

MINUTES
of the
Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

October 13, 2016

CCB Room 351, 210 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd., Madison WI

6:15 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Steve Arnold, Lauren Cnare (arrived 6:25pm), Maureen Crombie, Mark Geller, Ken Golden, Kris Hampton, Paul Lawrence (arrived 6:20pm), Larry Palm (Chair), David Pfeiffer, Caryl Terrell

Commissioners Absent: Zach Brandon, Peter McKeever, Ed Minihan

Staff Present: Linda Firestone, Sean Higgins (arrived 6:22pm), Sharon Knauf, Mike Rupiper, Steve Steinhoff

Others Present: Bradley Cantrell, three members of the public

1. Roll Call

Chair Palm called the meeting to order at 6:16pm. Quorum was established.

Chair Palm introduced Maureen Crombie, the new Commissioner who is replacing Evan Touchett (Dane County Cities and Villages Association).

2. **Approval of Minutes of the September 8, 2016 Meeting (*actionable item*)**

Mr. Arnold moved to approve the minutes of the September 8, 2016, meeting; Mr. Hampton seconded. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Golden commented that that he and Mr. McKeever had requested interaction with the MPO, which is noted in the minutes, and he did not want these requests to be forgotten.

3. Public Comment on Matters not for Public Hearing

No members of the public wished to speak at this time.

4. Report of Chair / Discussion

- a. Discussion of Budget & Personnel Panel (*note*: any members of BPP present at this meeting are invited to speak and will be included in all discussions under this item)

Chair Palm and Mr. Steinhoff met with Josh Wescott, Chief of Staff for the County Executive, on October 12th. The meeting was a follow-up to the Joint Study Committee meeting on April 27 with CARPC appointing authorities and members of the CARPC Executive Committee. The meeting with Mr. Wescott was the fourth and last of the follow-up meetings. The discussion was positive and covered topics including ways that CARPC could assist local units of government, and potential next steps for addressing broader agency funding questions. Mr. Wescott expressed appreciation for the way CARPC conducted its budget process this year.

5. Report of Directors

- a. Report of Deputy Director / Report and Discussion on Division of Community and Regional Planning Activities

- Presentation of A Greater Madison Vision Update

Steve Steinhoff gave a presentation which may be viewed at https://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/2016/Misc/CARPC_101316/CRDP_Updates_Presentation_101316.pdf

Ms. Terrell asked what would be the role of the Commission for the UrbanFootprint.

Mr. Steinhoff replied that there have been discussion at various meetings about Commissioners being members of or being assigned to AGMV sub-committees. The Strategic Planning Sub-Committee will be the one to work on developing and applying this UrbanFootprint tool. As scenarios are developed and drafted, they should be presented to the Commission for comment, discussion, and guidance.

Mr. Golden requested that the minutes reflect the following: First, on the UrbanFootprint. Is there some document that could be shared with the entire Commission or with me that gives an overview of what this thing is. I feel like I am doing the proverbial elephant. One week I hear about the trunk and one week I hear about the tail. Would that be possible?

Mr. Steinhoff replied yes.

Mr. Golden: Second thing. I will do the short one first. I really like the fact that you did this thing at the end with regional collaboration and I have one item to add to that. The Dane County Bond Council has expressed to the Chair of the Public Works and the Transportation Committee that it is illegal for the County to spend money on transit and the \$1.5 million dollar allocation that was made in the last County budget for transit will not be spent, apparently, as of this time. You might have missed that one, but I did not since I chair the committee that was supposed to spend the money. The third thing is, awhile back when we were doing the evaluation of urban service areas, you would bring up the old Vision 2020. I think there were goals, I forget the term we used, and there were some policies underneath them, and you talked about how things were consistent or not consistent with the goals. At one of our meetings there was a general consensus amongst the Commissioners that those were really out of date. They were done in 1997 in a very different political environment. There was some notion that we should really, even if we cannot do our part of the Land Use and Transportation Plan with the MPO, update those so there is some regional consensus about what those were. I am having a little trouble relating both the Greater Madison Vision when you did the 2016, 2017, and 2018, I did not see anything that suggested that would be one of the outputs of it and I do not know how that might or might not relate to the UrbanFootprint. So I do not know if that is something you could answer right now. I will let you try to respond.

