



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes LONG RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

---

Monday, December 12, 2011

4:00 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 108 (City-County Building)

---

### And possible quorum of PARK COMMISSION

Please contact the Parks Division at 608-266-4711, TDD #866-704-2315.

#### I ROLL CALL

A meeting of the Long Range Planning Committee of the Park Commission was held on Monday, December 12, 2011 in Room 108, the Parks Division, 210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd., Room 108.

LRP Members Present: Joe Clausius, Ed Jepsen, Steve Webster, Grant Frautschi  
LRP Member Excused: Bill Barker  
Parks Staff Present: Kay Rutledge, Sarah Lerner, LaVonne LaFave

#### II APPROVAL OF MINUTES

##### A November 7, 2011

A motion was made by Jepsen/Clausius to approve the Minutes of November 7, 2011 meeting. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### III PUBLIC COMMENT (3 minute speaking limit for items not on agenda)

There were no members of the public wishing to speak 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 OLD BUSINESS

##### A 2012-2017 Park and Open Space Plan

Lerner noted that the hard copy of the draft distributed this evening reflects the comments from the committee at the last meeting as well as comments from other agencies in the City. It was also posted on Legistar.

Registered Speaker:

NAME ISSUE  
Si Widstrand Park and Open Space Plan

Widstrand provided written comments that covered 1) the standards to guide future planning have changed; 2) the rest of the park system, and 3) recommendations for action.

The standards to guide the future planning have changed as far as the classification of parks, the service area standards, the desirable park size standards, the list of facilities desired or recommended for the new park classifications, and consequently the evaluation of deficiencies have changed from what was adopted in 2005. Widstrand found the proposed new standards to be more vague and more flexible, and was concerned that might make them more susceptible to political decision making rather than to how decisions were made in the past. He felt the new proposed standards are presented as already adopted and they are not adopted until the Park and Open Space Plan is adopted. They should be presented in this plan as proposed changes to the standards.

One of the things that needs to be clarified is that they are not NRPA standards. It was noted that the NRPA did not adopt or endorse their own standards but released guidelines back in 1997 that recommend that communities establish their own standards. Madison has been doing that for decades.

The draft POSP omits any discussion about the rest of the park system, such as Forestry, Olbrich Gardens, the Mall Concourse, Warner Park Community Recreation Center and many of the specific park functions and facilities. Those sections were addressed in previous plans and are not covered in this current draft. In one area in the draft it refers planning for those sections to the sections themselves and or to the Mayor's office process. That appears to leave the Park Commission out of the loop.

The third item is entitled recommendations for action. There is good policy discussion, but it's not the same as an agenda to move forward. There are fewer actionable recommendations than in past plans. Are there things that Parks wants to emphasize for support, for PR reasons or they should be covered in the plan for grant applications? Widstrand listed examples of recommendations from the 2005 POSP and noted that many of the recommendations have been accomplished.

Lerner addressed comments from the last meeting. The map regarding park service areas and school facilities was broken into Exhibits 3 and 4 to show the influence of school grounds on service areas. The bullet items on page 8 were changed. The trend data was updated and added in Chapter 6 to show information from 2006 through 2010. The table on page 17 was redesigned due to the concern about the way information was displayed. The document will be reviewed to change NRPA standards to NRPA guidelines consistently throughout. Table 3-4 on page 17 should include a footnote to describe what sites are included in the "Special" acres. A section on volunteers has also been added.

The maps in Exhibits 3 and 4 identify the service area radii. Exhibit 3 shows

the deficiency in park areas that is consistent with the Comp Plan. Exhibit 4 shows how school facilities impact those areas, however, those areas are not really open to the public during school hours though they do serve the neighborhood outside of school hours. Past plans have consistently used school facilities to meet park needs and advocate for acquisition of school properties if the school system no longer needed them.

It was noted that there are many isolated little parcels; are they really park space or are some of them possibly street end right-of-ways? It was noted that people love those little spaces and they get adopted by neighborhoods, though there are questions regarding maintenance and possible uses for those parcels.

