

# MINUTES

## Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

August 23, 2007

City-County Building Rm 103A, 210 MLK Jr Blvd, Madison WI

7:30 p.m.

---

Present: Zach Brandon, Kristine Euclide, Martha Gibson, Kris Hampton, Carlton Hamre, George Kamperschroer, Sally Kefer, Harold Krantz, Jeff Miller, Larry Palm, Anne Sayers, Kurt Sonnentag

Absent: Joe Chase

Staff Present: Chris Gjestson, Michael King, Kamran Mesbah, Barbara Weber

### 1. Roll Call

Interim Chair Miller called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

### 2. Approval of minutes of the August 9, 2007 meeting

Moved by Mr. Hampton, seconded by Mr. Brandon, to approve the minutes of the August 9, 2007 meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

### 3. Review of agenda

There were no requested changes to the agenda.

### 4. Public comment

None.

### 5. Presentation/discussion of Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan and its goals and objectives

Mr. King referred to the eleven goals of the Vision 2020 Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan, adopted by the Dane County RPC and the Dane County Board in 1997, and the objectives of the Plan developed to achieve the goals. The Commission could re-affirm the Plan's current goals and objectives, which would be used as a basis for amending urban service areas, and identify those areas which merit further discussion and consideration for revision. He suggested that because of the extensive public participation process in the Plan's development, it would be preferable not to make significant changes without a similarly extensive process.

Ms. Kefer asked if any goals proposed in the Dane County Comprehensive Plan conflicted with those of the Vision 2020 Plan. Mr. King stated that he wasn't aware of any conflicts. Mr. Palm suggested, and Mr. Kamperschroer agreed, that the Commission identify the goals and objectives it deems most important to measure urban service area amendments, and address the other goals over time. Mr. Kamperschroer asked if there were legal requirements to adopt a plan. Mr. King stated that the state regional planning laws required the Commission to develop and adopt a master plan for the physical development of the region, consistent with the elements of the Smart Growth planning law. Ms. Euclide expressed general agreement with the eleven goals, although the objectives appeared

relatively dated; a comparison to the County Comprehensive Plan might identify goals not sufficiently addressed in the Vision 2020 Plan. Mr. King suggested that the Commission might focus on the plan goals and the “environmental protection” category of objectives, rather than all of the objectives. Mr. Hampton expressed support for the eleven general goals, but questioned how they might be implemented. Discussion followed. Mr. King noted that the County Comprehensive Plan only applied to unincorporated areas; staff intended to provide a diagram which illustrates plan relationships in the county.

Mr. Mesbah noted that the transportation element of the Vision 2020 Plan required updating, since the regional transportation plan was recently adopted by the Madison Area MPO (November 2006). Mr. King noted that Chapter 2 (Conditions and Trends) of the Plan was updated by the DCRPC in 2004 to provide the MPO with updated data. Commissioners discussed with staff the Plan goals, implementation, and how to proceed.

Mr. King stated that staff would provide the Commission at their workshops the eleven Vision 2020 goals, the “environmental protection” category objectives for discussion, and would like to have the opportunity to review all the plan objectives and possibly suggest other objectives for possible inclusion. He stated that staff could also prepare a comparison of the Plan goals with those of the County Comprehensive Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and the Parks and Open Space Plan. He noted that it would be beneficial for the Commission to hear descriptions of these plans by representatives of their parent bodies.

#### **6. Presentation/discussion of urban service area amendment staff reports**

Mr. Mesbah discussed the USA amendment process and how staff analyses were typically conducted for amendment requests. He referred to two examples, previously provided to Commissioners at their July 26 meeting, for a City of Middleton request (dated 9/22/06) and a Village of DeForest request (dated 8/18/04). Staff analyses were prepared to evaluate amendment proposals on a technical basis, and measure their impacts and consistency with adopted regional and local plans.

Ms. Euclide asked if there was a standardized application form for amendment request submittals. Mr. Mesbah answered no, staff worked with the applicants and their representatives to fulfill the application requirements. He stated that if the Commission so desires, staff could investigate the development of a standard application form.

Commissioners asked questions of staff about the USA amendment process and how requests were reviewed by staff and presented to the Commission, and the Commission’s authority and role as the RPC and water quality management planning agency for the Dane County region.