Mr. Steinhoff: The intention is a vision and a strategy for growth which should include goals. At some point the Commission needs to act on adopting a regional land use plan. I do not think it has been decided whether the Commission could simply adopt that vision and strategy document and say this is our regional land use plan. Or there may be other steps after that to refine it further or make it more specific. That is yet to be determined. If we want to have goals by which we evaluate development proposals, if those goals are to have impact behind them, if they are to have buy-in and weight and support, then they need to come out of a process like A Greater Madison Vision. That is the intent of where we are going.

Mr. Golden: I totally agree. Right now we have an urban service area in front of us. This is a limited one that we have today. Let us go back to McFarland. When the staff does their report, there is a water quality portion of the report and then there is a land use portion of the report. Even though we are using the old goals from the old plan, I would hope that there is at least some documentation in the process. Maybe I should make a motion and have the Commission assert that this is one output that we would really like from that process to produce; not for us to produce of something that we could use in evaluating urban service area changes and other things that we might deal with if we get into more of a plan commenting role, for example. Absent that, there was really nothing that I saw in the slides that explicitly moved us in that direction. We may have a wonderful process that comes out with a consensus about how to grow and all this other stuff, but will staff still be evaluating urban service areas according to 1997 goals because that is the adopted plan? Maybe think about how to do that. I do not want to put you on the spot of having to invent something right now. But I am really tired of those goals. I was around when they were created. Commissioner Hampton might feel the same way. I really feel a touch embarrassed almost that the Commission has to use these obsolete goals. If there is at least a process that says in 2000 and something we will have something different that will more up-to date, more reflective of our current thinking. For example, climate change was not an issue back then, but it is a major issue now. Perhaps we have a goal on climate change and how a particular thing may interact with that. Make that as a request right now. If you need to, put it on the agenda to have a discussion about the Commission adopting something so that our input into the Greater Madison Vision process is to request that process at least produce something that we could use for those goals.

Chair Palm: I would like to add something here. Two things. One, I always have to remind you that this Commission reaffirmed and adopted those goals when it was created. So the planning happened but the goals come from our choices. Mr. Steinhoff and I have had lots of discussions about A Greater Madison Vision and what we need as an output from it for us to do what we do. The thing that we are stepping back with is recognizing that there so many plans out there in our communities and they don't weave together very well at all. State law is not very specific about what our plan should look like or do. It just says we have to have one. We have the potential here to create something completely different. One strategy we are looking at is to create a plan that basically is the basis for the next round of communities' comprehensive plans. We are trying to get out an ad. Madison is doing it right now and we are not going to

be done on time. And other communities are doing theirs. We do not want to say to the communities "Stop and wait for us." We do want to have a plan that, when we adopt it, we can work with communities and say "This is what the nucleus of your comprehensive plan should engage in too." Maybe it is not specifically a land use plan as we have seen it before, but a strategy to engage those local communities that need comprehensive plans on making their land use plans the best they can be.

Mr. Golden: That is fine. The question is does that replace this whole...

Chair Palm: Absolutely.

Mr. Golden: That is all I am asking for. That we explicitly are all aware right now and during the Greater Madison Vision process that we are all aware that at some point or when this is done or whatever, that the 1997 Vision 2020 plan will go up on the shelf and not be used again and we will have something else before us that will be used and we will be able to have staff reports based on whatever goals, or vision, or whatever is adopted.

Chair Palm: That is the ultimate goal of the Greater Madison Vision for the Commission. They have other goals but that is what we need.

