business days prior to the meeting.

NOTA: Si necesita un intérprete, un traductor, materiales en formatos alternativos u otros arreglos para acceder a este servicio, actividad o programa, comuníquese al número de teléfono que figura a continuación tres días hábiles como mínimo antes de la reunión.

LUS CIM: Yog hais tias koj xav tau ib tug neeg txhais lus, ib tug neeg txhais ntawv, cov ntawv ua lwm hom ntawv los sis lwm cov kev pab kom siv tau cov kev pab, cov kev ua ub no (activity) los sis qhov kev pab cuam, thov hu rau tus xov tooj hauv qab yam tsawg pab hnuv ua hauj lwm ua ntej yuav tuaj sib tham.

CARPC staff 608-266-4137 + TDD 608-266-4529

Draft MINUTES

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

July 14, 2011

City-County Building Rm 351, 210 MLK Jr Blvd, Madison WI

7:00 p.m.

Present: Jeff Baylis, Zach Brandon, Martha Gibson, Eric Hohol, Peter McKeever, Warren Onken, Larry Palm, Kurt Sonnentag, Susan Studz

Absent: Ken Golden, Jason Kramar, Ed Minihan, Caryl Terrell

Staff Present: Chris Gjestson, Rachel Holloway, Kamran Mesbah, Mike Rupiper, Steve Steinhoff; Attorney John St. Peter

1. Roll Call

Vice-Chair Palm took the Chair and called the meeting to order at 7:06 p.m.; roll was recorded. He welcomed Mr. Onken as an appointee from the Mayor of the City of Madison.

3. Review of agenda

Mr. Palm stated that item #6 required eight votes for approval; only seven members were in attendance. He suggested item #7 be taken up immediately after #4 Public Comment; there were no objections.

4. Public comment for items not designated for Public Hearing

Phil Salkin, 944 Autumn Woods Lane, Oregon, representing REALTORS Association of South Central Wisconsin, stated that although the Association didn't always agree with CARPC, it supported the Commission and appreciation its work and its staff.

5. New business

None.

7. Discussion of 2012 budget and consideration of authorizing letter to Dane County Clerk to certify the 2012 budget charge

Mr. Palm summarized CARPC budget activity to date; the CARPC Budget and Personnel Panel had approved a budget with a certified budget charge reduced by \$30,000 (from \$861,007 to \$831,007), and did not approve sewer service area (SSA) amendment application review fees although it intended to continue discussing the potential of implementing new fees. Mr. McKeever expressed support for developing a specific proposal for fees in order for it to be fairly considered; he noted the difficulty of budgeting due to the variability of fee revenue. (Mr. Brandon arrived.) Mr. Baylis stated that the variability of fees would be matched by the variability of the actual expenses incurred.

Mr. McKeever asked if the Budget and Personnel Panel was responsible for certifying the annual budget charge to Dane County, as was suggested by Panel members to be the case. Mr. St. Peter stated that statutes described the CARPC Chair as the certifying agent. Discussion continued.

Motion by Mr. Sonnentag, second by Ms. Studz, to authorize the Vice-Chair to certify a 2012 budget charge of \$831,007, as approved by the CARPC Budget and Personnel Panel. Motion by Mr. Brandon, second by Mr. Baylis, to substitute an amount of \$815,707 (\$861,007 original amount reduced by \$45,300) to be certified to the Clerk with a communication describing that the cuts are intended to be achieved in part by reduced salary expenditures and total removal of commissioner per diem and travel expenses. Mr.

Brandon described the amendment as an important message which communicates that CARPC and its staff understand the importance of continuing CARPC as an agent of local control and are willing to make sacrifices in its support. (Ms. Gibson arrived.) Mr. McKeever described concern for the CARPC budget charge impact on Dane County government due to its inclusion within the County levy cap, and expressed disappointment that the County Executive proposal was not approved by the Panel (staff distributed copies of the County Executive proposals to reduce the budget charge to \$652,313). Mr. Sonnentag stated that the budget charge as approved by the Panel was necessary due to previous budget charge proposals which were cut by the Panel (staff distributed table illustrating proposed and approved budget charges from 2008 to 2012.) Discussion continued. Motion to amend carried on voice vote; discussion followed. Main motion as amended carried on roll call vote 7-2 (Ms. Gibson and Mr. McKeever voting no).

Mr. Palm noted that the body had not considered Item #2 and should do so, after which it could conduct the public hearing.

2. Approval of minutes of the June 9, 2011 meeting

Moved by Mr. Sonnentag, second by Mr. Hohol, to approve the minutes of the June 9, 2011 meeting; motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

6. Public Hearing: Consideration of Northern USA Amendment for “Club 51” in the Town of Windsor: Resolution CARPC No. 2011-14 amending the Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan and Dane County Water Quality Plan

a. Staff Presentation

Mr. Rupiper described the amendment request, which proposes to add 2.5 acres to the Northern Urban Service Area in the Town of Windsor in order to extend sewer service to the “Club 51” commercial lot. The proposal did not add any new developable area to the USA. He described consistency with adopted regional goals and policies, and described the findings of the staff analysis dated June 14, 2011.

b. Open Public Hearing to take testimony from registrants; close Public Hearing

Deane Baker, Director, Village of DeForest Public Works, registered in support of the proposal, stated that the staff report responded to the issues well; he was available for questions. Mr. Sonnentag asked how long the septic system had been an issue; the owner (Mr. Gmeinder) replied around March.

c. Consideration of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-14

Motion by Mr. McKeever, second by Mr. Hohol, to adopt Resolution CARPC No. 2011-14. Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

Mr. Palm welcomed new Community Planner Rachel Holloway; Mr. Mesbah described the role of the position, which was matched 100% against the HUD grant, and had been vacated by Bridgit Van Belleghem who had been hired as the grant-funded Senior Community Planner.

7a. Consideration of a motion to convene into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted with respect to litigation in which it is likely to become involved with regarding the certification of the 2012 budget charge. The Commission intends to re-convene into open session immediately following this closed session item.

Motion by Mr. Brandon, second by Mr. Sonnentag, to convene in closed session pursuant to the agenda item language (Mr. Brandon read the language for the record). Motion carried unanimously on roll call vote; the meeting convened in closed session.

Motion by Mr. McKeever, second by Mr. Baylis, to re-convene in open session; motion carried, the meeting re-convened in open session.

Mr. Palm suggested that Item #12 be addressed in order to accommodate the attendees, and items #9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 could be dispensed with quickly; there were no objections.

14. Consideration of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-15 Expressing Appreciation to Curt Brink for His Service and Contribution to the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

15. Consideration of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-16 Expressing Appreciation to John Imes for His Service and Contribution to the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

Motion by Ms. Gibson, second by Mr. Baylis, to adopt the two Resolutions; motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

16. Approval of July disbursements and Treasurer's Report for June 2011

Motion by Mr. Sonnentag, seconded by Ms. Gibson, to approve the July disbursements (in the total amount of \$87,444.49) and June Report; motion carried on voice vote.

10. Consideration of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-13 amending the CARPC Bylaws to make unnecessary the regular "New business" agenda item

Motion by Ms. Gibson, second by Mr. Baylis, to adopt Resolution CARPC No. 2011-13; motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

9. Consideration of entering into contract to provide water quality management planning services to DNR effective July 2011 through June 2012

Mr. Mesbah noted that a contract had not yet been received from DNR. Motion by Mr. Hohol, second by Mr. McKeever to defer action; motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

13. Consideration of CARPC Newsletter

Ms. Studz suggested there was too much information in the newsletter; some of the material which was not date-sensitive could be put into a second newsletter; she offered assistance to edit and modify. Mr. Mesbah stated that staff would work with Ms. Studz prior to publication.

Mr. McKeever stated that the body should not need to review future newsletters, which should be delegated to staff; motion by Mr. McKeever, second by Mr. Sonnentag, to delegate future newsletter production and distribution to staff. Motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

12. Presentation on Envision Utah project by Calthorpe Associates

Motion by Mr. Sonnentag, second by Ms. Gibson, to defer (due to technical difficulties); motion carried unanimously on voice vote.

8. Discussion of requesting state to exempt CARPC certified charge from the County levy limit

Mr. McKeever expressed support for initiating a process which might lead to removing CARPC from the County levy limit. Ms. Studz suggested encouraging local governments to adopt resolutions of support to place the CARPC budget charge on its own line on property tax bills. Mr. Mesbah reported that legislation had been introduced in the past which had not received adequate support to be introduced to the legislature; he suggested that support among other state RPCs should be secured prior to CARPC proceeding on its own. Mr. McKeever suggested the item be added as an actionable item on the next agenda.

11. Report and discussion on FUDA planning process

Mr. Steinhoff reported on the FUDA planning process, which continued in the North Mendota and DeForest-Windsor areas. He referred to a written update provided in the meeting materials, described the staff White Paper "Households and Housing Trends: Implications for Future Urban Development in Dane County, Wisconsin" as provided in the materials, and answered questions from commissioners.

17. Communications

Two items were distributed as described in agenda item #7. Mr. Mesbah reported that the DNR had indicated that its 2011-2012 contract may provide about \$30,000 more than expected; the Restoration Ecologist-Biologist position allows CARPC to work with DNR in stream and lake habitat assessments, allowing an expansion of the scope of the contract.

18. Report of Chair/Discussion**a. Discussion of the Role of CARPC Chair**

None. Mr. Palm invited members to contact him with any questions.

