

MINUTES
of the Executive Committee
of the Capital Area Regional Planning Commission

June 7, 2021

Virtual Zoom Meeting

6:00 pm

Commissioners Present: Maureen Crombie, Mark Geller, Kris Hampton (until 6:51 pm), Peter McKeever, Larry Palm (Chair), David Pfeiffer (6:02 pm)

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Mike Rupiper, Haley Smith, Steve Steinhoff

Others Present: None

1. Roll Call

Chair Palm called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm. Quorum was established.

2. **Approval of Minutes of the May 10, 2021, Executive Committee Meeting (*actionable item*)**

Ms. Crombie moved to approve the minutes of the May 10, 2021, Executive Committee meeting; Mr. Hampton seconded. The motion carried on a voice vote.

3. Public Comment

No members of the public were present.

4. Options for Returning to In-Person Meetings

Mr. Steinhoff started the discussion on returning to in-person meetings. Some degree of virtual participation will continue prompting the need for hybrid meeting capabilities. We have been exploring our options in this area but find that other government entities are doing the same. The rooms that the commission used to meet in for free are either undergoing technology upgrades or other otherwise unavailable. Using the Agency's conference room in this manner will require equipment purchases and we are not sure exactly what are yet. The Agency does not need to be an early adopter in this area and is taking a wait-and-see approach to see what works for the county and other agencies while we continue to explore the issue in greater detail. Discussion amongst the commissioners ensued. Access and convenience were cited as major reasons for holding hybrid meetings for both the commissioners and the public, but arguments were also made for the sense of community gained from in-person participation. Concerns were expressed about meeting space needs for public hearings, audio quality, interactions on contentious issues, missing out on "parking lot" conversations, being able to see all meeting participants and presentation materials and lack of access to internet services/broadband issues. A suggestion was made to test out the new technology out on a small group to work out the bugs before moving to a full hybrid option.

The topic of a fall retreat was introduced now that the Agency is moving into a new chapter with the Regional Development Framework (RDF). The retreat would focus on what that means for the commission going forward.

5. CARPC Policies for Budget Amendments

The issue came up in other meetings that the Agency does not have a policy that governs when budget amendments need to be done, yet the bylaws require that public hearings be held on them. Practices have varied over the years as has the thinking on this topic since budgets are by their nature simply educated guesses. The gray area is what should happen when there is a major change? Should there be a threshold amount in dollars or percentages where an amendment should be required? An amendment was done last

year to acknowledge the 2% reduction in the property tax levy, but what happens when we receive additional grant monies throughout the year? Unless there are major changes, the budget should not need to be revised every time circumstances change.

Discussion among the commissioners ensued with the question of what do the other RPC's do in this area? It was agreed that having a policy in this area was a good idea and that staff should present policy options for consideration. It was also suggested that CARPC is more comparable to a county agency as opposed to a municipality and county agencies do not do budget amendments. The argument on that was that CARPC has a fiduciary responsibility that is a little bit different than that of a county department director and that we need to be aware of and record new changes (i.e., sources of revenue, unexpected expenses) in the budget.

It was agreed that in principle under normal operating procedures, a budget hearing probably is not warranted. However, should substantial or significant changes to the budget need to be recorded to reflect our operations more accurately, that would be a different situation. Included in that scenario would be any deficit spending or unbudgeted withdrawals from reserve funds.

6. Approval of Annual Agreement to Provide Water Quality Management Planning Assistance to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (*actionable item*)

Mr. Hampton moved for Approval of Annual Agreement to Provide Water Quality Management Planning Assistance to the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Mr. Pfeiffer seconded. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Mr. McKeever commented that under this agreement, the Agency has no decision-making authority. Mr. Rupiper responded that this is true for all RPCs, including SEWRPC. What the DNR expects is for the Agency to hold the public hearings, have Commissioners comment where appropriate, have staff work with the applicants to try to address the water quality concerns with recommendations in the staff report, and then give all that information to the DNR who has the ultimate decision-making authority.

A question was raised about the \$90,000 amount and where that number came from. It comes directly from the DNR based on the availability of state and federal funds for this program. It covers about 20% of the Agency's total costs for this work. The rest is made up from fees and county levy funds.

7. Approval of April 2021 Financial Statements and May 2021 Disbursements (*actionable item*)

Mr. Geller moved for Approval of the April 2021 Financial Statements and May 2021 Disbursements; Ms. Crombie seconded. The motion carried on a voice vote.

8. Future Agenda Items (Next meeting is July 8, 2021, via Virtual Zoom Meeting at 6:00 pm. Please note that the July CARPC will be held afterwards starting at 7:00 pm.)

- a. Would the Agency like to consider an annual planning award or certificate to acknowledge good planning that might be create some publicity event or appear in the newspapers? Per Mr. Steinhoff that aligns well with discussions that have been had in the Technical Advisory (TAC) and A Greater Madison Vision (AGMV) committee meetings and the need to tell the story of what communities are doing to carry out the goals of the Regional Development Framework (RDF) and AGMV priorities.
- b. Possible discussions on proactive versus reactive planning as another opportunity to discuss the Regional Development Framework (RDF) to educate plan commissions.

9. Adjournment

Mr. Geller moved to adjourn; Mr. Pfeiffer seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 7:01 pm.

Respectfully Submitted:

Handwritten signature of Kris Hampton in black ink.

Kris Hampton, Secretary