

Lake Monona Waterfront Design Challenge Responses to Ad-Hoc Committee Questions

February 16, 2023

1. Who will be the key members of your team that will work on the plan refinement phase and identify their roles.

There will be strong continuity and consistency in the team from the Design Challenge phase of work. Key team members will play the following roles during the plan refinement:

- **James Corner** will provide strategic direction, lead key presentations and serve as the team's liaison with key stakeholders, committee members, and potential donors.
- Sarah Astheimer will provide design leadership and participate in key presentations.
- Megan Born will manage the design and consulting team, participate in all meetings and presentations, and continue to serve as the project's primary point-of-contact.
- The Field Operations Team will be joined by our **Core and Specialist teams** as needed, including MSA, Toole Design, Quinn Evans, Anchor QEA, Hilary Dugan and HR&A.
- A new addition to the team during the plan refinement phase will be an Engagement
 Consultant. Per our original proposal response, we would like to work with the Ad-Hoc
 Committee and City of Madison to identify and engage the best local engagement consultant for
 the project.
- In addition to and in close relationship with the engagement consultant, we would like to bring on a **Ho-Chunk Tribal Liaison** to the team. Based on our experiences working with tribes in other regions, a trusted liaison is key to building a lasting, positive and productive relationships. Potential Liaisons include Samantha Skenandore, Bill Quakenbush, Kyla Beard, and Janice Rice.

2. Who will be your local liaison?

We will rely on the following local liaisons during the plan refinement phase:

- Kevin Luecke will serve as our technical lead on all transportation and connectivity issues.
- **Dan Williams**, will serve as our point of connection to the Ad-Hoc Committee, the Friends of the Nolen Waterfront, the City of Madison; Dan will also guide our team through initial regulatory compliance and informational meetings with local, regional, and state agencies.

3. How will your firm's Principals be involved?

The Field Operations' team is led by three of the firm's principals: James Corner, Sarah Astheimer, and Megan Born. Their involvement is detailed in response to Question #1.

4. What are your thoughts for public engagement during the plan refinement phase?

We see three primary goals/ objectives for engagement during the plan refinement phase:

- **Continuity:** Public Engagement during the plan refinement phase should build upon the excellent engagement and outreach already done by the Ad-hoc Committee, Friends of the Nolen Waterfront, the pre-planning work, and the Design Challenge.
- **Equity:** Engagement should target communities that have been underrepresented in the process thus far. This may include specific neighborhoods, demographic groups (such as race and age), or communities with particular interests. Our team will work closely to identify community leaders and work closely with them to engage with their neighborhoods and organizations.
- **Tribal Outreach:** We understand and respect the importance of the Ho Chunk community as a key stakeholder group and incredible resource and voice to the lakefront conversation.

These objectives will be achieved through the following activities:



- Host a large kick-off workshop, inspired by the incredibly successful Design Challenge event, with
 the community to gather input on all the work presented in the Design Challenge and confirm
 which ideas and concepts should be included in the refinement phase.
- Continue using existing channels for ongoing project updates.
- Target outreach in underrepresented communities. This will be done in close collaboration with our local engagement consultant.
- Foster and build a lasting and long-term collaboration with the Ho Chunk community.

5. Identify 1-2 recent projects that you feel most closely resembles your master plan proposal.

The Presidio Tunnel Tops has many similarities to the Lake Monona waterfront, including an extraordinary waterfront site with expansive views, full integration of infrastructure with parkland, and welcoming spaces for all.

The Seattle Central Waterfront shares the emphasis of connectivity between city and water, and has been shaped by close collaborative partnerships with local tribes.

Both of these projects, among many others in the Field Operations' portfolio, have followed very similar design processes to what you are doing in Madison. These projects began as design competitions, moved though master planning phases, and then culminated in design and construction.

6. What is your approach to developing a phasing plan that starts with a first phase that generates excitement and momentum for the entire project? Give us examples.