19. Report of Deputy Director / Discussion

Mr. Mesbah stated that staff was not aware of any new USA amendment proposals since he last reported in June. He noted that CARPC was one of only four agencies nationally being awarded with technical assistance from the federal EPA for its sustainability project.

20. Future Agenda Items

Mr. Brandon requested election of Chair be added to the next agenda; Mr. Baylis requested a discussion and action item on a moratorium on sewer service area amendments until FUDA planning is complete; Ms. Studz requested 1) a discussion on the Policies and Criteria Advisory Group recommendations, 2) a special retreat which may include discussion of the PCAG recommendations, and 3) a discussion on SSA fees; Mr. McKeever suggested that a specific proposal for fees be discussed. Mr. Palm suggested that if members wanted to identify parameters of fees, they should communicate them with him or staff. Ms. Gibson asked staff to identify those items in the PCAG report which should be carried out by CARPC to obtain Areawide Water Quality Management Planning Agency designation from DNR as soon as possible.

21. Adjournment

Moved by Mr. Baylis, seconded by Ms. Gibson, to adjourn; motion carried at 9:45 p.m.

Recorded by Chris Gjestson

Draft MINUTES
Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

August 2, 2011

City-County Building Rm 357, 210 MLK Jr Blvd, Madison WI

4:30 p.m.

Present: Jeff Baylis, Zach Brandon, Martha Gibson, Ken Golden, Eric Hohol, Ed Minihan, Warren Onken, Larry Palm, Kurt Sonnentag, Susan Studz, Caryl Terrell

Absent: Jason Kramar, Peter McKeever

Staff Present: Chris Gjestson, Kamran Mesbah; Attorney John St. Peter

1. Roll Call

Vice-Chair Palm took the Chair and called the meeting to order at 4:33 p.m.; roll was recorded.

2. Consideration of a motion to convene into closed session pursuant to Wis. Stat. 19.85(1)(g) to confer with legal counsel who is rendering oral or written advice concerning strategy to be adopted with respect to possible litigation with Dane County over the certified 2012 budget charge. The Commission intends to re-convene into open session immediately following this closed session item

Motion by Mr. Hohol, second by Ms. Terrell, to convene in closed session pursuant to the agenda item language (Mr. Hohol read the language for the record). Motion carried unanimously on roll call vote; the meeting convene in closed session.

Motion by Mr. Golden, second by Mr. Minihan, to re-convene in open session; motion carried unanimously on voice vote at 6:10 p.m.

3. Adjournment

Moved by Mr. Baylis, seconded by Mr. Hohol, to adjourn; motion carried at 6:11 p.m.

Recorded by Chris Gjestson

Re: Election of CARPC Chairperson and any other vacant offices

Decision Items:

1. Elect the Chairperson, and any other offices which may be vacant

The office of Chairperson was vacated in April when Town appointee Phil Van Kampen's term ended. Vice-Chair Palm currently performs the duties of Chair, pursuant to the Bylaws.

Article II Section 5 of the Bylaws describes the duties of the Chair:

“ Chairperson. The Chairperson of the Commission shall preside, with full voting rights, at all meetings of the Commission and the Executive Committee. The Chairperson shall be responsible for seeing that the agenda for each meeting of the Commission is prepared. The Chairperson is authorized to sign or execute documents on behalf of the Commission. The Chairperson shall perform such other duties as are required of him/her by law or these Bylaws and as are assigned to him/her from time to time by the Commission. The Chairperson shall present to the Commission such matters as, in his/her judgment, require its attention.”

Historically, the Commission has tried to fill officer positions with a representative from each of the four appointing authorities, and has appointed those officers to its Executive Committee. While this is not a requirement of the Bylaws, staff strongly recommends continuing this practice in pursuit of equal representation.

Current officers are Larry Palm (Vice-Chairperson, City of Madison appointee), Peter McKeever (Secretary, Dane County appointee), and Kurt Sonnentag (Treasurer, Dane County Cities & Villages Association appointee).

Materials Presented with Item:

1. None

Contact for Further Information:

Chris Gjestson, Administrative Services Manager
266-4138
ChrisG@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Re: Consideration of disseminating Draft 2012 Budget to local units of government to solicit comments at September 8 public hearing

Decision Items:

1. Consider distributing the draft 2012 budget to local governments

At its June meeting, the Commission recommended a draft budget to the CARPC Budget & Personnel Panel (BPP), which considered the budget on June 30 and July 13. In order to assist Dane County government in seeking a reduced impact on its General Purpose Revenue (GPR), the BPP approved a budget with a certified budget charge reduced by \$30,000, from \$861,007 to \$831,007. At its July meeting, the Commission considered the budget charge, which required certification by the CARPC vice-chair to the County Clerk by August 1, and approved an amount with an additional reduction of \$15,300 for a final budget charge of \$815,707. The total reduced amount of \$45,300 was intended to be achieved through reductions in salary expenses and by the deletion of all per diem and expense payments to commissioners in 2012. The charge was certified on July 18.

The following summarizes the changes to the draft provided to CARPC in June. The WRS increase is due to new information (required contribution rates will be increased by 0.1%).

Expenses

Salary/wages and workstudy reduced by \$30,363
Health insurance expense reduced by \$9,637
Retirement fund (WRS) increased by \$585
Commissioner per diem/expenses reduced by \$5,300

Revenues

Dane County property tax reduced by \$45,300
Net Fund Balance (applied to reduce tax) reduced by \$414
Operating reserve increased by \$414

The Commission will be investigating a sewer service area amendment application review fee (agenda item #12), which may provide an additional source of revenue in the future.

More detailed information on the preparation of the 2012 draft is described in the June cover sheet which transmitted the draft to CARPC.

The draft budget is summarized on the back of this page; attached is the full line-item draft with Personnel Detail and budget charge calculation.

Staff recommends distribution of the attached draft to the clerks of all local governments in Dane County for review and comment at the September public hearing.

	2010 Actual	2011 Adopted	2011 Estimated	2012 DRAFT
FTE (including HUD)	8.125	8.125	8.125	11.625
Expenses				
Personnel	788,092	777,931	756,579	754,698
Total Operating, Capital & Contractual	147,759	145,846	154,846	157,146
Pass-thru, including SCRPG	265,714	105,074	563,421	777,000
Gross Expenditures	1,201,565	1,028,851	1,474,846	1,688,844
Net Expenditures (less pass-thru)	935,851	923,777	911,425	911,844
Revenues				
Fees: sewer extensions	10,000	7,600	7,600	7,600
EPA/DNR Water Quality Mgmt Planning	75,580	71,230	75,000	75,000
RPC funds	248,690	146,552	182,749	7,788
Dane Co. (includes rent/IM support in lieu of cash)	686,645	686,645	686,645	815,707
All other	24,770	10,750	16,750	5,750
Pass-Thru, including SCRPG	330,030	105,074	506,101	776,000
Gross Revenues	1,375,715	1,027,851	1,474,846	1,687,844
Net Revenues (less pass-thru)	1,045,685	922,777	968,745	911,844

Materials Presented with Item:

1. Draft 2012 line item Budget with 2012 Personnel Detail and CARPC Levy Charge/Fund Balance analysis

Contact for Further Information:

Chris Gjestson, Administrative Services Manager
266-4138
ChrisG@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

2012 Amended Draft Line-Item Budget

11-Aug-11

	2010 Actual	2011 Adopted (as amended)	2011 Estimated	2012 Draft Budget
EXPENDITURES				
Personal Services (includes GIS contract)	FTE: 8.125	FTE: 8.125	FTE: 8.125	HUD-SCRCP FTE: 3.5 CARPC FTE: 8.125
Salaries & Wages	\$ 563,257	\$ 585,554	\$ 571,060	\$ 585,222 ¹
Workstudy / Interns	25,180	10,550	10,550	15,000
Retirement Fund	56,776	33,962	39,896	34,528 ¹
Social Security / Medicare	41,152	44,795	43,686	44,769 ¹
Employee/Retiree Insurance	101,727	113,290	101,386	99,541 ²
Furloughs or Salary Reduction	0	(10,220)	(10,000)	(24,363)
Total Personal Services	\$ 788,092	\$ 777,931	\$ 756,578	\$ 754,698 ¹
Operating Expenses				
Commissioner Per Diem & Travel	\$ 4,190	\$ 5,300	\$ 5,300	\$ - ³
Employee Travel & Meeting Expenses	6,312	5,000	5,000	7,500 ⁴
Training & Conferences	3,958	2,400	2,400	2,500
Office Supplies	11,976	16,000	16,000	22,500
Dues / Membership Fees	2,123	3,810	3,810	3,810
GIS Software	3,700	5,800	5,800	5,800
Recruitment	15,881 ¹³	0	0	0
Telephone	5,424	5,500	8,500	1,000
Office Space/Rent	33,036	33,036	33,036	33,036
Legal Services	19,951	30,000	27,000	30,000
Audit Services	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Advertising	580	0	0	0 ⁵
Insurance (package, WC, D&O)	7,639	8,000	8,000	8,000
Total Operating Expenses	\$ 120,770	\$ 120,846	\$ 120,846	\$ 120,146
Capital Outlay				
Office/Computer Equipment & Furniture	\$ 5,989	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,000
GIS Equipment (new plotter)	0	0	0	0
Fly Dane 2009/2010 Partnership	0	0	0	0
Total Capital Outlay	\$ 5,989	\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	\$ 6,000
Contractual				
Consultant services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 10,000	\$ 10,000 ⁶
Expanded Water Resources Monitoring	0	0	0	0
IM Services	21,000	21,000	21,000	21,000
Total Contractual	\$ 21,000	\$ 21,000	\$ 31,000	\$ 31,000
HUD & Other Pass-Thru Contracts				
HUD - SCRCP Grant	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ 670,000
Cooperative Water Resources Monitoring	95,219	96,074	96,074	97,000
Groundwater Model Update	100,169	0	219,347	0
EPA/DNR Stimulus Programs	62,120 ⁷	0	38,000 ⁷	0
WDOT Rural Work Program (90% funded)	8,206	10,000	10,000	10,000
Total Pass-Thru	\$ 265,714	\$ 106,074	\$ 563,421	\$ 777,000
Gross Total Expenditures	\$ 1,201,565 ⁸	\$ 1,028,851 ⁸	\$ 1,474,845 ⁸	\$ 1,688,844 ⁸
LESS pass-thru	\$ (265,714)	\$ (106,074)	\$ (563,421)	\$ (777,000)
NET TOTAL Expenditures (Gross less pass-thru)	\$ 935,851	\$ 922,777	\$ 911,424	\$ 911,844

