

Committee of the Whole

Monday, August 13, 2018

5:00 PM

McFarland Municipal Center
Conference Room A

AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER.
2. ATTENDANCE/ROLL CALL.
3. PUBLIC APPEARANCES.
4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.
 - a. Discussion and action regarding minutes of the meeting held on July 23, 2018.
5. BUSINESS.
 - a. Discussion and action to make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding consideration to approve and issue a Scope of Services in order to conduct a Public Safety Analysis.
 - b. Discussion and possible action to make a recommendation to the Village Board on revisions to Section 23-94 of the Village Code of Ordinances regarding direct legislation ordinance to require a binding referendum for projects requiring a Village expenditure of \$1,250,000 or more.
6. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE.
 - a. To be determined.
7. ADJOURNMENT.

This meeting notice constitutes an official meeting of the above referenced group and was posted in accordance with all applicable laws related to Open Meetings Law. It is possible that members of and possibly a quorum of members of other governmental bodies of the municipality may be in attendance at the above stated meeting to gather information. No action will be taken by any governmental body at the above stated meeting other than the governmental body specifically referred to above in this notice. Upon reasonable notice, efforts will be made to accommodate the needs of disabled individuals. For additional information or to request this service, contact the McFarland Municipal Center at (608) 838-3153 or cassandra.suettinger@mcfarland.wi.us

VILLAGE OF MCFARLAND
Committee of the Whole Minutes

Monday, July 23, 2018 - 5:00 PM

1. CALL TO ORDER.

President Czebotar called the Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 5:00 PM in Conference Room A.

2. ATTENDANCE/ROLL CALL.

Members present: Village President Brad Czebotar, Village Trustee Jerry Adrian, Village Trustee Stephanie Brassington, Village Trustee Dan Kolk, Village Trustee Mary Pat Lytle, Village Trustee Carolyn Clow (joined at 5:09 p.m.), Village Trustee Shaun O'Hearn (joined at 5:06 p.m.).

Members not present: None

Staff Present: Village Administrator Matt Schuenke, Village Clerk/Treasurer Cassandra Suettinger, Fire/EMS Chief Chris Dennis, and Police Chief Craig Sherven.

3. PUBLIC APPEARANCES.

(None)

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES.

- a. Discussion and action regarding minutes of the meeting held July 9, 2018.

The minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

5. BUSINESS.

- a. Discussion and action regarding the creation of a Scope of Services for the study of Public Safety Facility Development.

Administrator Schuenke provided reviewed the draft scope of services for the Village to engage a consultant to study the Public Safety needs of the Village. The Board provided feedback regarding the scope of services and requested staff bring it back to the next Committee of the whole meeting for further review.

6. SCHEDULE NEXT MEETING DATE.

- a. To be determined.

The Board set the next meeting for August 13th at 5:00 p.m.

The Board also directed an additional agenda item be added to the next Committee of the Whole meeting to discuss the Village ordinance 23-94 which requires a binding referendum for projects requiring a Village expenditure of \$1,250,000.00 or more.

7. ADJOURNMENT.

Motion by Village Trustee Dan Kolk, second by Village Trustee Stephanie Brassington, to adjourn at 6:46 p.m.

Pursuant to law, written notice of this meeting was given to the public and posted on the public bulletin boards in accordance with Open Meetings Law.

Respectfully submitted,
Cassandra Suettinger
Village Clerk/Treasurer



VILLAGE BOARD SUMMARY SHEET

MEETING DATE: Monday, August 13, 2018

SECTION: Business

DEPARTMENT: Administration

CONTACT: Matt Schuenke, Village Administrator

AGENDA ITEM: Discussion and action to make a recommendation to the Village Board regarding consideration to approve and issue a Scope of Services in order to conduct a Public Safety Analysis.

PREVIOUS ACTION:

This was last reviewed at the Committee of the Whole meeting on July 23rd. At that meeting, there were three possible Consultants identified to conduct this work. All three have been contact by Village Staff and discussed with them our project. They all remain interested and appear qualified to complete this work.

