

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

**July 11, 2022**

**Zoom Meeting**

**6:00 pm**

---

**Commissioners Present:** Maureen Crombie (until 6:55 pm), Mark Geller, Kris Hampton, Peter McKeever, Heidi Murphy, David Pfeiffer (Chair)

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Mike Rupiper, Haley Smith, Steve Steinhoff

**Others Present:** None

1. Roll Call

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

2. Public Comment

No members of the public were present to comment.

**3. Minutes of the June 6, 2022, Executive Committee Meeting (*actionable item*)**

Ms. Crombie moved to approve the minutes of the June 6, 2022, Executive Committee Meeting; Mr. Hampton seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote with Mr. Geller abstaining.

4. Filling the Gaps in the Executive Director Role

Per Chair Pfeiffer the goal of this evening's discussion is to clarify the role the Agency is looking to fill and how to get there. Mr. Hampton asked about the time frame for filling the position, but Agency changes such as staff retirements, potential staff and program additions and changes at the MPO could all impact when that happens. He then suggested that the need for it be defined and put in front of the of the appointing authorities to determine their level of support. Mr. McKeever stated that the appointing authorities would be more likely to respond to a specific candidate instead of a job description that the commission needs to come to consensus on the job summary first. He also did not like the term "ambassador" saying that it minimized the position and that the levy may need to be raised to fund the position, but that the issue needed to be brought up for discussion.

Mr. Geller said he would be reluctant to support hiring a part-time Executive Director on a trial basis for a limited time. Instead, he felt the Commission should be all in on it. He would be receptive to part-time Information Director and / or a shared position with the MPO since that might attract more potential candidates. Per Mr. Geller, CARPC is at a critical point in getting support for the Regional Development Framework, and he would rather present a candidate and the associated cost than wait for direction. He was clear that current Agency leadership should not fill this role as it will require a dedicated staff member who can promote the Agency, the vision of the Framework and the importance of regional planning within the entire region. Ms. Murphy added that the outreach responsibilities the Agency needs fulfilled would also be better suited to an Executive Director who can work across governments. She felt that commissioners and staff with already full workloads would not be as effective in the outreach area. Mr. Hampton inquired what the options would be if the Budget & Personnel Panel (BPP) chose not to hire an Executive Director? Could someone be hired under a different title? Chair Pfeiffer responded that while that may be a viable strategy, it may hinder the status of the person coming into this role. Regarding Mr. Geller's comments, Chair Pfeiffer thought it made sense to reach out to the individual appointing authorities to learn how they would respond to a position description to gauge their level of support and get their feedback.

The Framework has already been developed. It is the assistance in getting it out there and helping with the implementation that this role needs to fill, but the question is what are those outreach responsibilities? The internal piece of running the Agency is covered with existing structure; that is why this would be a part-time position. Mr. McKeever stated that he has not seen evidence that the Framework is widely supported and accepted and feels this is the reason we need to have an Executive Director on board. Implementation of the Framework will require public support, and support from local leaders, builders, developers, and others who are willing to follow the principals behind it. Connections are needed with the mayor and county executive's offices, the cities, towns, and villages and the media to move this forward and follow it in good faith. Chair Pfeiffer noted that the public was very engaged in the Utah example and continued to be engaged in the process after it was adopted. He said our audience should not just be the leaders. If the public shows that they care, the leaders will follow. Ms. Murphy suggested a good approach may be for an Executive Director to start the conversations where there is some degree of agreement and build upon that to work out the areas where difference exist.

Ms. Crombie offered suggestions for improvement on the job description and asked how this position would be recruited? As other commissioners had mentioned, she did not like the term "ambassador". Chair Pfeiffer stated that Framework had widespread buy-in in its goals and objectives and that the Executive Director role was about getting people to value more intergovernmental engagement earlier in their planning processes to be more proactive instead of reactive. If this were to go through the BPP, the Commission is required to submit three candidates per the CARPC bylaws. Mr. Steinhoff also felt there was widespread support for the goals, objectives, and strategies of the Framework, but the difficulty comes in carrying them out. The challenge is getting communities to be more proactive and assertive in ensuring that the developments that do come along really fit in with what they said they want in their comprehensive plans. The Executive Director role could add value to what we do in the planning support level in using CARPC as a resource and sharing success stories across communities. Coordinating this process with the MPO may also be valuable in showing a united front with our partner agency and going it alone. Perhaps combining the Executive Director position with the MPO's Public Information Officer might be a good way to go. Ms. Murphy stated that relationships also need to be established with developers, realtor associations, large landowners, MadREP, etc. for orderly development and help with preserving natural resources, because land sale transactions occur before development happens and that those parties are also stakeholders in the process. Mr. McKeever asked for more information on the Agency retirements, staff / program changes and budgetary concerns for more background on how they might affect the development of the position. Chair Pfeiffer responded that most of them are just assumptions at this point.