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission
2012 Amended Draft Line-Item Budget

11-Aug-11

	2010 Actual	2011 Adopted (as amended)	2011 Estimated	2012 Draft Budget
REVENUES				
Fees: sewer extensions	\$ 10,000	\$ 7,600	\$ 7,600	\$ 7,600 ⁹
Fees: USA/LSA applications ¹⁰	0	0	0	0 ¹⁰
Fees: Annual Planning Conference Registration	1,425	1,400	1,400	1,400
Land Use Inventory Grant (via Dane Co.)	11,877	6,000	10,000	0
Local Planning Assistance	0	0	0	0
MMSD	0	0	0	0
EPA/DNR Water Quality Planning	75,580	71,230	75,000	75,000
Product Sales	160	100	100	100
Interest Income (Less Bank Fees)	2,317	1,000	3,000	2,000
WDOT Transportation Plan Integration	5,589	2,250	2,250	2,250
Allocation from Reserves ("AR")	23,000 ¹³	0	0	0
Other	3,402	0	0	0
Pass-Thru (HUD - SCRP Grant)	0	0	200,000	670,000
Pass-Thru (WDOT Rural Work Program)	7,385	9,000	9,000	9,000
Pass-Thru (Groundwater Model update)	165,306	0	163,027	0
Pass-Thru (EPA/DNR Stimulus)	62,120 ⁷	0	38,000 ⁷	0
Pass-Thru (Coop. Water Resources Monitoring)	95,219	96,074	96,074	97,000
Net Fund Balance ("NFB") ¹⁴	225,690 ¹⁴	146,552 ¹⁴	182,750 ¹⁴	7,788 ¹⁴
Dane County Property Tax	686,645	686,645	686,645	815,707 ¹¹
Gross Total Revenues	\$ 1,375,715	\$ 1,027,851	\$ 1,474,846	\$ 1,687,844
LESS pass-thru	\$ (330,030)	\$ (105,074)	\$ (506,101)	\$ (776,000)
NET TOTAL Revenues (Gross less pass-thru)	\$ 1,045,685	\$ 922,777	\$ 968,745	\$ 911,844

Operating Reserves ^{12,15} \$ 194,451 ¹⁵ \$ 46,252 ¹⁵ \$ 11,702 ¹⁵ \$ 3,914 ^{12,15}

Estimated '11 EAV (no increase over 2010)	\$ 50,661,236,500
Estimated certified budget rate (CBR)	0.001610%

¹ Salaries/wages may be reduced by furlough days or other CARPC action; amounts do not include HUD grant-funded staff

² Estimated 2.5% decrease health, 5% increase dental insurance premiums; Workers Comp is in "Insurance" Operating Expenses

³ Commissioners will not be paid per diem or expenses in 2012

⁴ Mileage reimbursement based on \$0.55/mile; required travel estimated for 125 meetings (37.2 miles each), 46 USA/FUDA site visits (125 miles each) and 6 conference visits (200 miles each plus meals/lodging)

⁵ No advertising meeting & job announcements in local paper in 2012

⁶ Consulting expenditures for Community Profiles report, using Census 2010 data (for 2014 Plan update)

⁷ Three projects were contracted by CARPC and funded by EPA/DNR, initiated 2010, complete in 2011: USGS Black Earth Creek Monitoring (\$30,000), Yahara Clean Project (\$27,100), and WQP Appendix B update (\$30,000)

⁸ Does not include depreciation expenses

⁹ Less than 5 acres: \$200/review, estimated 8 reviews = \$1,600
5 - 15 acres: \$400/review, estimated 6 reviews = \$2,400
Over 15 acres: \$600/review, estimated 6 reviews = \$3,600

¹⁰ SSA application fees; at its Jun. 20, 2011, meeting, CARPC unanimously recommended to BPP that it consider implementing this fee

¹¹ Includes \$54,036 to be paid by Dane County as Rent and IM services in lieu of cash

¹² The Government Finance Officers Association recommends an unreserved fund balance of a *minimum* 5 to 15 percent of regular general fund operating revenues (~\$50,000 to \$140,000), or no less than 1 to 2 months of regular general fund operating expenditures (~\$65,000 to \$130,000)

¹³ Operating Reserve used in 2010 to partially off-set un-budgeted recruitment of Executive Director (per amendment Feb. 11, 2010)

¹⁴ Net Fund Balance ("NFB") is not technically "revenue", but are CARPC funds carried forward from the previous year specifically allocated to reduce the County budget charge.

¹⁵ Operating Reserves are equal to year-end Net Assets; cash reserves may be available beyond this amount equal to employee leave liabilities

2012 Personnel Detail	Start	Years Eff. 1-Jan-12	FTE	Salary *	FICA	WRS	LIFE	DIS	health/mo	HEALTH	den/mo	DENTAL	WC	TOT INS	TOT COST
Executive Director			0.000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Administration															
Administrative Services Manager - GJESTSON, C.	16-Nov-01	10.13	1.000	55,898	4,276	3,298	-	-	505	6,055	45	540	157	6,751	70,223
Community and Regional Development Planning															
Senior Community Planner - STEINHOFF, S.	1-Jul-10	1.50	1.000	66,878	5,116	3,946	13	-	1,186	14,229	127	1,521	187	15,951	91,892
Community Planner - HOLLOWAY, R.	13-Jun-11	0.55	1.000	44,832	3,430	2,645	5	-	505	6,055	45	540	126	6,725	57,632
Senior Community Planner - WEBER, B.	24-May-04	7.61	0.625	49,255	3,768	2,906	13	-	-	-	-	-	138	151	56,080
Environmental & Natural Resources Planning / Technical Support															
Senior Environmental Resources Planner - KAKUSKA, M.	4-Mar-96	15.84	1.000	82,722	6,328	4,881	26	-	1,186	14,229	127	1,521	232	16,009	109,939
GIS/IT Specialist - KREBS, A. (CONTRACTED)	25-Feb-04	7.85	0.500	26,148	2,000	1,543	-	-	-	-	127	761	73	834	30,525
Deputy Director / Director, Environmental Resources Planning - MESBAH, K.	1-Dec-88	23.10	1.000	115,960	8,871	6,842	68	463	1,445	17,342	127	1,521	1,971	21,366	153,038
Environmental Engineer - RUPIPER, M.	30-Apr-07	4.68	1.000	77,115	5,899	4,550	13	-	1,186	14,229	127	1,521	1,311	17,075	104,639
Graphic Designer - WAGNER, S.	18-Nov-96	15.13	1.000	66,414	5,081	3,918	11	-	1,445	17,342	127	1,521	186	19,060	94,474
CARPC TOTAL:			8.125	585,222	44,769	34,528	150	463	7,457	89,482	851	9,446	4,380	103,922	768,441
SCRPG Grant Staff															
Senior Planner - VAN BELLEGHEM, B.	8-Sep-08	3.32	1.000	65,774	5,032	3,881	5	-	505	6,055	45	540	184	6,784	81,471
Urban Designer-Planner - MCAULIFFE, D.	16-May-11	0.63	1.000	65,664	5,023	3,874	20	-	-	-	-	-	184	204	74,765
Restoration Ecologist-Biologist - GRANBERG, J.	2-May-11	0.67	1.000	75,096	5,745	4,431	25	-	505	6,055	45	540	210	6,830	92,101
GIS Specialist - ANDERSON, H.	31-May-11	0.59	0.500	24,849	1,901	1,466	5	-	-	-	-	-	70	75	28,290
SCRPG TOTAL:			3.500	231,383	17,701	13,652	55	-	1,009	12,110	90	1,079	648	13,892	276,628
Combined TOTALS:			11.625	\$ 816,605	\$ 62,470	\$ 48,180	\$ 205	\$ 463	\$ 8,466	\$ 101,592	\$ 940	\$ 10,525	\$ 5,028	\$ 117,814	\$ 1,045,069

* Salaries may be reduced by furlough days or other CARPC action

CARPC Levy Charge and Fund Balance Analysis

11-Aug-11

DRAFT CARPC 2012 Budget

Reserve Calculation

2010 Beginning Available Fund Balance (per audit)*	\$	267,913	
2010 Revenues (per audit)		1,128,708	
2010 Expenditures (per audit)		(1,202,170)	
2010 Ending Fund Balance*		194,451	
2011 Estimated Revenues (less NFB & AR)		1,292,096	
2011 Estimated Expenditures		(1,474,845)	
2011 Estimated Ending Fund Balance*		11,702	
2012 Budgeted Operating Reserve		3,914	
Jan. 1, 2012 Estimated Net Fund Balance Applied	\$	7,788	

Levy Calculation

2010 full EAV	\$	50,661,236,500	
2011 Estimated EAV (for 2012 budget charge)		50,661,236,500	0.0% Increase
2012 Budgeted Non-Dane Co Revenues		864,350	
2012 Budgeted Expenditures		(1,688,844)	
2012 Net Fund Balance Applied to Reduce Levy		7,788	
2012 Net Dane County Levy Charge		815,707	
Certification Charge Rate		0.0016101%	

* does not include long-term liabilities

Re: Discussion of Draft 2012 Work Program and 2012-2017 Overall Program Design

Decision Items:

1. None

The Commission will be discussing the 2012 draft budget at the meeting. The budget provides the resources for the conduct of the annual work program, which is the document that frames and guides the work of CARPC.