Mr. Arnold: To follow up on Commissioner Terrell's question about our role in UrbanFootprint. Would not you see CARPC, and particularly staff, being a consumer of that as we evaluate requests and community plans so that we could see, for example, how a proposal potentially affects health, or transportation, or economic development? I see that as an important tool in our toolkit. I would expect you will be giving us presentations about future proposals that say this is the area in UrbanFootprint and this is how this might play out according to that model and the datasets that it has.

Mr. Steinhoff: I think yes in the sense that we would be looking to use UrbanFootprint as a tool and a resource that we can provide to local communities. My opinion is that it would be best done in the early stages of the comprehensive planning process so that we can help them evaluate different options for growth for their community and the surrounding areas as a whole as it relates to the regional vision and strategy rather than at the point much later down the line after they have approved their comprehensive plan and after they have adopted a neighborhood plan and they have approved a USA proposal.

Mr. Arnold: After some developer has done a bunch of engineering that we say no to.

Mr. Steinhoff: At that point we have lost our opportunity for having a broader partnership influence in their decision making and the direction they are going.

Mr. Arnold: I think that is an excellent point but I think that is another answer to your question. Thank you.

Mr. Golden: Just a request that the minutes reflect our interaction and the other two items that I talked about.

b. Report and Discussion on Division of Environmental Resources Planning Activities

- Update on Potential Future Amendments to Sewer Service Areas/Implementation of Past SAA Amendments

Mike Rupiper gave a presentation which may be viewed at https://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/2016/Misc/CARPC_101316/ERPD_Updates_101316.pdf

Mr. Rupiper will contact David Liebl at the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts to ask if he can do a presentation at the November 10th meeting.

Ms. Terrell requested that Commissioners be sent the announcement of the location of meetings regarding the County Executive's proposal for cleaning up the phosphorus rich sediment out of the streams in the County.

Mr. Arnold moved to discuss item #6 after item #11. Mr. Pfeiffer seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. Future Agenda Items (Next meeting is November 10 in Room 357)

The Farmland Loss Mitigation Report will be discussed at the November CARPC meeting.

Mr. Golden requested that the staff's perspective on goals and things that the Commission should consider, based on what staff know as professional planners, be put on a future agenda.

Bill Schaefer from the MPO will give a presentation about the MPO's Regional Transportation Plan at the November CARPC meeting.

7. Amendment of the *Dane County Water Quality Plan* and Amending the *Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan* by Revising the Koshkonong Urban Service Area and Environmental Corridor Boundaries in the Town of Albion
 - a. Water Quality Plan

- i. Amendment Overview and Water Quality Plan / Water Quality Impact Assessment Staff Presentation (Mike Rupiper)

Mike Rupiper gave a presentation which may be viewed at https://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/2016/Misc/CARPC_101316/WQ_Staff_Analysis_Albian_Presentation_101316.pdf

- ii. Questions of Staff Presentation

No questions were asked.

- iii. Open Public Hearing to Take Testimony from Registrants; Close Public Hearing

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

One member of the public registered as an interested party:

Brian Standing (Senior Planner, Dane County Planning & Development/Town of Albion) – supported items #7a and #7b and wished to speak.

Mr. Standing spoke on items #7a and #7b at the same time.