ISSUE SUMMARY:

A revised draft of the Scope of Services has been included in your packet for review and recommendation to the Village Board for approval to issue. This latest draft is based on the comments made at the meeting on July 23rd in order to conduct a Public Safety Analysis to assist in the continued study of facility needs. All the revisions to the draft are included in the attached via track changes. Mt. Horeb went through a similar process in recent years, the RFP they used is included in your packet for reference as requested. A summary of these items is provided as follows:

- **Future Time Period to Study** - Language was added to the Scope to say not less than 10 years and not more than 20 years based upon recommendation of Consultant. Mt. Horeb did not define a time period but did request similar demographic projections.
- **Operational Alternatives** - Changes were made to this section as discussed in the last meeting to remove the link to space demands and leave open ended the question regarding operational service delivery.
- **Location** - Language was revised to make the focus on finding the most ideal location regardless of current land use and then cascading out from there around it based on certain distances to help find location alternatives.
- **Municipal Center Conversion** - There are no changes proposed but simply this item left in the Scope. There was some discussion as to whether or not this remains relevant, but the consensus seemed at the time it should remain in order for the theory to be tested.
- **Deliverables** - This section was added but is very basic outlining their responsibility to



present to the Village Board a draft and final report. The timeline discussed later leaves in review time for people to read in between meetings to ensure questions asked are being addressed. They will need to also coordinate their schedules as necessary with Staff to complete the work. Mt. Horeb did not include a deliverables section in their RFP.

- **Project Communication** - This section was added to incorporate some language from the Mt. Horeb RFP as well as delineate contact authority.
- **Project Timeline** - A timeline was prepared to complete the RFP process as well as outline our expectation on the Study completion. The schedule is presented to complete the RFP in September and begin work on the Study in October. The first presentation of the Draft report will be in December and final presentation at the end of January with time built in for review in between meetings.

These are the updates to the Scope of Services discussed at the last meeting. If agreeable, the Committee should make a recommendation to the Village Board to approve it and authorize its issuance. The Village Board is scheduled to do so at its meeting on Monday beginning at 7:00 pm.

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPACT:

To be determined based on responses received following release of Scope of Services. Best estimate thus far would put this work somewhere in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 range depending on the length of engagement.

VILLAGE PLAN REFERENCE:

None.

ORDINANCE REFERENCE:

None.

BOARD, COMMISSION OR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend to the Village Board approval of the Scope of Services and authorize Staff to distribute accordingly.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. McFarland Public Safety Scope of Services 08092018 mgs
2. Published FDMH Request for Proposals



Scope of Services

Public Safety Analysis

August 13, 2018

Village of McFarland
5915 Milwaukee Street, PO Box 110
McFarland, WI 53558

Village of McFarland

Scope of Services

Public Safety Analysis

INTRODUCTION

The Village of McFarland is located adjacent to the southeast side of the City of Madison in Dane County. The current population of McFarland is estimated at 8,200. The Village is serviced by USH 51 serving as the main connection point into the Village. The Village of McFarland has 75 permanent employees supplemented by seasonal, temporary, and part-time employees when necessary. The Village's primary departments include Administration, Community Development, Communications/Technology, Fire and Rescue, Library, Public Works (including Parks and Utilities), Police, and Senior Outreach. More information about the Village is available at www.mcfarland.wi.us.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

The Village has been studying certain facility improvements necessary for service delivery by its Departments. One of the objectives in determining space needs revolves around the future of our Public Safety departments (Fire and Rescue, Police) and the challenges surrounding their ability to provide service to the Community within the spaces presently provided. Prior to engaging in further space needs analysis, several questions have arisen regarding the manner in which Public Safety services are delivered warranting further study prior to conducting future facility designs. The Village Board desires to engage a Consultant to work with the Board, Departments, and the Public on the following issues/challenges regarding ongoing service delivery of our Public Safety Departments.