Attached is a draft person-month distribution which highlights the amount of staff effort planned for the 2012 Work Program (for basic descriptions of Work Elements, please refer to the adopted 2011 Work Program, linked under the "About the CARPC" menu item on the website). Based on Commission direction at this meeting, staff will provide a draft Work Program document to be considered at the September meeting for Commission review and approval of dissemination to local governments. Consideration of adoption will be at an October public hearing.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. Draft 2012 Direct Person-Month Distribution

Contact for Further Information:

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director
266-9283
KamranM@CapitalAreaRPC.org

DRAFT 2012 Direct Person-Month Distribution

* Total person-months do not include interns
 ** Total person-months will be reduced by furlough days; number to be determined
 ■ Work Elements which directly or indirectly support FUDA planning

			HUD - SCRPG Grant-funded Staff															
Catg	Elem	Element Name	PERSON-MONTHS*		Executive Director	Deputy Director / Director ERP	Senior Env Res Planner	Environ Engineer	Graphic Designer	GIS Specialist	Senior Com Planner	Senior Com/Env Planner	Community Planner	Senior Planner	Urban Designer-Planner	Restoration Ecologist-Biologist	GIS Specialist	Intern
			2012**	2011 Adopted	Mesbah	Kakuska	Rupiper	Wagner	Krebs	Weber	Steinhoff	Holloway	Van Belleghem	McAuliffe	Granberg	Anderson		
1000		Community & Regional Development Planning																
	1110	Land Use Inventories and Development Monitoring	5.50	5.91						1.00	0.50	1.00		1.00			2.00	1.00
	1120	Demographic, Economic and Physical Features Studies (Census)	9.00	0.49							3.00		2.00		3.00		1.00	1.00
	1130	Geographic Information System Maintenance	3.00	1.97					3.00									1.00
	1210	Land Use and Transportation Planning	2.00	2.46							0.50		1.50					
	1213	Land Use and Transportation Plan Integration	0.50	0.49							0.50							
	1215	Intergovernmental Cooperation	1.00	0.00	1.00													
	1220	Plan Implementation (amendments)	4.00	4.92				1.00	1.00	2.00								
	1230	Housing Element and Planning	0.00	0.98														
	1310	Countywide Assistance	0.00	0.00														
	1315	Agricultural Planning	0.00	0.00														
	1320	Comprehensive Planning/Smart Growth Law Assistance	1.00	0.98									1.00					
	1410	Economic Analysis	1.50	0.98									1.50					
	1420	Project Notification and Review	0.50	0.98	0.50													
	1430	Public Participation, Education, Information Dissemination and Outreach	18.50	12.80	2.00	0.50		5.00		1.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00		2.00	
	1500	FUDA Community Planning	32.50	15.75	1.50			2.00	1.00		9.00	2.00	9.00	7.00		1.00	1.00	
		Category 1000 Total	79.00	48.71	0.00	5.00	0.50	0.00	8.00	6.00	7.50	12.00	10.00	12.00	12.00	0.00	6.00	4.00
3000		Environmental Resources Planning																
	3121	Monitoring Program	0.30	0.30			0.30											
	3122	Data Analysis	1.00	0.49			1.00											
	3131	Water Supply Systems Planning	0.75	0.98			0.50	0.25										
	3132	Water Supply Systems Service	0.50	0.98			0.25	0.25										
	3141	Wastewater Systems Planning	2.00	1.97	1.00		1.00											
	3142	Wastewater Systems Service	3.00	2.95	1.00		2.00											
	3143	Urban Service Area and Environmental Corridor Delineation	11.00	4.92	2.00		3.00	1.00				2.00			3.00		1.00	
	3144	On-Site Wastewater Systems	2.00	2.95			2.00										1.00	
	3151	Urban Non-Point Source Management	3.00	5.42	1.00		2.00											
	3152	Agricultural Non-Point Source Management	0.20	0.20			0.20											
	3153	Stream and Lake Water Quality Evaluation and Management	3.00	0.98			1.00								2.00			
	3154	Wetland and Floodplain Protection	2.00	0.98											2.00			
	3155	Groundwater Protection	1.75	0.98			1.75											
	3156	Water Quality Plan Update	2.50	0.98	0.50	1.00		1.00										
	3161	Drainage and Flood Management Planning	0.00	0.00														
	3162	Drainage and Flood Management Service	0.50	0.49				0.50										
	3174	Regional Hydrologic Modeling and Management Program	1.00	0.98			1.00											
	3181	Lake and Watershed Management Planning	1.00	0.98			0.50	0.50										
	3210	Solid Waste Management Planning	0.00	0.00														
	3220	Solid Waste Service Activities	0.00	0.00														
	3310	Air Quality Management Planning	0.00	0.00														
	3320	Air Quality Service Activities	0.00	0.00														
	3410	Energy Management Planning	0.00	0.00														
	3420	Energy Management Service Activities	0.00	0.00														
	3510	Environmental Impact Evaluation	2.50	0.98	0.50										2.00			
	3520	Other Special Studies	0.00	0.00														
	3530	Environmental Conditions Reports for FUDA Planning	10.50	6.89	1.00	4.00	0.50	2.00							3.00			
		Category 3000 Total	48.50	35.40	0.00	7.00	11.50	12.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	12.00	0.00	2.00
TOTAL			127.50	84.11	0.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	6.00	7.50	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00	6.00	6.00	6.00

Minimum % allocated to SCRPG-supported activities

25% 30% 20% 25% 10% 0% 100% 100% 100% 100% 30%

Re: Discussion and potential consideration of moratorium on consideration of sewer service area amendments until adoption of FUDA plans

Decision Items:

1. None

This item was requested by Commissioner Baylis.

Beginning in September 2009, the Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability (CRANES) began requesting that CARPC hold a “moratorium” on considering sewer service area (SSA) amendment requests, so that it could focus on FUDA planning. More recently, CARPC County Executive Parisi has requested (e-mail memo dated June 23, 2011) that local municipalities complete FUDA plans before requesting SSA amendments. County Board Chair McDonnell (memo dated June 23, 2011) indicated support for a moratorium on SSA amendments, citing excess housing stock as a basis for such a “pause”, and called for a two-year moratorium in the Capital Times Opinion page (July 13).

Staff encourages the Commission and stakeholders to engage in regular discussions on growth management. As the only master planning agency for the Dane County region, these types of discussions are appropriate and necessary. However, as all state Regional Planning Commissions are strictly advisory (§66.0309(8)(a)2), and the final authority to grant extensions of public infrastructure lay with other bodies, the role of CARPC remains one of coordination and collaboration.

CARPC legal counsel John St. Peter has shared his opinion with the Commission that prior to any decision concerning a moratorium, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources should be consulted and their concurrence secured, since the CARPC performs this work as an agent for DNR.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. None

Contact for Further Information:

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director
266-9283
KamranM@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Re: Discussion of the Report on the Recommendations of the Policies and Criteria Advisory Group

Decision Items:

1. None

This item was requested by Commissioner Studz.

At the meeting of March 10, the Commission received and approved dissemination of the Report on the Recommendations of the Policies and Criteria Advisory Group (PCAG). PCAG, composed of two appointees from each of the four CARPC appointing authorities, met over the course of over two years to solicit input from local governments and stakeholders to generate recommendations on approaches or processes that would develop broad regional agreements on historically confrontational and divisive issues in regional land use planning and management. PCAG, its process and recommendations have been viewed by DNR as a critical element in its consideration of designating CARPC as the Areawide Water Quality Management Planning Agency.

The Report was distributed by e-mail on April 22 to all local government clerks and chief elected officials. To follow up and emphasize the importance of the document, hard copies were mailed on June 3 to each local government. To date, no comments on the Report have been received.

The four recommendations, as follows, are described in detail in the Report. Due to the importance of the pursuit of the recommendations and because a number of them concern the Commission's decision-making process, staff recommends they be discussed by the body at a strategic planning session or "retreat." Staff has noted actions and processes that need to be undertaken by the Commission to integrate the PCAG recommendations into its operations, and actions that are already under way or are part of current operations.

1. Development of a broad regional agreement on comprehensive objectives and generation of consistent implementation processes suitable for different governmental sizes and capabilities.
2. Improvement of the service area amendment process.
3. Use of education/encouragement and standards/enforcement.
4. Establishment of consultative sessions where prospective applicants can discuss plan concepts with the Commission at the initial stages of planning and receive feedback.

