

From: annewalker@homelandgarden.com
To: [Transportation Commission](#)
Subject: Agenda Item 9, Legistar 74962
Date: Wednesday, December 14, 2022 1:34:07 PM
Attachments: [WPM\\$E5Z4.PM\\$](#)

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Dear Transportation Commission,

Isthmus neighborhoods are green space, canopy tree and park space deficient. We also have a great deal of competition for the space we do have, including in our terraces. The city goal of a 40% tree canopy should include **every** neighborhood, including isthmus neighborhoods.

That competition for space includes both street reconstructions and development. From the *Downtown Plan: Madison, WI, 2012*. "**A healthy urban forest comprised of all the trees within the public-right-of-way and on public and private property can contribute greatly to perceptions of a community. Recent development has generally occupied more lot area and left less room for existing or new trees. This has put a premium on having healthy and sustainable trees along streets and sidewalks. Trees with larger canopies in particular can greatly enhance a streetscape. Trees provide shade, habitat, color and other aesthetic enhancements, reduce the urban heat island effect, and offer many other benefits. The importance of street trees in maximizing the goal of developing a tree canopy on Downtown streets cannot be overstated.**"

Isthmus neighbors, like every other neighborhood, needs to reach a 40% tree cover.

We have other challenges that also need to be addressed. We are flooding. Technologies such as Silva cells and other bioretention must be prioritized. I live across from the Yahara River, a river that has flooded many, many times since I moved here in 1992. 2018 was really scary, and, could have been much worse. While infiltration can be tricky in our area, bioretention is not. How will this guide effectively manage these environmental challenges?

If the city wants neighbors to embrace this plan, adequate opportunities need to exist to assess it. I do not make the next point lightly. I have worked with city staff over the years and have often found the experience to be professional and efficient. In this instance, and with this policy, city staff did **not** make a real effort to reach out to our neighborhood, though they were asked to do so for over a year. It is not the neighborhoods 'fault' that at this late stage, we are *trying* to better understand the implications of this policy, going forward. That needs to change. Adequate time for neighbors to assess and adequately comment upon this policy is reasonable.

Respectfully,

Anne Walker
(no attachments)