1. Future Service Delivery – The Study should review the current means by which service is provided by our Public Safety Departments and project what the future entails for the delivery of these services. This would include review of Police Department and Fire and Rescue Department. This item should also address the format by which service is provided in order to consider various options such as full-time staffing, district creation, higher license threshold of emergency care, shared/joint department, etc. as applicable to the service listed. The Study should consider projects not fewer than 10 years nor more than 20 years into the future based upon the recommendation of the Consultant.
2. Operational Alternatives – This item should review current services as a means to make suggestions on the current operational delivery of service alternatives ~~that would alleviate some need for facility expansion~~. Essentially, what are possible changes that could be made to current operations that help streamline service delivery, align services with best practices, and make suggestions that help with Public Safety delivery. ~~would remove or lessen the need to construct new facilities.~~

3. Right Size – The Study should bring together necessary data and demographics to objectively demonstrate the facility needs to support Public Safety Services. Types of data to be reviewed would include but not limited to personnel, equipment, consideration of adjacent communities, population, geographic growth, height of buildings, and our service responsibilities in relationship to other jurisdictions both municipal, county, and state.
4. Location – This item would assist in trying to figure out what ~~locations is the best and most ideal location in order are generally feasible and delivery of service in which~~ to locate a Public Safety facility, ~~regardless of current land uses and property ownership. The intent is to create a radius around this point based upon certain distances to assist in finding suitable sites to locate such a facility.~~ The desire would be to take into account response times, volunteer response ability, ~~and~~ ISO minute coverage maps as ~~applicable and~~ available, and all other information as might be applicable. This should also review locations based on the idea that the Public Safety facility would be a joint facility as well as a stand alone fire station and/or police station. This item should also account for the Village's growth pattern as it expands through new development and annexations.
 - o Municipal Center Conversion – The current Municipal Center was constructed in 2000 to house all Village services including Public Safety with the exception of the Library and Public Works. At the time this facility was planned and constructed, it was the future at that time (approximately 20 years ago) that Public Safety would expand and utilize the entire Municipal Center forcing non-Public Safety users elsewhere. Given the needs of these Public Safety services and their future projections, this item would review whether or not that idea remains feasible.
5. Operating Costs – Based on what the future may hold for these services, the Study should review and project operating costs based upon the future staffing projections considered.
6. Garage Space – This item would review the vehicle and equipment needs for EMS, Fire, and Police services over the course of the next 10 years. This item should further study how these needs coincide with current space availability and possible options for expansion.
7. Shared Facility – This item should review the feasibility of a shared Public Safety facility that houses EMS, Fire, and Police services. Obviously each of the three have different needs regarding their facilities and the Study should consider whether it is realistic of the Village to consider all three within one facility.

DELIVERABLES

The Consultant will be required to attend two public meetings in order to make a presentation regarding a draft and final report to the Village Board. Additional meetings whether in person or otherwise to be coordinate by Staff as needed. Both versions of the Study will be submitted electronically to thoroughly address each of the seven points raised above in the Scope of Services. Both presentations regarding the Study will be provided to the Village Board, Department Heads, and General Public upon conclusion of the Study.

PROJECT COMMUNICATION

This project will require an approach that supports a philosophy of shared information, openness, and collaboration between many different interests. The Proposal should describe specifically how your team will support and sustain a high level of communication and collaboration. Further, it should demonstrate your ability to clearly and concisely communicate the protective service terminology into easy to understand public communications. The main point of contact for this RFP and the Study shall be Matt Schuenke, Village Administrator, in association with Chris Dennis, Fire and Rescue Chief, and Craig Sherven, Police Chief. They can be reached as follows:

Matt Schuenke, Village Administrator – matt.schuenke@mcfarland.wi.us

Chris Dennis, Fire and Rescue Chief – chris.dennis@mcfarland.wi.us

Craig Sherven, Police Chief – craig.sherven@mcfarland.wi

Phone – (608) 838-3153

PROJECT TIMELINE

Please note the following schedule:

<u>Issue Scope of Services</u>	<u>August 15, 2018</u>
<u>Responses Due</u>	<u>September 7, 2018</u>
<u>Interviews (As Needed)</u>	<u>Week of September 17th</u>
<u>Decision Issued</u>	<u>September 24, 2018</u>
<u>Project Begin</u>	<u>October 1, 2018</u>
<u>Draft Report Transmittal</u>	<u>November 23, 2018</u>
<u>Draft Report Presentation</u>	<u>December 10, 2018</u>
<u>Final Report Transmittal</u>	<u>January 14, 2019</u>
<u>Final Report Presentation</u>	<u>January 28, 2019</u>
<u>Project End</u>	<u>January 31, 2019</u>

PROPOSAL

Consultants shall review this Scope of Services and prepare a proposal for submittal to the Village Board for consideration. The Proposal submitted should reflect the Consultants professional expertise and experience regarding their approach to complete this work to the sole satisfaction of the Village Board. The Proposal shall include a timeline for completion of their work and associated fees for service as is applicable. The Village Board will consider and select the Proposal it feels in its sole discretion best meets the needs of the Village in order to fully address the Scope of Services requested.

Request for Proposal
Feasibility Study for Mount Horeb Area Joint Fire District
Mt. Horeb, Wisconsin
March 6, 2013

1. Introduction and Overview

The Mount Horeb Area Joint Fire District (MHAJFD) is interested in conducting a comprehensive review of the long term facility needs of the District. They intend to utilize the expertise of a qualified consulting firm to conduct a study. The scope of the study, along with other pertinent information is provided within the following pages of this Request for Proposal (RFP).

2. Project Background

The Mount Horeb Area Joint Fire Department is comprised of the Villages of Mount Horeb and Blue Mounds as well as the Townships of Blue Mounds, Cross Plains, Perry Primrose, Springdale, and Vermont. Within the fire department territory there are 12,212 residents over 137 square miles. The incorporated Villages of Mount Horeb and Blue Mounds account for half of the residents within the fire district. The remaining population resides in small unincorporated rural communities, on farms and in forested areas.

In 1991, renovations were made to an existing Mount Horeb lumber store/yard in preparation for the relocation of the Mount Horeb Fire Department. The frame and steel building was originally constructed in 1963. Changes to the building included additional offices, a bathroom, a kitchen, floor drains and a 20 foot extension to the bay floor, apparatus bay doors and a fire sprinkler system.

Over the last year, several issue categories with the current fire station have been identified by the Building Committee: Life Safety concerns, building code and NFPA standard compliance, staff operations/efficiency and space needs were ranked as the top three categories. Over 22 individual issues were specified within these three categories alone.

The intent of undertaking this feasibility study is for the MHAJFD to gain a better understanding of the options and costs associated with insuring not only that the facilities and program are up to date by today's standards but are also well positioned to provide code compliant service into the future.

3. Scope of Requested Services

- a. Perform a future population trends assessment of the community for risk related to fire and emergency medical service needs. Review current demographics and future projections for growth, considering future transportation implications and traffic congestion issues, trends in emergency and non-emergency demands and assessment of current mutual aid and automatic response agreement(s).
- b. Conduct a space needs analysis for the MHAJFD. Provide a space summary detailing the appropriate space requirements for both present and future needs of the District. Review projections for future staffing needs related to facility space requirements. Evaluate current condition and appropriateness of apparatus/vehicles and equipment to determine future facility needs. Review appropriateness of current apparatus replacement plan related to facility space needs. Identify current and future training programming as it relates to facility and land needs.