Summary of Recommended Actions:

A. Commission to create work groups to address the following:

- i. To build trust for the Commission, and building support behind specific authority which might be added to CARPC to enable it to address critical and strategic challenges facing the Region in the next 50 years.*
- ii. Develop a clear approach concerning annexation conflicts, and present to the Commission for consideration.*
- iii. Identify desired outreach strategy and program, and desired outcomes.*

B. Commission to hold a strategic planning retreat to address the following:

- i. Define a CARPC vision, mission, and implementation strategies.*

- ii. *Define the commission's leadership role, and its approach to consensus-building in the region, and the desired outcomes from its facilitation and consensus-building activities.*
- iii. *Establish a clear, coherent, and unified approach to policies, their interpretation, and implementation.*
- iv. *Establish an approach that uses education/encouragement before standards/enforcement.*
- v. *Develop a clear, coherent, and unified approach to issues where CARPC does not have clear enforcement authority.*
- vi. *Develop a clear definition of small, "no-brainer" applications for service area amendments for quick Commission action.*
- vii. *Establish Commission policy for thorough evaluation and formal adoption of new standards and technologies prior to use as conditions in service area amendments.*
- viii. *Establish types of information and analysis needed to facilitate informed and objective decisions.*

C. Commission to direct staff to undertake the following:

- i. *Develop a checklist and brochure concerning service area amendment policies and minimum criteria and required elements for Commission consideration.*
- ii. *Outline approach to a more active solicitation of comments from affected units of government regarding service area amendments for Commission consideration.*
- iii. *Generate approaches to ensure commissioners understand the planning intent of local comprehensive plans.*
- iv. *Generate various approaches for including economic analysis in staff reports for Commission consideration.*
- v. *Create a framework and scope for commenting on proposed local plans for Commission consideration. Adopt framework and scope for staff comments and informed units of government of the availability of this service.*
- vi. *Prepare a brochure outlining technical assistance available from CARPC staff*
- vii. *Generate framework and criteria for awards recognizing good projects.*
- viii. *Schedule regular Commission meetings in various areas of the region. On-the-road RPC meetings to include local planning activity reports and consultation.*
- ix. *Provide commissioners with list of local planning meetings for their attendance. Include commissioner report of meetings on CARPC meeting agenda.*

D. Include the following work activities in the CARPC work program:

- i. *Detailed CARPC Legal and Institutional Analysis for 2013.*
- ii. *Regional Energy Analysis and Plan*
- iii. *Appendix E of the Dane County Water Quality Plan (Agricultural Nonpoint Source Analysis).*

E. Request the FUDA Advisory Group to assess whether decisions being made by CARPC are foreclosing future options.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. Staff Comments on PCAG Recommendations: Outline of steps identified by staff as necessary to integrate the recommendations of PCAG into the operations of the CARPC.
2. Report was provided in March and is linked on the home page of the website. The direct link is at http://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/2011_postings/draft_reports/report_on_the_recommendations_of_PCAG.pdf

Contact for Further Information:

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director
 266-9283
 KamranM@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Staff Comment on PCAG Recommendations

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>1. Develop a broad regional agreement on comprehensive objectives that are key to the well-being, sustainability, and vitality of the Region. Generate implementation measures to achieve these objectives through a consistent process suitable for differing sizes and capabilities in local units of government.</p>	
<p><i>Details:</i></p>	
<p><i>A. Create a workgroup of CARPC and charge it with the task of building trust for CARPC, and building support behind specific authority which might be added to CARPC to enable it to address critical and strategic challenges facing the Region in the next 50 years (this may require a process that first builds agreement behind what these critical and strategic challenges are).</i></p>	<p>Action: A representative workgroup of the Commission should be created to undertake this task.</p>
<p><i>B. Build trust between CARPC and local units of government through collaboration and cooperation by:</i></p>	
<p>1. Arranging bus tours for CARPC to visit examples of development in the Region.</p>	<p>Action: Being undertaken as part of the HUD Grant. Will include in the work program after the Grant period.</p>
<p>2. Commissioners attending local planning meetings.</p>	<p>Action: Staff can assemble a schedule of local planning meetings for Commissioners' use. A report item can be included in every Commission agenda to allow Commissioners to report on their visits.</p>
<p>3. CARPC staff providing comments on proposed plans.</p>	<p>Action: This service is currently provided by request. The RPC staff used to provide comments on town zoning changes. This practice became controversial and was discontinued in the late 1990s. Staff recommends continuing this service as requested by units of government, and based on a clear framework and scope so it will not become controversial again. Once a framework and scope have been developed and adopted by the Commission, the availability of the service needs to be widely disseminated.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
4. CARPC staff providing consultant services to local units of government.	Action: This is currently being provided by request.
5. Creating a venue for intergovernmental sharing and discussion of long-range growth plans.	Action: Currently being provided as part of FUDA planning. Expected to become a routine activity in FUDA areas between updates.
6. CARPC staff providing comments on long-range growth plans.	Action: This is part of the FUDA planning process.
7. CARPC staff increasing outreach and education activities.	Action: Currently being done as time and staffing allows through webinars, presentations, forums, conferences, workshops, newsletters, blogs, reports, websites, and personal outreach activities.
8. CARPC staff providing technical information and assistance to local units of government.	Action: Currently being provided by request and through presentations, reports, and websites. This is also part of FUDA planning process. Commission should direct staff to prepare a brochure of available services and materials to be sent to all units of government and included on the website.
9. Making reports available to units of government in advance of their planning activities.	Action: Currently provided by request and as part of FUDA planning. A systematic approach to would require units of government to inform staff of their intent to update plans.
10. Holding work sessions and charrettes around the Region (with Commissioners and Commission staff participating).	Action: Currently provided as part of FUDA planning. Commissioners are informed of meetings as a way of encouraging them to attend.
11. CARPC staff making presentations on specific subjects and issues around the Region.	Action: Currently provided by request and as time allows. This is also part of FUDA planning.
12. Recognizing good projects in CARPC newsletter and/or through awards.	Action: Recognition of good projects as part of the newsletter and website is currently in place. An award requires a clear framework and criteria, and can be part of the annual conference.

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>13. Creating venues for the Commission to discuss its view of regional issues and opportunities with local units of government and other interested parties.</p>	<p>Action: Requires holding special meetings of the Commission around the region, perhaps as part of the FUDA planning process or as a separate activity. If done as a separate activity, this would allow the Commission as a whole to discuss its objectives with local units of government. Such an undertaking requires that the Commission speak with a generally unified voice. Otherwise, it will only serve to confuse local decision-makers.</p>
<p>14. Inviting municipal decision-makers to explain local plans and policies.</p>	<p>Action: Can be achieved by holding regular Commission meetings around the region and including presentations from nearby units of government as part of the agenda. Can also be part of FUDA (background) presentations by local units of government to the Commission.</p>
<p><i>C. Harmonize regional authority with local authority:</i></p>	
<p>1. Undertake a detailed Legal and Institutional Analysis of the responsibilities and authority of CARPC and other governmental jurisdictions in the Region. The final report should outline how the authority of various levels of government dovetail into one another, clarify these roles and responsibilities, and clear up any confusion in the delineation of authority. This report should recommend a series of voluntary memoranda of understanding (MOUs) between CARPC and the entities in charge of planning, review, implementation, and enforcement of regional issues, clearly outlining the role of each entity. MOUs should not be required for service area amendment requests or as conditions of approval.</p>	<p>Action: Such an analysis would have to be included in the work program and will require additional funding for legal analysis by John St. Peter. Potential MOUs can be generated as the result of the analysis, and recommended to the Commission for its concurrence.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>2. Regional actions have local impacts and many local actions have regional impacts. CARPC should not get involved in local issues that do not have regional impacts. Continue to allow local management agencies to decide how regional goals and objectives are achieved through local action. Work with local units of government to identify the interrelationship between local action and regional impacts to inform both local and regional decision-making. The FUDA planning process has promise for providing a vehicle to blend local and regional needs and opportunities based on a collaborative, joint decision-making process. CARPC should proceed with the FUDA planning process in cooperation with local units of government, even if only on a sub-regional basis.</p>	<p>Action: FUDA planning is being undertaken with the approach outlined in the recommendation.</p>
<p>i. <i>Increase Density:</i> Analyze each service area to determine an overall density target suitable to its location, and help the community to reach the community target.</p>	<p>Action: Such analyses are part of the FUDA planning process with communities. Work includes economic and market analyses of various forms of development.</p>
<p>ii. <i>Intergovernmental Coordination:</i> Continue to provide intergovernmental coordination of planning between cities, villages, and towns as a routine part of planning.</p>	<p>Action: Already being provided.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>iii. <i>Provide a Venue for Cooperation and Conflict Resolution:</i> Continue to act as the venue for intergovernmental and inter-jurisdictional coordination and cooperation. If requested of CARPC, CARPC staff should be permitted to facilitate discussions between city, village, and town officials concerning planning issues. CARPC should not insert itself in annexation, and border conflicts, or other issues where parties have not requested CARPC involvement. Intergovernmental cooperation should not be a requirement or condition for service area amendments, however, CARPC should encourage conflict resolution wherever possible in its planning process.</p>	<p>Action: Already being provided as staff resources allow. The Commission should develop a clear approach concerning annexation conflicts to prevent confusion.</p>
<p>iv. <i>Facilitate Intergovernmental Communication:</i> Solicit and consider comments from affected units of government regarding proposed service area expansions. Inform adjacent units of government of proposed service area expansions as early in the process as possible.</p>	<p>Action: Adjacent units of government are already being informed of proposed service area amendments. A more active solicitation of comments can be a routine part of the amendment process if the Commission adopts such an approach.</p>
<p>v. <i>Promote Vibrant and Livable Urban Areas:</i> To encourage livable, viable, and connected new urban areas, consider logical planning areas for USA amendments regardless of annexation status of these lands.</p>	<p>Action: The current policy requires USA amendments to be based on logical neighborhood areas/plans even if only some phases of the neighborhood are being added to the service area. The Commission should develop a clear approach concerning annexation conflicts and issues to prevent confusion.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>3. Develop a land demand methodology to be applied to each service area using the population projection methodology outlined in NR 121, and based on a systematic analysis of existing land use, land use and market trends and factors, environmental constraints, and the flexibility that might be needed for each service area to reach planning goals and objectives. Consideration should be given to local goals and objectives. Monitor land use changes and the effectiveness of the methodology and make corrections every decade based on new Census and growth data.</p>	<p>Action: Several phases of such an assessment have already been completed. The 2010 land use inventory and Census analysis are being completed this year. The work program for 2012 includes a \$10,000 contractual item to integrate the analysis of land use, population, and demographic trends into community growth trends. This study would provide the needed information for analyzing and developing an updated protocol based on evidence and data, allowing the protocol to be proposed based on DOA population projections for 2040.</p>
<p><i>D. Use joint fact-finding processes to promote consensus behind objective metrics and standards concerning relevant regional issues related to water quality and natural resources, rural and agricultural lands, growth, development, public participation, transportation, transit, regional waste management, and economic development.</i></p>	<p>Action: This is the purpose of the Commission staff. The Commission should discuss the type of information and analysis needed to facilitate a more informed and objective decision-making process.</p>
<p><i>E. Use the results of joint fact-finding processes to promote a dialogue to inform stakeholders and to be informed of their concerns. Be inclusive and respectful of entities with the statutory authority to implement the resulting plans and goals.</i></p>	<p>Action: The Commission can elect to hold joint meetings. Joint meetings require clear scope agreed to by both parties to be productive. Joint staff presentations are being planned to start a dialogue between CARPC and L&WC as well as MATPB. These presentations are expected to identify areas and issues where joint meetings can be fruitful.</p>
<p>1. Solicit presentations from stakeholders.</p>	
<p>2. Hold joint meetings and encourage interaction with the Lakes and Watershed Commission.</p>	
<p>3. Hold joint meetings with the Madison Area Transportation Planning Board (MPO).</p>	
<p>4. Hold joint meetings with the Regional Transit Authority.</p>	