Mr. Standing was hired by the Town of Albion as a consultant to assist the Town with its planning efforts. Per Mr. Standing: The Town was interested in both some comprehensive planning related to the commercial area near the interchange, but also to deal with an area of urban service areas as described in the staff report that was originally planned many years ago for development. Since then, the development expectations for that area have changed and also, at the same time, there is a number of land owners who are interested in participating in the Farmland Tax Credit. Again, these are areas of agriculture use. In regards to the environmental corridor standards, these are designated as a resource protection corridor and recently amended to the Town of Albion comprehensive plan. There is an amendment to the Dane County Comprehensive Plan and to the Dane County Farmland Preservation Plan which would both carry those resource protection corridors forward. The zoning committee will be taking that up on October 25th and I anticipate that will pass handily. The county is currently working on incorporating the town plan standards into the county comprehensive plan. Mr. Rupiper is quite right that the land owners in these particular areas are interested in the Farmland Tax Credit and the prerequisite for that is that they be in a farmland preservation planning area and the County Farmland Preservation Plan. They cannot be in an farmland preservation planning area and in an urban service area at the same time. It has to be one or the other. Basically what the state tells us is that, if it is an area planned for something other than farmland within a 15-year time frame, it cannot be a farmland preservation planning area. Obviously, those two categories are incompatible. Working with the Town, we had a number of public meetings; we notified all the land owners affected; we had good attendance at those meetings to discuss these issues and other issues. There was strong support from the Plan Commission and the Town Board for the changes before you for both the land use and water quality perspective. To put my County planner hat on, we also reviewed this and we provided staff recommendations to the Zoning Committee in support. It is consistent with the Dane County Comprehensive Plan and the Dane County Farmland Preservation Plan.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

- iv. **Approval of CARPC Resolution 2016-14-A Recommending to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources amendment of the *Areawide Water Quality Management Plan for Dane County* by revising the Koshkonong Urban Service Area and Environmental Corridor boundaries in the Town of Albion (*actionable item, supermajority of 8 votes required for approval*)**

Mr. Hampton moved to approve CARPC Resolution 2016-14-A; Mr. Golden seconded.

A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: Commissioners Arnold, Cnare, Crombie, Geller, Golden, Hampton, Lawrence, Palm, Pfeiffer, and Terrell. Absent: Commissioners Brandon, McKeever, and Minihan. Motion passed on roll call vote.

b. Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan

- i. Consistency Between Urban Service Area and Town of Albion Trends and the Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan Staff Presentation (Sean Higgins)

Mr. Higgins gave a presentation which may be viewed at:

https://danedocs.countyofdane.com/webdocs/PDF/capd/2016/Misc/CARPC_101316/CD_Staff_Analysis_Albian_Presentation_101316.pdf

- ii. Questions of Staff Presentation

No questions were asked.

- iii. Open Public Hearing to Take Testimony from Registrants; close Public Hearing

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

One member of the public registered as an interested party:

Brian Standing (Senior Planner, Dane County Planning & Development/Town of Albion) – supported items #7a and #7b and wished to speak

Mr. Standing had nothing else to add to his previous statement and was available for questions.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

- iv. **Approval of CARPC Resolution 2016-14-B Amending the *Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan* by revising the Koshkonong Urban Service Area and Environmental Corridor boundaries in the Town of Albion (*actionable item, supermajority of 8 votes required for approval*)**

Ms. Cnare moved to approve CARPC Resolution 2016-14-B; Mr. Hampton seconded.

A roll call vote was taken. Ayes: Commissioners Arnold, Cnare, Crombie, Geller, Golden, Hampton, Lawrence, Palm, Pfeiffer, and Terrell. Absent: Commissioners Brandon, McKeever, and Minihan. Motion passed on roll call vote.

8. Amendments to the 2016 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Budget

- a. Staff Presentation (Steve Steinhoff)

Mr. Steinhoff reviewed the requested amendments to the 2016 budget.

Ms. Terrell requested that the minutes reflect the following: Ms. Terrell has a request for Mr. Steinhoff that we look at the presentation that was made by the City of Madison planning director when she appeared before CARPC to discuss the scenario planning of UrbanFootprint. If you cannot find it, it is in the minutes, but my recollection is that one of the things she indicated was that a very strong aspect of the most green redevelopment scenario (we did not know at the time what that was going to be) to try to confine all of the new population to the existing urban service areas. I think that is something that would be very important to review and reflect on the reason that she said that. The minutes do not reflect a whole lot and they do not include a lot, but I am really concerned that we remember some of the things that were said to us about UrbanFootprint and scenarios.