- c. Perform a review and evaluation of the existing facility with regard to both support and emergency appropriateness. Evaluate the life expectancy of equipment and systems. Review needs to consider compliance of the existing facilities with regard to industry safety standards and codes. Recommend essential repairs, outline deficiencies and provide information on the existing condition. Provide cost estimates and supporting data with regard to all findings and recommendations so that if chosen as a course of action, this effort would bring the existing facility up to current standards.
- d. Confirm current average response times utilizing existing MHAJFD provided data.
- e. Confirm appropriate station location to maximize emergency response criteria, address economic considerations and the existing condition of the current facility. Consider the geographical locations of the MHAJFD volunteer staff and impact their locations may play in the siting of a new facility. Working with the MHAJFD plan to identify and analyze up to three new site locations as well as the existing location. Note that consultant may be required to find the alternative site locations for the purposes of this comparative analysis. Provide complete project cost estimates for each location, including the existing location.
- f. The appropriate I.S.O. standards for fire station locations should be considered in all aspects of this study. Provide input where ratings could be improved and how to accomplish them.
- g. Review the report with the Building Committee not later than September 4, 2013 and present it to the MHAJFD Municipalities at their annual meeting on September 25, 2013.

4. Evaluation and Selection Schedule

From the RFPs submitted the MHAJFD will develop a short list of response candidates to be scheduled for interviews. The chosen consultant will be selected based upon the proposal deemed most advantageous to the MHAJFD, in its sole discretion.

Anticipated Selection Schedule:

Issue RFPs	March 6, 2013
Mandatory Site Visit Meeting	March 15, 2013
RFP Responses due	March 29, 2013
Shortlist Announced	April 8, 2013
Interviews	April 18, 2013
Decision Issued	April 25, 2013

Mandatory Site Visit Meeting is scheduled from 12:30 PM until 2:00 PM on March 15th at the existing fire station located at 120 South 1st Street in Mt. Horeb. Representatives from the MHAJFD will provide a brief overview of the scope of the work intended to be covered by this RFP, conduct a tour of the existing facility, review in-house documents related to the RFP and answer questions.

5. Submittal Requirements

Based on the information provided in the project background and the scope of services your proposal should address the following identified sections preferably as organized below:

A. General Firm Background & Summary:

Provide a brief summary, which describes and highlights your firm's specific experience, qualifications, and particular expertise in conducting similar feasibility studies. Although the MHAJFD

is not soliciting responses for design related services beyond the feasibility study phase, please provide whatever information your firm feels is appropriate with respect to your capabilities in this area.

B. Specific Project Team:

Identify the team's proposed main point of contact and others who will be specifically assigned to this engagement. Clarify roles and responsibilities within the team.

Provide information regarding the qualifications, experience and relevant expertise of each individual. Include at least three references including contact information. If your team includes outside consultants provide similar information on them and the proposed personnel.

C. Project Timeline:

Propose a detailed schedule of the project from initial award of the contract through the required presentation to the MHAJFD Board at their annual meeting on September 25, 2013. Define how your team will maintain this schedule while also assuring a collaborative approach. Describe the process to be used by your firm along with the level and type of participation required by MHAJFD staff, commissioners and/or others.

D. Project Communication:

This project will require an approach that supports a philosophy of shared information, openness and collaboration. Describe specifically how your team will support and sustain a high level of communication and collaboration. Demonstrate your ability to clearly and concisely communicate the protective services terminology into easy to understand public communications and/or laymen's terms.

E. Unique tools and firm characteristics:

Describe tools used by your firm to manage the project. What sets you apart? Please tell us anything else about your firm or your approach that you want us to know, focusing on how you will bring value to our targeted priorities.

F. Fee for Services:

In a separate sealed envelope, provide a detailed fee listing including hourly rates and a not-to-exceed limit for services and out-of-pocket expenses. Provide separate break-out pricing for Voluntary Alternates 1 and 2. Advise if your firm is able to provide these services directly, or through the help of a sub-consultant.