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p><i>F. Implement measures to support participation by a broad segment of the residents and stakeholders of the Region.</i></p>	
<p>1. Defer action if more information is needed regarding a service area expansion or policy proposal.</p>	<p>Action: This is already a Commission policy.</p>
<p>2. Schedule regular Commission meetings throughout the Region.</p>	<p>Action: The Commission has held meetings in various areas. It may want to formalize it by establishing quarterly meetings that can be scheduled ahead of time, accompanied with presentations, field trips, and activities.</p>
<p>3. Develop stakeholder outreach and involvement policies, protocols, and programs (this may be coupled with the Institutional Analysis effort).</p>	<p>Action: The Commission should identify various stakeholder groups and the outreach programs and desired outcomes for outreach.</p>
<p><i>G. Provide leadership to build consensus among all the units of government in the Region.</i></p>	<p>Action: The Commission needs to define its leadership role and what it regards as consensus-building, and what specific results it would aim to facilitate.</p>
<p><i>H. Undertake greater outreach activities and distribute its reports and issue papers more widely.</i></p>	<p>Action: Already being done based on the availability of staff and resources, mostly through two websites and access to digital versions of reports. Additional reports are digitized as time allows. It would be appropriate for the Commission to create a work group to develop an outreach strategy and program. The Commission needs to first establish a clear, unified, and coherent mission and vision for its work.</p>
<p><i>I. Identify resilience factors and “no regrets” strategic planning decision items that would allow long range planning on the following items:</i></p>	
<p>1. Carrying capacity of natural systems to provide potable water to a growing population.</p>	<p>Action: Being done through the update of the Regional Groundwater Model and future detailed studies associated with it.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
2. Impact of changes in technology for transportation, building, energy, and other built systems.	Action: Some of these are being introduced as part of the HUD grant. Much more work is needed in this area, especially in preparation for the update of the Land Use and Transportation Plan.
3. Dependence on unsustainable sources of energy.	Action: A regional energy analysis and plan was developed by the RPC in the 1970s. A new effort is needed to address challenges that will likely be faced in this area.
4. Limits of the natural attenuation capability of environmental systems.	Action: Several watershed studies have been proposed and need to be undertaken as resources allow.
5. Fragmentation of environmental interconnections.	Action: Being undertaken as part of the HUD grant.
6. Fragmentation of structural and institutional capabilities.	Action: This may be a follow-up to the Institutional Analysis update recommended under 1.C.1.
7. Beneficial re-use of wastewater and stormwater.	Action: Pilot projects have been already completed for stormwater and data from these are being analyzed to guide future measures. Beneficial reuse of wastewater is more controversial, and needs to be evaluated with thorough assessment of impacts, cost-effectiveness, and public acceptance of such measures. Pilot projects have been actively pursued since the 1990s. Staff will inform the Commission as new opportunities arise.
<i>J. Establish a workgroup to assess whether decisions being made by CARPC are foreclosing future options.</i>	Action: The Commission can assign this work to a new representative work group of its members. A clear and thorough definition of the scope of work for this work group is needed.
<i>K. Work with the Dane County Land and Water Resources Department to address agricultural non-point source issues.</i>	Action: Agricultural non-point source pollution is a technical appendix of the <i>Dane County Water Quality Plan</i> , and it needs to be updated as resources allow. This update is not currently programmed.

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>2. Improve the service area amendment application process and promote good planning to include adopted policies and criteria, broad regional vision and development goals, and good planning.</p>	
<p><i>Details:</i></p>	
<p><i>A. Improve the service area amendment application process:</i></p>	
<p>1. Publish a checklist document that clearly shows the minimum standards required for service area amendments.</p>	<p>Action: Staff can develop a draft document for the Commission’s consideration. Such a document is best developed after the Commission has held its retreat and developed a clear, coherent, and unified approach towards service area amendment process.</p>
<p>2. Produce a brochure concerning service area amendments outlining requirements, expectations, general time frame, standards, etc. (this brochure will include the checklist noted above).</p>	<p>Action: Staff can develop a draft document for the Commission’s consideration. Such a document is best developed after the Commission has held its retreat and developed a clear, coherent, and unified approach towards service area amendment process.</p>
<p>3. Include a review of all relevant plans in service area amendment staff analyses.</p>	<p>Action: Already being done.</p>
<p>4. Implement an expedited process for certain small, “no-brainer” applications, with quick action by Commission.</p>	<p>Action: The Commission should develop a clear definition of such applications as part of its planning retreat. Commission should then direct staff to generate approaches for its consideration.</p>
<p>5. Create a map that identifies permanent (long-term) preservation and conservation areas in the Region.</p>	<p>Action: Already part of the <i>Dane County Water Quality Plan</i> in the form of Open Space Corridors and Environmental Corridors. FUDA planning is expected to result in the expansion of these areas as a potential part of Park and Open Space acquisitions.</p>
<p>6. Develop mechanisms to ensure CARPC commissioners understand the planning intent of local comprehensive plans.</p>	<p>Action: Commission should direct staff to generate approaches for its consideration.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>7. Solicit and consider comments from affected units of government regarding proposed service area expansions. Inform affected adjacent units of government of proposed service area expansions as early in the process as possible.</p>	<p>Action: Already being done to some extent. Commission should direct staff to include such solicitations as a routine part of service area planning and amendment process.</p>
<p>8. Consider logical planning areas for USA amendments regardless of annexation status of these lands, to encourage livable, viable, and connected new urban areas.</p>	<p>Action: The Commission already requires planning at a logical neighborhood scale to provide a context for each amendment, even where the amendment area is a small phase of a larger neighborhood. Staff analyses and presentations should more consistently remind the Commission of this policy.</p>
<p><i>Note: The Advisory Group considered a scoring approach for reviewing proposed service area amendments and did not find it to be workable.</i></p>	
<p><i>B. Promote Good Planning:</i></p>	
<p>1. Create an Advanced Planning Guidebook featuring best planning and management practices that will provide applicants with methods to meet or exceed the minimum standard published in the recommended checklist. A technical group should be formed to research, evaluate, and publish information about implementing specific best planning and design practices fit for local and regional application. The Guidebook is not intended to replace minimum standards.</p>	<p>Action: Such a guidebook is being developed to guide the FUDA planning process. This guide can be piloted as part of FUDA planning, and peer reviewed for consistency and applicability. Alternatively, the FUDA Advisory Group can be asked to assist in developing this guidebook.</p>
<p>2. Recognize good projects in newsletter or through awards.</p>	<p>Action: The Commission should direct staff to propose a framework for such recognition and award for its consideration.</p>
<p>3. Create a clearing-house for information on grants available for local units of government.</p>	<p>Action: Many such clearinghouses already exist. Links can be placed on the CARPC website.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p>4. Publish new best practices on CARPC website.</p>	<p>Action: New best practices need to be assessed for local relevance and applicability before the RPC can promote them. Once such assessment has been performed, best practices are promoted through workshops, guidebooks, recommendations, and the website.</p>
<p><i>C. Include a critical analysis of economic factors in service area amendment analyses by contracting with Thrive to perform evaluations (similar to what MPO does for transportation).</i></p>	<p>Action: The Commission should direct staff to investigate various approaches for including economic analysis in staff reports for its consideration.</p>
<p><i>D. New Region-wide standards, including those made possible by new technologies, should be required only after thorough evaluation regarding effectiveness and practicability by CARPC staff and/or the Environmental Resources Technical Advisory Committee. Such standards should undergo formal adoption before they are required as part of service area amendments.</i></p>	<p>Action: The Commission needs to include a thorough discussion of this issue as part of its retreat. A coherent and unified policy is needed for the Commission.</p>
<p>3. Use approaches that incorporate both education/encouragement and standards/enforcement, in that order. Use voluntary MOUs in areas where CARPC does not have clear enforcement authority, and monitor compliance with MOUs.</p>	<p>Action: The approach to issues where the Commission does not have clear enforcement authority needs to be discussed as part of a Commission retreat so there is a clear, coherent, and unified approach to such issues.</p>
<p>4. Encourage applicants to give a one-time, voluntary presentation of development concepts to CARPC in the beginning stages of neighborhood planning or other development planning. CARPC staff should prepare summary reports to inform the Commission of issues and opportunities related to the location and development concept at the same meeting. Use these consultative sessions to provide guidance and substantive feedback to applicants regarding information that should be provided and issues that need to be addressed in the potential service area amendment proposal.</p>	<p>Action: This approach is being slowly introduced. The Commission should direct staff to develop a routine approach for such presentations for its consideration as part of the brochure for service area amendments.</p>

