

Phase Two Community Feedback Summaries : Imagine Madison Strategies

July 28, 2017 DRAFT
for Plan Commission Review



Imagine  Madison
People Powered Planning
www.imaginemadisonwi.com

Phase Two Feedback Summaries - Imagine Madison Strategies

Objective:

The purpose of this report is to summarize the feedback received from community members during Phase Two of the Imagine Madison process. The report is organized by six overarching themes of the Plan: Form and Connectivity, Neighborhoods and Housing, Economy and Opportunity, Culture and Character, Green and Resilient, and Services and Facilities. The summaries in this packet are based on data from three different types of community feedback: the Imagine Madison website, Community Meetings, and Resident Panels.



Engagement:

In Phase Two **Community Meetings**, attendees were presented with a draft list of the 60 Imagine Madison strategies on posters broken down by theme (shown above). They then placed a limited number of stickers on strategies that they supported, or wrote new strategies directly on the posters.

The **Imagine Madison website** had a module that allowed users to view the draft strategies by theme, click on strategies they supported to “like” them with a “thumbs up,” and submit additional strategies to the website that others could view and “like.” There was no limit to the number of strategies a user could “like” on the website.


Community groups participated in **Resident Panels**, which are gatherings for group members to discuss their thoughts on the Comprehensive Plan topics and provide feedback. The Resident Panel process was similar to Community Meetings, including discussion of draft strategies by theme, voting with a limited number of stickers, and suggesting additional strategies. Additionally, the groups provided summary documents about what they discussed, and noted if there was consensus or differing viewpoints about certain topics. Planning staff was not present during meetings of Resident Panels, as they were coordinated directly by the community groups.

Methods:

Staff read each comment submitted and each Resident Panel summary document. While doing so, staff pulled out the main ideas of each comment, and determined the common themes and discrepancies across feedback methods. Each piece of feedback has been considered carefully and has been used to impact both the strategy revisions, including adding entirely new strategies, and the plan itself going forward.

Note:

It is important to note that the quantitative information presented in these summaries is not intended to be statistical in nature, but is presented as a reflection of the input received from the community to help capture major themes. Every comment collected is available on Legistar in its “raw data” format for anyone who would like to access them.



Goal: Madison will be comprised of compact, interconnected neighborhoods anchored by a network of mixed-use activity centers.

Goal: Madison will have a safe, efficient, and affordable regional transportation system that offers a variety of choices among transportation modes.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Improve transit connections between peripheral residential and employment land uses, focusing on connecting transit-dependent populations to jobs.	25	35	48	108
2	Continue to pursue implementation of bus rapid transit (BRT) , beginning by increasing bus garage capacity to allow for expansion of Metro service .	31	27	20	78
3	Work with regional partners to collaboratively improve our regional bicycle system to further enable safe and convenient bicycle use.	30	31	23	84
4	Improve the pedestrian environment in the City by providing sidewalk widths that are appropriately scaled for pedestrian activity and existing and planned adjacent development.	21	27	29	77
5	Prioritize the maintenance and efficient use of existing roadway facilities over expansion or construction of new roadways.	18	37	14	69
6	Ensure the benefits of transportation investments are fairly distributed and that adverse health and environmental impacts do not disproportionately impact low-income residents and people of color.	19	41	20	80
7	Reduce the demand for development of farmland and vacant land on the periphery of the City by encouraging infill, redevelopment , and higher development densities at appropriate locations.	24	37	31	92
8	Provide appropriate transitions between areas of low intensity residential development and higher intensity developments in neighborhood centers and along major transit corridors.	21	17	24	62
9	Concentrate the highest intensities of residential, employment, commercial, and mixed-use development downtown, along transit corridors, and at major activity centers .	12	12	10	34
10	Maintain downtown Madison as the government center for the State and primary activity center for the region.	7	10	11	28
11	Encourage development that is consistent with adopted neighborhood plans, neighborhood development plans, and other adopted City plans .	7	22	4	33

Key: **CM** – Community Meeting Feedback; **Web** – Website Feedback; **RP** – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support High support



Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: 20 additional comments

- A. Two strategy comments from Community Meetings **highlighted the desire for light rail**, despite the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) strategy proposed by Imagine Madison.
- B. The most comments received at Community Meetings were on the topic of transit. Comments emphasized **innovative transit systems and solutions, fewer cars on isthmus, and more connectivity regionally and to the outer areas of the city.**
- C. Overall, the strategy to maintain downtown Madison as the government center for the state and primary activity center for the region (Strategy 10) was not popular at Community Meetings. For example, a **new strategy with the text “Not #10” also received 7 votes of support.**
- D. At Community Meetings, two comments emphasized the need for **more development and density, and advocated for decreased restrictions on the height of buildings to allow for taller structures**, especially around the capitol.