Fee is to be provided as follows:

- a. Basic Services: A lump sum cost to provide the scope of work identified in this RFP.
- b. Reimbursable Expenses: Provide a not to exceed amount for reimbursable expenses along with a general listing of all items to be considered as a reimbursable expense.
- c. Hourly Rates: Provide hourly rates for each team member in case there is a need to have you provide additional services on an hourly basis.
- d. Clearly identify any other cost items, not included in your fee that may be required to be paid by the MHAJFD in order to complete the scope of work identified for this project. Based on your firm's experience, provide a listing of additional services that may be considered by the MHAJFD. Include a detailed fee listing for any of these additional services.

- e. *Voluntary Alternate Price #1* - Provide resources as necessary to help identify and possibly secure potential funding sources for the project. Assume this item, if accepted, may occur prior to the final report being presented or not later than the end of 2013.
- f. *Voluntary Alternate Price #2* - Work with the MHAJFD to conduct a survey, or other recommended methods to help gauge community support for the project after the presentation to the MHAJFD Municipalities on September 25, 2013 but prior to the end of 2013.

6. General Information

Submit Eight (8) copies to the Mount Horeb Area Joint Fire District no later than 2:00 PM CST on March 29, 2013. The office is located at 120 South 1st Street, Mount Horeb, WI 53572.

All proposals submitted in response to this RFP shall become the property of the MHAJFD and public records; and as such may be subject to public review. Proposals will not be returned.

MHAJFD reserves the right, in its sole discretion, to accept or reject any or all proposals and to waive any irregularities in a proposal. Furthermore, MHAJFD reserves the right to cancel this RFP request. Should they modify or cancel the request, all respondents will be notified in writing.

It is understood and agreed by the submitting firms that submittals, interviews, etc. are voluntary and that MHAJFD and/or its employees, agents, etc. are not responsible for any compensation for costs associated with submittals or interviews. MHAJFD is not liable for any costs incurred by proposers in the preparation of proposals or costs related to proposal submission.

7. Questions

Questions and inquiries are to be submitted in written form via email and directed to:

Jenny Minter
Deputy Chief
Mount Horeb Area Joint Fire District
120 South 1st Street
Mt. Horeb, WI 53572
Phone: (608) 437-5571
E-mail: jminter@fdmh.org



VILLAGE BOARD SUMMARY SHEET

MEETING DATE: Monday, August 13, 2018

SECTION: Business

DEPARTMENT: Administration

CONTACT: Matt Schuenke, Village Administrator

AGENDA ITEM: Discussion and possible action to make a recommendation to the Village Board on revisions to Section 23-94 of the Village Code of Ordinances regarding direct legislation ordinance to require a binding referendum for projects requiring a Village expenditure of \$1,250,000 or more.

PREVIOUS ACTION:

None.

ISSUE SUMMARY:

At the last Committee meeting there was discussion regarding the referendum requirement and whether or not it should be changed. It was also desired to solicit public input in the matter, but after the Committee could provide direction if changes were desired. The intent of the meeting on Monday is to discuss the Referendum requirement to see if/what the Committee wants to change with the current ordinance. There were three options discussed:

1. **No Change** - The ordinance stays in place as currently drafted, no further action or discussion would be necessary.
2. **Revision** - The Committee would have to discuss what elements of the ordinance should change.
3. **Removal** - This option would remove the ordinance entirely from the Code.

The key for Monday is deciding if a revision or removal is desired, and if so then schedule the issue for consideration by the Village Board with public input at a future meeting. In theory then, once we know what we want to do with it then we know what to bring to the public for all to weigh in on. Of course if neither revision or removal is desired, then the issue has been discussed and is done.

Included in your packet is a copy of the existing ordinance for reference and a survey of our comparable communities.

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPACT:

While the ordinance regulates certain large capital expenditures, the costs to specifically change



it can be contained within existing operating budgets as needed.

VILLAGE PLAN REFERENCE:

None.

ORDINANCE REFERENCE:

Section 23-94

BOARD, COMMISSION OR COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the Committee of the Whole discuss the ordinance and consider either to leave it alone, remove it, or revise it in some capacity.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Section 23-94 - Referendum Requirement
2. Referendum Requirement Survey 08092018

Sec. 23-94. - Direct legislation ordinance to require a binding referendum for projects requiring a Village expenditure of \$1,250,000.00 or more.