PCAG Recommendations	Staff Comment
<p><i>Rationale: Many opinions regarding the duties, responsibilities, and authority of CARPC exist within the Region. This diversity of opinion may be caused, in part, by lack of information and differing interpretations of the governing statutes and founding agreements of CARPC. This study would update and expand a similar study conducted as part of the Dane County Water Quality Plan in 1978.</i></p>	

Re: Discussion and potential consideration of CARPC retreat to discuss PCAG recommendations and other items (*actionable item*)

Decision Items:

1. Consider retreat

This item was requested by Commissioner Studz.

At the May meeting, Commissioners discussed the merits of holding a “retreat” in order for the body to focus discussion on certain CARPC issues. The core of these issues are raised in the recommendations of the PCAG report (see agenda item #10).

It may be most beneficial for the body to conduct this meeting at a place and time different than the regular CARPC meetings. A more informal, comfortable setting (which meets Open Meetings Law requirements) that is more conducive to interaction among commissioners would be ideal. While staff would recommend a Saturday morning/early afternoon session to capitalize on fresh minds less occupied with weekday responsibilities, the Commission may wish to consider a weekday morning session if weekend schedules are more restrictive.

The goal of the retreat would be the development of a specific plan to address the four recommendations of the PCAG report. It would also be appropriate to designate the beginning of the retreat as a discussion on the basic role of CARPC.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. None

Contact for Further Information:

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director
266-9283
KamranM@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Re: Discussion of SSA Application Review Fees and Consideration of Recommendation to the CARPC Budget and Personnel Panel (*to be deferred pending additional information*)

Decision Items:

1. Consider deferring

This item was requested by Commissioner Studz.

The Commission has agreed to discuss Sewer Service Area (SSA) amendment application review fees as a potential new source of revenue to pay for the costs of such reviews. Staff has worked on potential approaches and needs to hold discussions with city, village and town representatives to identify specific approaches to fees that are practicable for local units as well. Staff will report as information becomes available.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. None

Contact for Further Information:

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director
266-9283
KamranM@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Re: Introduction of Resolution CARPC No. 2011-17 amending the CARPC Bylaws to clarify the status of the Budget & Personnel Panel, and to identify Commission budget certification procedures

Decision Items:

1. None

This item was requested by Commissioner Palm.

Recent public statements and actions concerning CARPC have raised questions regarding the status of the local resolutions of petition for CARPC creation. These resolutions carried important structural, political and policy implications. However, the legal function of these resolutions was to request that the Governor 1) create the CARPC, 2) define its jurisdiction, and 3) define its membership.

Although other activities and policies of the local resolutions do not have the force of law, the Commission has agreed on the importance of their intent. To acknowledge this importance, the body may wish to consider codifying the intent of the petitions by amending its Bylaws as follows.

- 1) Deleting Article III "Budget & Personnel Panel" as its own Article, and adding it as Section 4 in new Article III "Committees": this illustrates the status of the BPP as a committee of CARPC.
- 2) Amending Section 1 "Annual Budget" of Article VII "Budget & Finances" by describing the budget certification process: this language is meant to identify the process already prescribed by state law.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. Resolution CARPC No. 2011-17

Contact for Further Information:

Chris Gjestson, Administrative Services Manager
266-4138
ChrisG@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Resolution CARPC No. 2011-17

Amending the CARPC Bylaws

WHEREAS, the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission (“CARPC”) was created on May 2, 2007, by Executive Order #197, pursuant to §66.0909(2)(b), Wis. Stats., in response to local government resolutions of petition for CARPC creation (“Petitions”); and

WHEREAS, the legal function of the Petitions was to create CARPC, to identify Dane County as the area in which CARPC has jurisdiction, and to set forth the membership plan of CARPC which identifies thirteen members appointed by four authorities; and

WHEREAS, the Petitions also called for the creation of a Budget and Personnel Panel (“BPP”) other important roles and functions, and CARPC wishes to provide clarity on the role, function and scope of the BPP while maintaining consistency with existing state and federal law; and

WHEREAS, CARPC follows the procedures set forth in state law regarding the annual budget charge certification process (§66.0309(14)(b), Wis. Stats.), which requires the CARPC Chairperson certify the budget charge; and

WHEREAS, CARPC has established rules of procedures in the CARPC Bylaws, as adopted on November 8, 2007 and as amended, which CARPC views as an appropriate vehicle to meet the intent of this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, CARPC has reviewed this amendment to the Bylaws, and believes it to be in the best interest of the Commission and its constituents.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission hereby amends the CARPC Bylaws as indicated below.

- 1) Deleting Article III “Budget & Personnel Panel” in entirety;
- 2) Amend Articles IV and V to Articles III and IV, respectively;
- 3) Add deleted language in #1 above as new Section 4 in new Article III “Committees”; and
- 4) Amend Section 1 “Annual Budget” of Article VII “Budget & Finances” by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence of Section 1: “The Commission shall direct the Chairperson to certify to the county clerk, before August 1 of each year, the proportionate amount of the budget charged to the county for the services of the Commission.” And by striking “..and the Budget and Personnel Panel...” in the last sentence of Section 1.

Date Adopted

Larry Palm, Vice-Chairperson

Re: Approval of August disbursements and Treasurer's Report for July 2011

Decision Items:

1. Approve payment of CARPC bills for August and the July 2011 Treasurer's Report

CARPC internal controls require that bills be approved by CARPC or its Executive Committee and also that the Treasurer routinely review the CARPC bank statement, the entries and balance of the cash account of the general ledger, the bank account reconciliation prepared by staff, and the previous month's ending cash balance. This review by the Treasurer is regularly confirmed by his or her signature on the Treasurer's Report.

These bills and the Report are attached. Also provided is the year-to-date revenue and expenses as related to the adopted 2011 budget. Staff will secure Mr. Sonnentag's signature on the Treasurer's Report prior to the meeting.

Materials Presented with Item:

1. August 2011 Voucher Bills and July 2011 Treasurer's Report, plus CARPC year-to-date revenues and expenses

Contact for Further Information:

Chris Gjestson, Administrative Services Manager
266-4138
ChrisG@CapitalAreaRPC.org

Voucher Bills for August 2011

11-Aug-11

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

The following list of bills have been encumbered by the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission and are true and correct.

Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director

Date

The Capital Area Regional Planning Commission or its Executive Committee has examined the following list of bills and approves payment.

Vouchers No. 1 through 23 totaling \$ 140,535.45

August 11, 2011

Date Approved

Larry Palm, Vice-Chairperson

Kurt Sonnentag, Treasurer

Voucher Bills for August 2011

11-Aug-11

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

<u>No.</u>	<u>Payee</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u>	
1	Amcore Bank Visa	Office supplies (to be paid in August)	300.00	<i>estimated</i>
2	AT&T	July phone use	400.00	<i>estimated</i>
3	Board of Regents of UW	Groundwater Modeling update (pass-thru)	36,063.58	
4	Board of Regents of UW	Water Resources Monitoring (pass-thru)	25,728.00	
5	CARPC Employees	Travel expenses	85.00	<i>estimated</i>
6	CARPC Employees	Payroll 17B and 18C	44,300.00	<i>estimated</i>
7	Dane County	Safeword Token & maintenance (Anderson)	70.00	<i>paid</i>
8	Delta Dental	September dental insurance	717.12	
9	Econoprint	Business cards	145.00	
10	Edgerton, St. Peter, Petak & Rosenfeldt	July HUD GRANT legal counsel (0.0 hrs; \$0 sundry)	0.00	
11	Edgerton, St. Peter, Petak & Rosenfeldt	July legal counsel: County litigation (9.8 hrs; \$0.00 sundry)	1,810.00	
12	Edgerton, St. Peter, Petak & Rosenfeldt	July standard legal counsel (4.7 hrs; \$28.00 sundry)	921.00	
13	Kamran Mesbah	Reimbursement for BlackBerry data plan (July)	47.00	
14	Madison Area TPB	July transportation planning	350.00	<i>estimated</i>
15	Minnesota Mutual	September life insurance (CARPC contribution)	16.09	
16	Physicians Plus	September health insurance	7,984.44	
17	Unum Life Insurance Company	September disability insurance (CARPC-paid)	38.60	
18	Wisconsin Retirement System	July employer contribution	2,374.11	
<u>HUD - SCRP Grant (Reimbursed Expenses)</u>				
19	CARPC Employees	Payroll 17B and 18C	17,000.00	<i>estimated</i>
20	CARPC Employees	Travel expenses	125.00	<i>estimated</i>
21	Delta Dental	September dental insurance	85.64	
22	Physicians Plus	September health insurance	1,035.04	
23	Wisconsin Retirement System	July employer contribution	939.84	
TOTAL			\$ 140,535.45	