Website: 58 additional comments

Regarding transportation:

- E. Most comments (17) were focused on **transit, advocating for increased service – faster buses, more routes, less complicated routes, and fewer cars.**
- F. **Bicycle comments were the next most prevalent**, with 10 comments about increasing the bicycle network, considering how the system can be more equitable and accessible, and educating drivers so that biking can become a form of transportation for more Madisonians.
- G. Along with these comments **were several concerns about equitable transportation, expressing that systems need to ensure a high quality of life for all Madison residents, not just the white and wealthy, and expressing that having choices is not enough without considering safety and equitable access.**
- H. Aside from comments about transit in general, there were five comments advocating **light rail in Madison** itself, and rail transit regionally. In contrast, **Bus Rapid Transit** only received one explicit mention in a strategy comment gathered through the web.
- I. Three popular comments suggested that some **city roads could be put on “road diets” and could become more complete streets**, with more dedicated bike lanes and transit lanes instead of space for cars. Another comment was critical of arterials acting as commuter highways running through the isthmus.
- J. Comments that favored **pedestrian access** were highly supported.
- K. Commenters also stressed the need for **better connectivity throughout the city**, with 5 comments.

Regarding development:

- L. Two comments were **in favor of more development and greater density in Madison**. One comment specified that the areas around the West and East Towne Malls could accommodate much more density, and another noted that without more infill development, our city will not be dense enough for BRT transit. This commenter felt that neighborhood community groups should be limited in development conversations, as they act to protect a wealthy middle class, not the city.
- M. A third comment asked that **transitions to surrounding neighborhoods** should be kept in mind when new buildings are proposed, a sentiment we have also heard often in the Future Land Use Map comments.
- N. Two comments were more skeptical of infill and development, expressing that they were **not convinced that density and infill prevent sprawl** and that downtown is becoming a “corridor of giant tall buildings and is not always pleasant to be in” – these commenters **fear that Madison is losing its green spaces and small scale.**

Resident Panels: 37 additional comments

- O. Overall, **community groups emphasized accessibility of transit in 14 separate comments, including wanting more routes, fewer bus transfers, and education** about how to use the transportation network.
- P. Community groups **supported transit network expansion, but also noted that driving was necessary within their communities in order to access jobs and employment.**
 - a. Ideas included encouraging businesses around Madison to incentivize their employees to use public transportation, and implementing a sliding payment scale for a regional transit system.
- Q. **Pedestrian friendly environments and more sidewalks** were ideas raised with multiple community groups.

- R. Overall, community groups were **unfamiliar with BRT or skeptical of the idea**. A few raised the idea of rail transit and many more **supported an expanded bus network**.
- S. A few community groups expressed distrust or hesitation about **the strategies related to development, specifying that access, sustainability, and affordability for all members of the community** were important development goals.
- T. One community group expressed **concern that downtown would become all sky-scraper type development**.

New Ideas

- i. Regional and local rail transit service is desired to provide connectivity surrounding suburbs and neighboring metropolitan areas, integrating a sliding payment scale. (Web, RP)
- ii. Education is needed about many aspects of the transportation system, from using public transportation, to bicycle safety, to obtaining drivers' licenses, especially for immigrant communities. (Web, RP)
- iii. Partner with private companies, such as Epic, to provide additional transit routes and incentivize employees to use transit. (Web)
- iv. Plan for autonomous vehicles. (Web)
- v. Add Park and Ride options near downtown Madison to decrease the traffic crossing the isthmus. (CM, Web)
- vi. Set performance standards for transportation systems, such as transit arriving on schedule and operating within the speed limit. (Web)

Staff Discussion:

Connectivity, especially equitable, affordable, and accessible transit, was the most popular topic in this area. Madisonians feel that much better transit and road connections are needed to outlying areas of the city, that the current transit routes can be improved and have fewer connections, and that explorations into rail and other new forms of transit are needed. Many felt that cars should be discouraged on the isthmus, but others noted that often more privileged Madisonians are the ones who can live in the places with adequate bicycle and transit connections, so cars should not be discouraged until connectivity is spread throughout the city. Pedestrian access was also highlighted, especially expanding the sidewalk network.

Though some comments tied density, development, and transit corridors together, others seemed wary of infill development. However, many people did support Strategy 7, recommending infill development and higher density to preserve farmland. The City may need to provide more information about the benefits of infill development and densification in strategic areas.

Finally, across all feedback methods, Strategy 10 garnered the least votes of support of any strategy, and also received negative feedback. One community group asked for clarification of this strategy, calling for more affordability downtown, fewer parking tickets and more available parking. Another community group specified that concentration of development downtown was less important than reaching underserved areas in need of development. Staff will adjust strategies related to downtown in accordance with this apparent community preference and reconsider Strategy 10 overall.



Goal: Madison will be a safe and welcoming city of strong and complete neighborhoods that meet the needs of all residents.

