



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes - Approved LONG RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

Monday, April 25, 2011

4:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.
Room 104 (City-County Building)

A meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee of the Park Commission was held on Monday, April 25, 2011 in Room 108, the Parks Division, 210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Room 108. Committee Chair Webster called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. A quorum was present and the meeting was properly noticed. Bill Barker was welcomed as the newest member of the subcommittee.

Parks Staff Present: Kay Rutledge, Eric Knepp, Sarah Lerner and LaVonne LaFave

I. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Clausius arrived late

Present: 5 -

William W. Barker; Grant J. Frautschi; Stephen A. Webster; Edward A. Jepsen and Joseph R. Clausius

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Jepsen/Frautschi to approve the Minutes of January 31, 2011 meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public who wished to comment on items not on the Agenda.

IV. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

There were no disclosures or recusals by members of the Committee for any item on the agenda.

V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. [22016](#) Request by County Executive Kathleen Falk and Mayor Dave Cieslewicz to dedicate a section of the Cherokee Marsh land in memory of Harold "Bud" Jordahl.

Request by County Executive Kathleen Falk and Mayor Dave Cieslewicz to dedicate a section of the Cherokee Marsh land in memory of Harold "Bud" Jordahl

Rutledge explained the request to name a portion of Cherokee Marsh after "Bud" Jordahl who was instrumental in establishing the State Stewardship Fund that the Parks Division has used on several occasions to acquire land. While it appears Bud's interest was more global in nature, his main connection was his role in creating the State Stewardship Fund. Following the criteria in the Naming Policy it appears that this request is consistent with those guidelines. Planning staff will review the parcels in Cherokee Marsh and provide the subcommittee with possible locations that may be suitable at a future meeting

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Park and Open Space Plan Update

Parks Planning is in the midst of updating the Park and Open Space Plan (POSP). The public input process consisting of three public meetings as well as a survey that was available both on-line as well as hard copies that were placed at the libraries, community centers and senior center has been completed. The results are being evaluated to provide a summary with key items to include in the new POSP. Preliminary information is being presented today.

The proposed Table of Contents was introduced. Discussion tonight will cover drafts of chapters one, two and eight. The goal is to have additional chapters available for the June meeting and that later this year the entire Plan would be reviewed in order to make a recommendation to the Park Commission.

Concern was expressed about the low participation in the public meetings but members were pleased with the response via the on-line survey. Staff felt the process was well advertised. It is possible that because of the response to the survey, people felt they didn't need to attend a meeting. A separate survey was also sent to recreation groups. There will also be opportunities to respond when the draft plan is completed. People can also provide input when it is presented to the Park Commission. It was noted that a Park Commissioner had previously mentioned concerns about the questions. There may be some merit for the subcommittee to look at the process for citizen participation at some point in the future.

Work on the POSP had been on a fast track because of Stewardship Fund applications but that funding for new applications has since been curtailed. Any new applications will need to provide an economic justification.

Discussion began with Chapter 8. Knepp was available to answer questions and provide an overview on the financial information that is included.

Financial data is new for our POSP and are customarily included in these types of plans. This includes the organizational chart and staffing levels which lead to budgetary and financial components. The current POSP focuses on general park maintenance and conservation parks but doesn't address office personnel, Warner Park Community Recreation Center, Olbrich, forestry, golf and cemetery that are all component pieces of our Parks Division. Because of this the operating budget numbers are significantly lower than the numbers shown in the published city budget for parks. Forestry and street trees are not normally included in POSPs. What is included in the POSP are those costs that are typically standard for parks operations with a note regarding those other sections.

Additionally there are differences in the capital budget numbers. The POSP does not take into account the reauthorization process because capital projects often span more than one year and a determination is made as to which year to put it in. For example the Goodman Pool is shown over two years, Warner Stadium seating over 5 years, the Goodman Maintenance Facility over 3 years, etc. The POSP uses actual expenditures for capital projects.

Members of the subcommittee felt this was a useful addition to the Plan because people generally don't understand the budget. Knepp indicated it will be easier to show this information going forward because of new software that will be able to separate the individual section budgets. It was suggested that comparisons of the budget to national averages be added because otherwise the numbers don't really provide a context for interpretation. These comparisons could include costs per acre maintained. It may also be necessary to add a footnote on the effects of fuel costs to the budget. It would also be nice to provide statistics on the number of volunteer hours because that impacts staffing levels. Those statistics should also show what those hours are worth in hourly labor costs. There are some volunteers who consistently report the number of hours that are volunteered and we also have volunteers who just work on projects and don't report anything. A suggestion was made that funds in the parks budget be identified for those services provided by the Division outside of our parks.

Discussion turned to Forestry and the fact that its work on trees in parks is limited. It has a full plate in dealing with street trees. The question was posed as to why forestry is a Parks section and not a stand-alone entity or part of the Streets Division. There have been discussions regarding this question and one of the reasons it remains in Parks is it would require a change in bargaining units. Parks does get benefits from forestry; work at Forest Hill Cemetery is a prime example. Forestry has also been very involved in the EAB planning and they will probably work in our parks rather than on street trees when an outbreak occurs. Contractors will probably be used on street trees. Forestry also did the primary work at Glenwood Children's Park. Forestry also goes in and evaluates trees in parks and helped along the Yahara Parkway. Knepp and Rutledge both indicated they felt it was beneficial to have Forestry as a part of Parks.