Chair Pfeiffer suggested that one recommendation might be to reestablish the CARPC/MPO work group to look at the long-term objectives and see what the options might be to meet the needs of our agency and theirs in this area. A joint meeting will be held with them on Wednesday, August 3<sup>rd</sup> at 7:00 pm and we could propose resumption of the task force at that time. The CARPC Proactive Planning Committee's results will not be available in time to inform the process. However, Mr. Steinhoff added that it may still provide a "reading" of local officials to determine what value they might see in an executive director position. Chair Pfeiffer asked if a marketing / sales piece is needed for the job description and if a working group is needed to do this. Mr. Geller supported this approach so everyone could share what their vision for this position should be to get the ball rolling. Chair Pfeiffer proposed a Zoom or in-person work session for the Executive Committee to pull this together to present to the commission for comment and refining. Mr. Geller agreed the Executive Committee could do this and Mr. McKeever asked for an initial draft to start from; a persuasive piece about why we need this and knocking out the arguments against it. Mr. Steinhoff volunteered to do that, and Mr. Geller suggested that Ms. Shanahan might be able to assist as well. The Executive Committee will then meet on it and refine it before putting it before the full commission. The focus will address a wide audience be a sales pitch on why the position is needed and exactly what they will be doing instead of a job description at this point.

Chair Pfeiffer asked if there was anything else in the materials provided for the meeting that should be pursued in the short term? Mr. Geller wondered how soon we could pull this together and was intrigued by the idea of a shared position with the MPO. He would like to see it gain some momentum but acknowledged that there are a lot of different moving parts. He suggested it could start off as a limited position with CARPC and possibly morph into a shared position with the MPO later. Chair Pfeiffer clarified that there are two tracks to follow up on: making the sales pitch and investigating the budgetary logistics.

**5. CARPC Draft 2022-23 Cost Allocation Plan (*actionable item*)**

Mr. McKeever moved to approve the CARPC Draft 2022-23 Cost Allocation Plan; Mr. Geller seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

Mr. McKeever asked about the “cognizant agency” being declined by both the DNR and WisDOT in the materials and if this plan was approved by the auditors? Ms. Smith stated that the auditors do not review this, but it was completed after the audit, so audited figures could be used in the calculations. Mr. Steinhoff added that because the auditor’s role is to review our overall financials and financial systems, also preparing documents that would be audited could be a conflict of interest for them. WisDOT asks for this information as part of the annual work program, but they decline to be the act as the cognizant agency for us. Generally, a cognizant agency is the State agency with the largest dollar value of Federal awards with a governmental unit or non-profit. For CARPC, that would be the Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Mr. Rupiper noted that the DNR stated it does not perform this role for anyone. As such, the Agency prefers to have a third party compile these figures since they are used in some of the fee-based billings we produce. Mr. Steinhoff added that in the absence of one of the State or Federal agencies signing off on this, we use the third-party accountants to prepare it, so we are not doing it ourselves. The same template is also used by the Southwest Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC) who is also a customer of the Southwest Wisconsin Workforce Development Board (SWWDB) and the auditors signed off on it last year.

Mr. Geller asked how the cost allocation rates were used to in the calculation of the billing rates. Ms. Smith shared her Billing Rate Reference spreadsheet that uses the cost allocation rates to show how each staff member’s hourly billing rate is created. For those community planning and service area amendment projects that are ready to be billed, payroll reports detailing staff hours on specific projects are produced and the hourly rates applied accordingly. The project manager reviews this billing support before each project is invoiced. Mr. Rupiper added that per state statute, municipal fees may not exceed actual costs for services. Yet another reason to have a third-party calculate those rates.

**6. Restatement of Qualified Retirement Plan including Action by Governing Board (*actionable item*)**

Mr. Geller moved to authorize the Agency Director to execute the Restatement of Qualified Retirement Plan including Action by the Governing Board; Mr. McKeever seconded. The motion passed on a voice vote.

**7. May 2022 Financial Statements and June 2022 Operating Account Reconciliation (*actionable item*)**

Mr. Geller moved to approve the May 2022 Financial Statements and June 2022 Operating Account Reconciliation; Mr. Hampton seconded. The motion was approved on a voice vote.

**8. Future Agenda Items (Next meeting is August 8, 2022, via Zoom Meeting at 6:00 pm)**

- Executive Director discussions will continue

**9. Adjournment**

Mr. Hampton moved to adjourn the meeting; Ms. Murphy seconded. The meeting adjourned at 7:20 pm.

Minutes taken by Haley Smith and reviewed by CARPC staff

Respectfully Submitted:



Kris Hampton, Secretary