Our plan suggests an initial set of capital projects focused on access and connections, including the transformation of John Nolen Drive and several key connections to get people safely and easily to the waterfront. This strategy would require a large amount of funding at the project's start. Knowing this may not come to fruition, a first phase could just as easily be one of the four proposed parks and destination piers in our plan. Beginning with a pier and park would generate lots of excitement and momentum for future work.

We acknowledge that these capital projects are significant and will take time to design, permit and build. We recommend pairing this work with temporary, quick-build projects, early win activations and a calendar of programming events. These activities will build momentum and establish a track record of progress that builds trust across the community. We have experience designing and implementing these early wins, ranging from branding and wayfinding, to environmental stewardship and recreational activities.

7. How will you review and potentially integrate concepts from the other plans to take advantage of multiple visions for the project?

This is what we do as designers—we integrate and incorporate the best ideas for a project, and we will certainly do so if selected to make the best possible vision. In fact, on many projects, we will develop three unique schemes and with the community will synthesize them. It is important that this integration process is informed by you. Our team would begin the next phase of work with a public event and collaboration with the Ad-Hoc Committee to evaluate and identify the full range of public comments on all the proposals. We imagine the design refinement phase to be an incredible iterative process—marked by significant evolution and advancement of the vision.

8. What is your experience working with public/private partnerships and how do you help to bridge and assist each in achieving the overall mission?

Nearly all our large-scale and high-profile projects are driven by public-private partnerships, including The High Line, Cleveland Public Square, the Seattle Central Waterfront, the Presidio Tunnel Tops, and



Chicago Navy Pier. We understand that successful project delivery not only includes great design, but also inclusive engagement and consensus building, clear and organized project management, technical expertise and precision, tenacity and patience, fundraising from multiple sources, and strong personal relationships.

9. Can you please provide more detail on the proposed underpass (item 21 on Board 1)? Specifically, where would it connect north of John Nolen Drive? How was it determined to be technically feasible?

Our design proposal seeks to maximize connectivity between the lake and the city. We have identified ten potential routes to the water, including an underpass between Law Park South and Brittingham Park.

This design feature responds to the City's engineering studies and request to include a connection in this location. We do, however, acknowledge technical challenges – the primary one being the need for pumping as it sits below the water table.

This new drawing helps to clarify where we have located the underpass and how it connects to nearby trails. Our location was chosen to minimize the length of the underpass while keeping the facility universally accessible.

10. Does your plan include removing the Brittingham Park Dog Park? (See top photo, Board 2.)

No. Our plan retains the dog park and aims to create better connections between Brittingham Park and Law Park at Broom Street and the Brittingham Underpass.

11. Can you please provide more detail on the proposed Brittingham footbridge (item 23 on Board 1)? Specifically, is this proposed to be a pedestrian underpass crossing John Nolen Drive? If so, what will the clearances be? Will it be operational year-round?

The Brittingham Bridge connects the John Nolen Causeway separated use trail to Brittingham Park and the trail along North Shore Drive. This feature is included in our plan to maximize connectivity to Brittingham Park, Monona Bay and the nearby neighborhoods.

The bridge ramps down and crosses under the Causeway. The intention is for the bridge structure to sit 1' above the high-water line and be built of a permeable material than can easily withstand floods. Coordination with the Causeway reconstruction project will be necessary to ensure proper clearances can be maintained.

12. Can you please elaborate about your plans for the Monona Fishing Pier (Board 5), including the most relevant environmental, engineering, and regulatory considerations?

The Monona Fishing Pier seeks to open and enlarge one of the most popular destinations on the lakefront today. The Pier was designed knowing construction and regulations in and over Lake Monona has evolved over the last 150 years. We are aware that the construction of this feature will be contingent approvals from multiple agencies and regulatory bodies. When engaging in this process it will be important to consider the scale of the pier in context to Monona Terrace. It is quite small in comparison and any impact on the lake will be proportional. The structure can be built from materials that allow light and air to penetrate its surface, which will lessen its environmental impact. If a permanent structure is deemed unfeasible, the same concept may be pursued as a floating dock or barge, which will not be subject to the same regulations.