At this point Clausius joined the meeting.

Returning to Chapter One, there are placeholders throughout the document because the data analysis for those items has not been completed. There is

acreage that may be considered parkland but may not be actual parkland, e.g. traffic lanes, etc. Staff is reviewing boundaries to determine the correct acreage but they do not believe the acreage will go down significantly. A question was asked about some of the waterways (detention and retention ponds) and which agency controlled them. They do, however, function as a linear corridor connecting park space. The question is whether that acreage should be captured within a greenway category or should it be located elsewhere.

Discussion turned to Chapter 2 and the draft goals and objectives for the Plan. The goals and objectives from 2005-2010 as well as the draft goals and objectives for 2011-2016 were reviewed. The focus is for the next five years. The previous goals and objectives were captured as policy statements which are tasks for implementation of a POSP. A POSP typically does not go down to that level; it should define what the goals and objectives are for the future and once the Plan is adopted, then the tasks that will be needed to achieve those goals/objectives will be identified.

The whole issue of lakes and lakeshores and their protection is very important. Members inquired whether Engineering is discussing lake levels and the effects of high water levels on adjoining shoreline and habitat with the surrounding communities. It does not appear to be reflected in this document. This may be appropriate as a recommendation in the Plan. It's a very sensitive issue and staff is not certain how to address it since it is a city issue that is ongoing. Engineering is overseeing this issue.

A final suggestion was that the statements be changed from activities to outcomes, e.g. what is to be achieved.

With reference to Goal 3, sustainable development is a broad term. It is intended to mean that we make sure that site development occurs in a sustainable manner and the natural and cultural resources are protected. The goal is about preservation and protection. Parks has not done an archeological study for new developments in the past.

The balance of Chapter 2 addresses accomplishments and highlights over the past five years. A suggestion was made to add information on the community gardens that have been opened in the past five years.

Turning to Parkland classifications, the first page is from the Comprehensive Plan that compares different types of parks and how they were categorized in the past. The second page is the NRPA standards and we want to make sure our classifications are consistent with those standards. It is recommended that the current classifications be changed to move closer to NRPA classifications. This will also help when comparing our classifications to other municipalities. The different names of parks mean different things to different people and having consistent categories identifies the different types of facilities within them.

The third page is what Parks is suggesting in terms of classifications. The verbiage has been tweaked to City of Madison standards. While school parks are not mentioned, they are mentioned in the POSP and will be part of the inventory because they fill a gap. There will be a list of what amenities are included with schools in the city, e.g. playgrounds, athletic fields, etc. The list

contains only City of Madison parks. Part of the mapping will also show where parks are needed.

Barker mentioned types of uses from conservation parks where people cannot get off trails to an area within Warner Park that is not high enough quality to be a conservation park where people could get off the trails to explore. A possible designation could be nature contact zones. Staff has discussed the idea of resource management areas in parks that would be areas where you do the best you can to protect the natural and cultural resources and are not used for athletic fields. Madison has ordinances specific to conservation parks and that can be problematic if other areas are labeled as conservation because they would need to meet that standard for protection. There are conservation parks that are adjacent to neighborhood parks as well as portions designated as conservation areas within regular parks. Concern was expressed about children's nature deficit disorder and members would like parks staff to take the lead and develop areas where kids and adults can get off trails.

It was noted that trafficways are street ends down to the lakes that are public access to lakes and yet are not owned by parks and not considered a park but are road right of ways. It would be more appropriate to categorize them separately. When doing park and open space analysis the fact that something is road right of way doesn't matter. We just categorize what Parks owns and what it doesn't and yet is being used as parkland. Also considered are the ordinances that spell out what can happen in a road ROW which can be different than what is allowed in parks.

A statement regarding the survey monkey results will indicate that this is not a statistically valid survey. It is like a public input meeting opened up to as many individuals as could be reached from our various Listservs. It reaches people with computers or people who were at a location where hard copies were available and wanted to respond and usually had a specific interest they wanted to address. The information will not be used in any statistically valid compilation. Staff is not aware of any campaign where people filled out the survey more than one time to skew the results. There were groups that did advocate within their group to complete the survey. A brief discussion took place about some of the responses shown on the survey.

The POSP will speak very generically and not use numbers or percentages but state something like "the top three activities are 1, 2, 3." Another statement to be used will be: "Of the people who chose to respond to the survey we found . . ." The survey will probably be attached as an appendix.

VII. NEXT MEETINGS

May 16, 2011 at 4:30 p.m. – Capital budget
June 20, 2011 at 4:00 p.m. - POSP

It was then noted that the various topic areas will be discussed once the POSP has been taken care of.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Frautschi/Barker to adjourn at 6:01 p.m.