Goal: Madison will have a full range of quality and affordable housing opportunities throughout the City.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Ensure that there is a sufficient supply of rental housing to reduce housing costs and provide more choices.	32	20	70	87
2	Develop a wider mix of housing types, sizes, tenures and costs (e.g. affordable housing units, multifamily buildings, single-family homes of various sizes, and others) in all new neighborhoods.	28	44	44	99
3	Integrate affordable housing into neighborhoods and corridors that have access to transit, schools, parks, libraries, neighborhood centers, and other amenities needed for daily living .	46	44	55	124
4	Allow seniors to age in place by providing affordable housing options that are integrated into the community.	22	33	57	94
5	Provide housing options with supportive services for our most vulnerable residents .	18	23	42	61
6	Create complete neighborhoods where residents have access to transit, schools, parks, libraries, neighborhood centers, and other amenities needed for daily living.	57	43	34	120
7	Coordinate with school districts to plan for compact community schools that fit within the neighborhood and support students, families, and other neighborhood residents.	15	15	39	53
8	Support diverse food production options in all neighborhoods through community gardens and edible landscapes on public land, appropriate animals (chickens, bees), rooftop & marketing gardening.	31	35	34	82
9	Foster diverse food retail, meal programs, pantries & self-provisioning (gardens, gleaning) to ensure healthy, dignified, culturally appropriate food access in all neighborhoods.	25	36	45	91
10	Increase community safety and wellbeing through improved relations between residents and police officers.	22	20	50	71
11	Provide neighborhood facilities that bring people of diverse backgrounds together and strengthen social connections .	25	27	39	73

Key: CM – Community Meeting Feedback; Web – Website Feedback; RP – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support

High support

Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: 19 additional comments

- A. The topic area that received the most comments was development, especially relating to **development of under-used land downtown and in the central city and providing more housing units**.
- B. Other comments specified **that affordable housing for seniors must be accompanied with pedestrian-friendly environments and access to transit**.
- C. Housing strategies provided by attendees included **co-housing, mixed-income housing, accessory dwelling units, and tiny homes**.
- D. One commenter noted a need to create or **foster destinations within neighborhoods**, not just downtown.

Website Feedback: 46 additional comments

- E. **Affordable housing** comments garnered by far **the most support of any category of online comments**. Specifically, there was support for more affordable housing that is accessible to more people in more locations throughout the city.
 - a. Comments related to affordable housing highlighted issues related to **housing cost burden, affordable housing for older adults, affordable housing downtown for students, and housing for families**.
- F. Overall, there were 14 comments about development issues, though comments expressed varying viewpoints. About half of these **comments tied development and housing supply to housing affordability**, calling for relaxed regulations and fewer barriers to building housing developments, including **less development oversight by homeowner associations and neighborhood associations**. Other comments argued for greater neighborhood oversight of development.
 - a. Example comments:
 - i. "In order to build enough housing, neighborhood plans that were written by incumbent, well-to-do homeowners will have to be ignored. They were written to protect existing home values-- not a prob today!"
 - ii. "Above all, the city and its committees should respect the wishes of neighborhoods in the planning process & not simply roll over them like an armored vehicle. Begin & end with neighborhoods not committees."
- G. Four comments called for more **mixed-income housing developments in new development and existing neighborhoods**.
- H. Five comments were in support of **accessory dwelling units and tiny homes**, noting that the city should work to remove barriers to building these units.

Resident Panels: 64 additional comments

- I. Five different community groups identified lack of **affordable housing as a major issue affecting Madison**, and further emphasized the need for transportation and amenities around affordable housing development. Community groups also emphasized the urgency for affordable housing, and suggested infill development in abandoned spaces throughout the city as possible sites for low-income housing, and also called for better monitoring of current housing programs.
- J. Community groups spoke out about homelessness, and the need to de-criminalize homelessness and the need for more **housing programs directed towards people experiencing homelessness**.
- K. Some comments were wary of development, and wanted to ensure that new businesses would strengthen the neighborhood. One example was the Plasma Center on Allied Drive, which one commenter felt brought drug activity.
- L. One community group highlighted **driving and ride services** that accompany older adults to appointments and on errands as a key strategy, allowing older adults to age in place.
- M. **Housing cooperatives, boarding houses, and communal living spaces** were identified as ways to provide more choices and fight housing insecurity, but community groups stressed that these organizations and spaces must be fully accessible to, inclusive of, and supportive of all people, especially TNBGNC, LGBTQ+, POC, QTPOC, disabled people, undocumented people, and older adults.
- N. **Community gardens** are supported as a strategy by many different community groups, and window and terrace gardens have also been specified as important strategies for food production.