Recommended for Approval: _____
 Kamran Mesbah, Deputy Director

Report: July Estimated Amounts as Paid

		<u>Estimated/Approved</u>	<u>Paid/Incurred</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Amcore Bank Visa	Office supplies (paid in July)	300.00	130.37	(169.63)
AT&T	June phone use	400.00	402.26	2.26
CARPC Employees	Travel expenses	85.00	76.50	(8.50)
CARPC Employees	Payroll 15B and 16A	42,150.00	44,330.20	2,180.20
Dane County	2Q 2011 printing services (xerox/paper/postage/long dist)	1,670.00	1,986.27	316.27
Madison Area TPB	June transportation planning	350.00	1,762.00	1,412.00
<u>HUD-SCRP Grant (Reimbursed Expenses)</u>				
CARPC Employees	Payroll 15B and 16A	17,000.00	16,962.40	(37.60)
CARPC Employees	Travel expenses	125.00	175.75	50.75
TOTAL Over (Under) Estimated Amounts				\$ 3,745.75

estimate off by: 6.03%

Treasurer's Report July 2011

11-Aug-11

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

July 2011

CHECKING

Reconciled Cash Balance June 30, 2011		133,085.50
July Disbursements		
Personnel (includes HUD)	(76,477.84)	
Operating Expenses	(7,629.92)	
Contractual (MATPB)	<u>(1,762.00)</u>	
Total Disbursements		(85,869.76)
July Deposits		
Transfer from Money Market	0.00	
HUD-SCRIP Grant Reimbursement (for June expenses)	21,419.17	
Sewer extension fees	<u>0.00</u>	
Total Deposits		21,419.17

MONEY MARKET

Cash Balance June 30, 2011		365,776.25
July Disbursements (x-fer to Checking)	0.00	
July Deposits	0.00	
July Interest	<u>217.96</u>	
Net Change July 2011		<u>217.96</u>

Reconciled Total Cash Balance July 31, 2011

\$ 434,629.12

I have reviewed for the month(s) indicated above the CARPC bank statement, the entries and balance of the cash account of the general ledger, and the bank account reconciliation prepared by staff, and hereby find to the best of my knowledge the reconciled Cash Balance indicated above to be true and correct.

signed: _____
Kurt Sonnentag, Treasurer

date: _____

August 2011 (estimated)

Estimated August Disbursements		\$ (140,535.45)
Estimated August Deposits		
Dane County (2nd of 2 installments)	289,286.50	
HUD reimbursement	20,000.00	
Sewer extensions	2,800.00	
AWRPC reimbursement (for printing AWRPC profiles)	1,787.00	
Interest	300.00	
David Greene (COBRA payment)	196.12	
Total Estimated Deposits		<u>314,369.62</u>
Estimated Cash Balance August 31, 2011		<u><u>\$ 608,463.29</u></u>

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

2011 Revenue & Expenditures as of
7/31/11

Accounts	A	B	C	D
	Actual YTD	Under/ (Over) YTD	Pro-rata Budget YTD	Adopted RPC Budget
EXPENDITURES				
Personal Services (no grant staff)				
1 Salaries & Wages (includes GIS Specialist)	\$ 305,782	\$ 35,791	\$ 341,573	\$ 585,554 ***
2 Workstudy / Intern	11,696	(5,542)	6,154	10,550
3 Wisconsin Retirement	21,812	(2,000)	19,811	33,962 ***
4 Social Security / Medicare	26,080	51	26,130	44,795 ***
5 Employee / Retiree Insurance (less COBRA refund)	59,272	6,814	66,086	113,290
6 Furloughs (4 days; included in lines 1-4 in Col. A)	-	-	-	(10,220)
7 Total Personal Services	\$ 424,641	\$ 35,114	\$ 459,754	\$ 777,931
Operating Expenses				
8 Commissioner Per Diem & Travel	\$ 2,897	\$ 195	\$ 3,092	\$ 5,300
9 Employee Travel & Meeting Exp	812	2,105	2,917	5,000
10 Conference & Training	1,372	28	1,400	2,400
11 Office Supplies (Postage, printing, copies, etc.)	7,129	2,204	9,333	16,000
12 Dues / Membership Fees	886	1,337	2,223	3,810
13 GIS Software	-	3,383	3,383	5,800
14 Recruitment	-	-	-	-
15 Telephone / Internet	6,570	(1,612)	4,958	8,500 ***
16 Office Space (Rent)	33,036	(13,765)	19,271	33,036
17 Legal Services	9,791	7,709	17,500	30,000
18 Advertising	-	-	-	-
19 Audit Services	6,340	(2,840)	3,500	6,000
20 Insurance (Package, WC, D&O)	1,982	2,685	4,667	8,000
21 Total Operating	\$ 70,815	\$ 1,428	\$ 72,244	\$ 123,846
Capital Outlay				
22 Office / Computer Equipment and Furniture	\$ 820	\$ 930	\$ 1,750	\$ 3,000
23 Fly Dane Partnership	-	-	-	-
24 GIS Equipment	-	-	-	-
25 Total Capital Outlay	\$ 820	\$ 930	\$ 1,750	\$ 3,000
Contractual				
26 Consulting Services	\$ -	\$ 5,833	\$ 5,833	\$ 10,000 ***
27 IM Services	21,000	(8,750)	12,250	21,000
28 Total Contractual	\$ 21,000	\$ (2,917)	\$ 18,083	\$ 31,000
Pass-Thru				
29 Cooperative Water Resources Monitoring	\$ 25,728	\$ 30,315	\$ 56,043	\$ 96,074
30 Groundwater Model Update	95,500	(401)	95,099	163,027 ***
31 EPA/DNR Stimulus Programs	38,000	(15,833)	22,167	38,000 ***
32 MPO Transp Planning/Pass-Thru	6,008	(175)	5,833	10,000
33 Total Pass-Thru	\$ 165,236	\$ 13,906	\$ 179,142	\$ 307,101
Pass-Thru: HUD GRANT^				
34 Salaries & Wages	\$ 43,836	\$ 65,620	\$ 109,456	\$ 187,639 ^
35 Fringe Benefits	7,399	24,297	31,695	54,335 ^
36 Travel Costs	399	2,334	2,733	4,685 ^
37 General Office Supplies	-	577	577	989 ^
34 Non-Consumable Materials	4,768	621	5,388	9,237 ^
35 Consultants	-	51,042	51,042	87,500 ^
36 Contracts & Sub-Grantees	-	101,115	101,115	173,340 ^
37 Other Direct Costs	4,112	8,618	12,730	21,823 ^
38 Total HUD Grant	\$ 60,514	\$ 254,222	\$ 314,736	\$ 539,548 ^
39 GROSS Expenditures	\$ 743,026	\$ 302,684	\$ 1,045,710	\$ 1,782,426
40 NET Expenditures (No Pass-Thru or HUD Grant)	\$ 517,276	\$ 34,555	\$ 551,831	\$ 935,777

Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

2011 Revenue & Expenditures as of

7/31/11

REVENUES					
Non-Dane County Revenue					
41	Fees: sewer extensions	\$ 7,200	\$ 2,767	\$ 4,433	\$ 7,600
42	Conference Registration Revenue	-	(817)	817	1,400
43	Land Use Inventory grant revenue	-	(3,500)	3,500	6,000
44	Local Planning Assistance	-	-	-	-
45	MMSD	-	-	-	-
46	EPA/DNR Water Quality Planning	31,700	(9,851)	41,551	71,230
47	FHA/WDOT Transp Planning Funds	4,590	3,277	1,313	2,250
48	Interest Income (less bank fees)	2,215	1,632	583	1,000
49	Product Sales	-	(58)	58	100
50	PASS-THRU: MPO Transp Planning	3,757	(1,493)	5,250	9,000
51	PASS-THRU: Groundwater Model	163,027	67,928	95,099	163,027 ***
52	PASS-THRU: EPA/DNR Stimulus	38,000	15,833	22,167	38,000 ***
53	PASS-THRU: Coop Water Resources Monitoring	96,074	40,031	56,043	96,074
54	Fund Balance *	85,489	-	85,489	146,552 *
55	Dane County Property Tax **	686,645	286,102	400,543	686,645 **
56	HUD GRANT^	40,387	(274,349)	314,736	539,548 ^
57	GROSS Revenue	\$ 1,159,084	\$ 127,502	\$ 1,031,582	\$ 1,768,426
58	NET Revenue (No Pass-Thru or HUD Grant)	\$ 817,839	\$ 279,552	\$ 538,287	\$ 922,777

* Portion used to reduce County levy; Actual = Pro-Rated for tracking purposes

** includes \$54,036 in annual services (rent, IM support) provided in-lieu of cash

*** Amended, or to be amended by CARPC

^ HUD Grant pass-thru is estimated and presented for information/tracking purposes only; authorization and administration of HUD funds is based on 3-year contract

Excess Revenue over Expenses	\$	300,563
Less Depreciation		<u>0</u>
YTD Excess Revenue	\$	<u><u>300,563</u></u>