

# MINUTES

## CARPC Policies & Criteria Advisory Group

October 22, 2009

City-County Building Rm 309, 210 MLK Jr Blvd, Madison WI

5:00 p.m.

---

Present: Phyllis Hasbrouck, Eileen Kelley, Mike Dailey, Robert Phillips, Jim Pulvermacher, Brad Murphy,

Absent: Caryl Terrell, Tom Wilson, Bruce Sylvester

Staff Present: Bridgit Van Belleghem, Kamran Mesbah

### 1. **Introductions**

The meeting convened at 5:05 p.m.

### 2. **Changes to the agenda**

None

### 3. **Approval of the minutes of the meeting of September 24, 2009**

Motion by Ms. Hasbrouck, second by Mr. Phillips, to approve the Sept. 24 minutes, motion carried.

### 4. **Continued discussion of comments and issues raised by local units of government regarding CARPC policies and criteria for sewer service areas, and next steps**

Mr. Mesbah reported that staff contacted all units of government and that he met with over half of the chief elected officials. Mr. Mesbah needs to meet with the Capital Region Advocacy Network for Environmental Sustainability and Smart Growth Coalition.

Mr. Mesbah referred to the "CARPC Points of Friction" document mailed to members. The document is based on the previous meetings "Categorized Input from Local Governments" document containing groups of common view points paired with opposing view points. The group eliminated #34 because it is redundant.

Members discussed the friction points and made wording changes to the document language. Language now reads:

#20 Fix proposals with problems v. reject non-compliant proposals

#21 RPC as just another layer of government

Ms. Hasbrouck requested information on how other RPCs perform their work. Mr. Mesbah presented some of the limitations of researching other RPC structures and policies because the CARPC has a unique role and unique constraints. Mr. Mesbah will send out a document about Michigan RPCs to the group.

In examining the friction points, the group determined that certain "points" were related and could be grouped together. The groupings are as follows:

Authority 1-9, 16, 17, 29, 35

Scope 10, 11, 14, 15

General Approach 12, 30, 20  
Time Horizon 22, 23, 36  
Standard/Criteria Approach 37, 28  
Density Criteria 24-26

Others remaining on the list were either stand alone categories or have not yet been placed in a group. Work will continue at the next meeting.

Members discussed the 'scope' category. This category includes friction points addressing broad regional planning versus water-quality planning only. Members discussed how the commission could tie water quality management to other aspects of regional planning, such as transportation and traffic generation. The group determined that this could be done in general terms, but that the science does not exist to develop meaningful, implementable, and measureable policies and criteria to tie traffic generated by a specific development to water quality at a particular location. Mr. Murphy noted that the further away the standards are from directly applying to water quality the greater the likelihood of appeal. Air quality was suggested as an addition to water quality that would help capture some of the other growth management issues.

Mr. Mesbah asked the group if they could recommend what the commission could be more effective in growth management. Mr. Pulvermacher asked whether the work of the Land and Watershed Commission makes CARPC redundant. Mr. Mesbah informed the group that this is not the case because Land and Water does not do water quality planning, they implement plans.

Mr. Mesbah questioned as to whether CARPC should seek enforcement through regulation creating authority or seek enforcement through regional consensus. Ms. Kelly suggested that the current application asks the right questions about the issues not directly connected to water quality planning and management. The group determined other issues can be addressed, yet the basis for approval/denial is water quality.

Mr. Mesbah pointed out that diverse jurisdictions have different analysis capabilities and different size amendment areas will require different types of analysis. These differences make establishing a single set of criteria or application requirements challenging.

The committee also discussed regional revenue sharing. The first type, already being used in the county, is in local intergovernmental agreements. The second type, a region-wide sharing program, as used in the greater Minneapolis area, would require changes in state enabling legislation. The group acknowledged that many would perceive a "win/lose" outcome, thus support would be hard to gain.

## **5. Set future meeting dates and times**

Members agreed to meet next on November 19 at 5:00 p.m. for a 2-hour meeting.

## **6. Adjournment**

Moved by Ms. Hasbrouck, seconded by Mr. Wilson, to adjourn; motion carried at 7:00 p.m.

Recorded by Bridgit Van Belleghem