#### **7. Discussion of approach and scheduling of “workshop” meetings**

Mr. Miller referred to the outline of workshop meetings at the Commissioners’ places, which were proposed to provide a forum for Commissioners to discuss its goals and criteria for USA amendments and arrive at a general consensus. Members discussed, and agreed to convene at 5:00 p.m. at its regularly scheduled September meetings (13<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup>) at a Middleton location, to be arranged by staff, and would be facilitated by Bill Rizzo of Dane County UW-Extension. It is anticipated that goals and criteria will be adopted at a public hearing following the workshops.

## **8. Report of CARPC Bylaws Workgroup**

A draft version of the bylaws were provided at the Commissioners places which reflected the discussion and comments made at the bylaw work group meeting, attended by Ms. Euclide, Ms. Gibson and Mr. Palm on August 21. Mr. Kamperschroer and Mr. Hampton had provided written comments to the group. The work group identified three areas of the bylaws for further discussion: the automatic deferral of denied motions requiring 8 votes; the relationship of the Executive Director to the Budget and Personnel Panel; and the role and membership of the Executive Committee ("EC").

Mr. Kamperschroer stated that the work group felt that the provision to automatically defer denied motions requiring 8 votes was unnecessarily extensive, and should not defer motions to a third meeting; final action should occur at the second meeting. Ms. Euclide stated that members at the work group meeting felt that the full Commission should make all important decisions, and not delegate any to the EC. Mr. Palm described three options discussed by the work group: a traditional EC composed of elected officers; an EC composed of all Commissioners; or a traditional EC of elected officers which would meet only in emergency administrative situations as determined by the full board, but certain issues could be referred to specialized standing committees, such as a Finance (for budget issues) or Personnel committee. Ms. Gibson stated that duties could be assigned to the EC on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Euclide agreed, and suggested that the EC might also address routine operational issues, such as approval of monthly bills and hiring/firing of employees. Mr. Brandon stated that an EC worked in part to keep the body functional when the full body is not otherwise able to do so. Discussion continued.

Mr. Mesbah suggested that a standing Personnel Committee would be helpful in reviewing employee grievances, and staff hiring/firing by the Executive Director. This would be a separate from the body which might conduct performance evaluations of the Executive Director, so that the objectivity of the Personnel Committee would not be affected by existing relationships with the Director.

Mr. King stated that staff was developing a list of topics, as requested by the work group, which were routinely addressed by the EC of the Dane County RPC. The bylaw work group would meet again and provide a draft for Commission review.

## **9. Internal Control procedures amendment**

A summary of proposed changes to the CARPC internal control procedures (adopted 7/12/07) were at the Commissioners' places, which would 1) include the CARPC Deputy Director as an authorized check signatory; 2) include Michael King and Kamran Mesbah as authorized CARPC check signatories through December 31, 2007; 3) authorize staff to use electronic transfer of CARPC funds to make federal tax deposits and to make direct deposits of employee paychecks. Moved by Mr. Palm, seconded by Mr. Hampton, to adopt the procedures as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

## **10. Report of Interim Chair / Discussion**

Mr. Miller stated that the Executive Director application process was scheduled to close on August 31. He referred to employment tax forms at the Commissioners' places to be filled out and submitted to the CARPC office so that per diem could be collected.

**11. Report of Division Administrator / Discussion of Reports****a. Dane County proposal related to GIS Specialist position**

Mr. King stated that the Dane County Department of Planning might budget for its GIS Specialist as 1.0 FTE in 2008; the position is currently split between Planning and CAPD, and was budgeted by the CARPC as a 0.5 FTE in 2008. He stated that staff could draft a contract or similar document for the CARPC to retain the services of the employee under terms which would provide for the continuation of the current work arrangement. The Commission could adopt its 2008 budget with a shift in line items; net amounts would not change. Mr. Brandon requested that any negotiated agreement should specify rules about work performed by the employee for the CARPC, and long-term standards for cost of the agreement.

**b. Services provided in urban and limited service areas in Dane County**

A table of USA/LSA services was included in the meeting packet materials.

**12. Future Agenda Items**

The September meetings of the Commission are workshop meetings to discuss USA amendment criteria.

**13. Adjournment**

Moved by Mr. Hampton, seconded by Mr. Sonnentag, to adjourn. Motion carried at 9:52 p.m.

Recorded by Chris Gjestson