- (a) Prior to the start of any physical construction of any Village-financed project requiring a net Village capital expenditure of \$1,250,000.00 or more, the Village Board shall submit to the electorate a binding referendum for approval of the project. Failure of the binding referendum shall preclude the Village from proceeding with the project. The wording of any referendum shall provide the specific purpose, location, and cost of the project. Nothing in this provision shall be construed to preclude the Village from exercising its role in the planning or design of such publicly financed projects.
- (b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to public street projects, public projects paid for by McFarland Utilities (water, sewer and stormwater), or to any other capital expenditures that are not public construction projects.
- (c) The maximum capital expenditure amount in subsection (a) shall be adjusted annually for inflation or deflation in November of each year for the subsequent calendar year, utilizing the Consumer Price Index for all Urban Consumers, National Series (CPI-U), assuming [November 1, 2014] = 100, for all nonfood items as published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. The Village shall maintain a file open to the public and published on the Village website showing the said maximum amount for all years after the initial effective date.
- (d) This is a charter ordinance and shall take effect 60 days after its passage and publication, unless within such 60-day period a referendum petition as provided by Wis. Stats. § 66.0101 shall be filed, in which case this ordinance shall not take effect until it shall have been submitted to a referendum vote of the electors and approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon.

(Code 1998, § 3-1-14; Ord. No. 2005-09, 4-14-2005; Ord. No. 2014-11, § 1, 10-13-2014)

Editor's note— Section 1 of Ord. No. 2014-11, adopted Oct. 13, 2014, changed the title of § 23-94 from "Direct legislation ordinance to require a binding referendum for projects requiring a Village expenditure of \$1,000,000.00 or more" to read as herein set out.

State Law reference— Direct legislation, Wis. Stats. §§ 9.20, 61.342.

Comparable Survey - Referendum Requirement

Each of the below Communities were asked the following yes/no question:

Does your Community have an ordinance mandating a binding referendum be held in order to construct certain capital improvements?

Municipalities *	Yes/No	If Yes, what are the requirements...
Baraboo	No	
<i>Cottage Grove</i>	<i>No</i>	
DeForest	No	
Delafield	Yes	Yes, anything in excess of \$1 Million
<i>Fitchburg</i>	<i>No</i>	
Grafton	No	
Hartland	No	
<i>Middleton</i>	<i>No</i>	
Monona	No	
<i>Mount Horeb</i>	<i>No</i>	
Oregon	No	
Portage	No	
Stoughton	No	
Sun Prairie	No	
Sussex	Yes	When project exceeds 1% of eq Value
Verona	No	
Waunakee	No	
Yes	2	
No	15	
Total	17	

* The list of Comparable Communities was derived from the Classification and Compensation Study dated January 5, 2015. The Village Board set these communities for this purpose due to their similarities in size, location, and demographics. An excerpt of that report is attached for reference. Several other larger Dane County communities (shown in italics) were also polled for reference.

** Additionally, the Clerk/Treasurer asked the same question of Municipal Clerks Statewide via her Clerk's Association. No responses as of packet time were received in the affirmative.

Survey respondents were asked to provide information on only those Village of McFarland positions which they considered to be comparable to positions in their organizations. Therefore, survey respondents did not provide data for every position surveyed.

The Village Board, upon recommendation of the Personnel Committee determined that the following communities and the Bureau of Labor Statistics were the most comparable to the Village of McFarland based on size, location and demographics:

- City of Baraboo
- City of Delafield
- City of Delavan
- City of Monona
- City of Portage
- City of Stoughton
- City of Sun Prairie
- City of Verona
- Village of DeForest
- Village of Grafton
- Village of Hartland
- Village of Oregon
- Village of Sussex
- Village of Waunakee