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

No members of the public registered as interested parties.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

b. Approval of CARPC Resolution 2016-15 Adoption of Amendments to the 2016 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Budget (*actionable item*)

Ms. Terrell moved to approve CARPC Resolution 2016-15; Mr. Arnold seconded. The motion passed on unanimously on a voice vote.

9. Adoption of the 2017 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Work Program

a. Staff Presentation (Steve Steinhoff)

Mr. Steinhoff reviewed the 2017 Work Program.

b. Open Public Hearing to Take Testimony from Registrants; close Public Hearing

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

No members of the public registered as interested parties.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

c. Approval of CARPC Resolution 2016-16 Adoption of the 2017 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Work Program (*actionable item*)

Mr. Golden moved to approve CARPC Resolution 2016-16; Mr. Hampton seconded. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

10. Adoption of the 2017 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Budget

a. Staff Presentation (Steve Steinhoff)

Mr. Steinhoff reviewed the 2017 budget.

b. Open Public Hearing to Take Testimony from Registrants; close Public Hearing

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

No members of the public registered as interested parties.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

c. Approval of CARPC Resolution 2016-17 Adoption of the 2017 Capital Area Regional Planning Commission Budget (*actionable item*)

Mr. Golden moved to approve CARPC Resolution 2016-17; Mr. Arnold seconded. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

11. Approval of CARPC Bylaw Changes

a. Staff Presentation (Steve Steinhoff)

Mr. Steinhoff reviewed the proposed changes to the CARPC bylaws.

Mr. Arnold remarked that the first sentence of Article III Section 6.b. has a double period that needed to be struck. Chair Palm remarked that there was a pagination issue after Article III Section 1 that needed to be corrected.

b. Open Public Hearing to Take Testimony from Registrants; close Public Hearing

Chair Palm opened the public hearing.

No members of the public registered as interested parties.

Chair Palm closed the public hearing.

c. Discussion

Ms. Terrell remarked that the index of the bylaws will need to be corrected.

12. Report of the Executive Committee

- a. **Recommendation for Approval: Process for Amending the Dane County Land Use and Transportation Plan by Adjusting Sewer Service Area Boundaries and Integrating Local and Regional Planning (*actionable item*)**
- b. **Recommendation for Approval: Authorize Deputy Director to Execute Agreement with Wegner CPAs to conduct annual audits for 2016-2018 (*actionable item*)**
- c. **Recommendation for Approval: Authorize Deputy Director to Execute Memorandum of Understanding with City of Madison for use of UrbanFootprint Scenario Modeling Tool (*actionable item*)**
- d. Approval of Commissioners Remaining as Independent Contractors vs. Employees
- e. Approval of September 2016 Disbursements and Treasurer's Reports for August 2016

Mr. Golden moved to adopt the report. Mr. Geller seconded.

Mr. Arnold moved to separate item 12.d. from the report so that it could be discussed separately; Ms. Terrell seconded.

The motion to accept items 12.a., 12.b., 12.c., and 12.e. passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Chair Palm noted that the Executive Committee has made a recommendation to allow each individual Commissioner to decide whether he/she wanted to be an employee or an independent contractor.

Discussion ensued.

Chair Palm asked if there was a motion to amend the Executive Committee's recommendation. Mr. Arnold moved to amend the recommendation by designating all Commissioners as independent contractors, with the possible exemption of the Chair being voted to another status; Ms. Cnare seconded.

Discussion ensued.

There was a show of hands of Commissioners who wanted to be an employee, independent contractor, or a volunteer. No count of the show of hands was taken.

The motion to replace the recommendation with the amendment passed on a voice vote.

The motion to accept the amended recommendation passed on a voice vote.

13. Discussion of CARPC Role in Transportation Planning and Other Plans that Comprise the Regional Master Plan


Mr. Steinhoff gave a summary and then discussion ensued.

14. Adjournment

Mr. Hampton moved to adjourn; Mr. Arnold seconded. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:51pm.

Minutes taken by Sharon Knauf and Linda Firestone

Respectfully Submitted:



Kris Hampton, Secretary