Members indicated they needed time to review the 2005 document and compare it to the current draft. It was also suggested to reference the 2005 document in the introduction. Lerner added that she could add a reference in Section 3 to make the relationship between the 2005 document and the current document more explicit. She specifically stayed away from listing specific improvements for specific parks because those details can be discussed through the budget process. Parks also does not want it to be a politically driven plan where people who were loudest would drive the recommendations in the plan.

Rutledge stated that these recommendations are the overriding philosophies of what we want to achieve in our park system. The goal is to have the POSP adopted which then feeds information into the next Comprehensive Plan update. For example, when there are opportunities for links to connect parcels we will pursue them as these acquisitions are supported by the POSP. The recommendations would move through the capital budget process toward implementation during the next 5 years.

Discussion turned to why other parks sections are not included in more detail. Forestry, Olbrich and Warner have their own plans or are developing plans. Forestry's plan would go to the Park Commission at the appropriate time for review and approval. Olbrich's plan would be endorsed by Olbrich Botanical Society while the Warner Park Community Recreation Center's plan would be adopted by its own group as well as the Park Commission, as appropriate. It was suggested that a link to those plans could be provided in the document. Much of the focus of Forestry is an emphasis on street trees, which are not part of the park system. Since their main focus is not necessarily the park system it seemed appropriate that they are referenced as part of the Parks organizational structure, but not provide as detailed a discussion on them. It was felt that a person reading the POSP should learn the scope of our park system.

Similar to the Comprehensive Plan, the POSP is a general planning document which recognizes the recommendations developed in more detailed plans such as neighborhood development plans and the Downtown Plan. The subsidiary plans should have a direct link to specific action items and how recommendations will be carried out. For instance, will the forestry plan discuss landscaping management in parks and their role in that process or will they only come out with generalized recommendations? The implementation plan for the next 5 years should be based on the recommendations in the POSP.

Registered Speaker:

**NAME ISSUE**

Brenda Konkell Process for requesting improvements in parks

Suggestions for improvements in parks can come from a number of sources. The master plan for that park is reviewed to see if the request is appropriate or if it will produce a significant change in use, which would require a revision to the master plan.

Members suggested that one of the recommendations in the POSP should be to establish a standard for when master plans are created, e.g., for all community or neighborhood parks above a certain size (10 acres). It should also indicate where people can find master plans for the various parks. Rutledge indicated that the Parks Division hoped to post existing master plans on our website soon. Chapter Nine does recommend that Master Plans continue to be developed for parkland which includes both passive (non-developed) and active (developed) recreation. It was noted that the Planning section, based on current staffing, can only complete a small number of master plans each year. There is an internal goal to create master plans for parks that currently don't have them. A more consistent process is needed for obtaining public input on what the public wants in their parks. A more thorough evaluation of the site itself needs to occur, in terms of topography, soils, existing vegetation, what resources are there that need to be protected and what kind of amenities should be added. The POSP should provide those guidelines without dictating specifics.

In the past, many master plans were not revised when the park was fully developed. It would be a good idea to review those old master plans, especially in terms of redevelopment or reconstruction of facilities. The other type of master plan is the one done by Parks staff for a new park before there are any people living there, as part of a new subdivision. There is no opportunity for a public process when there are no residents. It was suggested that the Long Range Planning Committee could take on the task of reviewing the master planning process for parks.

It was requested that all comments on the current draft be returned by January 9, so that these comments can be incorporated into the next draft to be brought forward on January 23. The goal is to bring the POSP to the Park Commission at their February 2012 meeting, if possible.

Discussion turned to the various project assignments of the committee. Clausius and Lerner are working on the alcohol in parks issue. Frautschi reviewed the blue letters and ordinances. Jepsen and Bauer are working on the Memorial Policy. Parking regulations had been Wallner and Maglio and should be turned over to Barker. Webster is working on the ice rinks and the behavioral study and needs a new point person since he had been working with Doniger. A staff person will be identified to help move these projects forward.

**VI NEXT MEETINGS**

**A Dates for 2012**

The next meeting is January 23, 2012 at 4:00 p.m. Updates on the Memorial policy, alcohol issue and parking will be on the agenda for review.

**VII ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Jepsen/Clausius to adjourn at 5:14 p.m.