- O. Strategy 10 prompted many **diverse viewpoints about public safety and community relationships with police between different community groups**, and sometimes within the same community groups. Some community groups called for greater police presence in the city, but many other community groups indicated distrust of the police force and explicitly called for reduced police presence and surveillance, indicating that police presence actually destabilized community safety due to increased aggressive interactions, incarcerations, and decreased employment.

New Strategy Ideas

- i. Explicitly call out housing cost burden at 30% of income or less as a marker of housing affordability, or otherwise define affordable housing in the Comp Plan strategies. (Web, RP)
- ii. Support tiny homes and accessory dwelling units to help with housing affordability (Web, CM), but not necessarily as a solution for people experiencing homelessness. (RP)
- iii. **Missing middle ideas:** “Amsterdam-style low-rises with a town square...infill”(Web) “Madison should land-bank individual ‘show’ houses to rebuild single family homes ...into sustainable [buildings with] basements and 2nd story for resale.” (CM)
- iv. Create an ombudsman ...[to] talk about issues with building managers. (RP)
- v. Encourage more transportation options specifically tailored older adults to allow more older adults to age-in-place. (RP)
- vi. Older adults need affordable housing (Web), and come comments offered ideas about intergenerational housing as well.
- vii. Explicitly name categories of “vulnerable residents” from Strategy 5. (RP)
- viii. Add strategy language about condition of housing and the responsibilities of landlords. (RP)

Staff Discussion:

Throughout this topic area and across feedback methods, community members stressed the need for affordable housing in Madison, with an emphasis on the location of housing, accessibility from and to housing, and integration of affordable housing in neighborhoods with many amenities. Some respondents were also in favor of mixed-income housing throughout Madison, and others wanted to encourage more amenities in all neighborhoods rather than locate affordable housing in areas that already have amenities. There is a sense that focusing on locating housing in areas that already have amenities, rather than improving established residential areas with more amenities and greater connection, will create further inequities.

One strategy to providing more housing units that was mentioned in many different feedback methods was encouraging more accessory dwelling units (ADU) and tiny homes to be built in Madison. Accessory dwelling units could be a strategy to lowering housing costs in the city by providing unit renters a cheaper rent than other developments while also providing homeowners with a supplementary income. Portland, OR has a very successful ADU program, with clear instructions about how to navigate the process on their website: (<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bds/36676>).

The public seems divided and unsure as to whether the private sector and developers will provide affordable housing in Madison. Some comments called for more development and trust in the private market, but some comments expressed distrust in developers.

Finally, community groups called into question the use of the word “support,” noting that more clarification was needed about what types of support would be provided by the city – funding, programming, etc. Detailing the implementation plans for some of these strategies in Phase 3 will help alleviate these questions.



Goal: Madison will have a growing, diversified economy that offers opportunity for businesses and residents to prosper.

Goal: Madison will have equitable education and advancement opportunities that meet the needs of each resident.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Provide support (e.g. transportation, daycare, credit repair, or diversion programs) to those who need assistance to achieve economic stability .	47	27	57	131
2	The City should lead and encourage other employers to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of the workforce.	26	28	47	101
3	Support efforts for businesses and consumers to buy local .	42	24	33	99
4	Support small businesses and cultivate business startups, including businesses owned by people of color.	33	27	58	118
5	Ensure there is a sufficient supply of developable sites for office, research and development, and industrial uses.	8	6	6	20
6	Develop more jobs that pay a family-supporting living wage for all workers.	46	31	53	130
7	Ensure access to affordable high speed internet service for residents, businesses, and institutions.	27	33	34	94
8	Provide services that support high school graduation and GED attainment, career guidance , and work placement to youth and residents facing barriers to employment.	41	19	56	116
9	Focus resources on retail, nontraditional and local food, nutrition incentives, procurement policies, zoning, and education to improve access to nutritious, affordable, culturally appropriate food.	15	18	29	62
10	Work to close the educational achievement gap .	50	29	51	130

Key: **CM** – Community Meeting Feedback; **Web** – Website Feedback; **RP** – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support High support

Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: 19 additional comments

- A. Overall, Strategy 10, stating “to close the **educational achievement gap**,” received broad support at Community Meetings.
 - a. One commenter noted the need to “focus on early childhood readiness.”
- B. Another commenter illuminated the need to “**identify the root causes of poverty and eradicate it.**”
- C. Participants strongly favored Strategy 1, emphasizing the need to provide support to “those who need

assistance to achieve **economic stability.**"

- D. Two comments called for the City to provide **"training and incubators" for small businesses.**

Website Feedback: 30 additional comments

- E. The topic area that received the most comments was the **local food sector**. Community members would like greater access to buy local food at affordable prices.
- a. Additionally, one commenter emphasized the need to improve regional connectivity to facilitate the trade of local food throughout the state.
- F. Three comments highlighted the need to increase school capacity and resources to help "retain residents in the district and provide **greater opportunity and equity for students.**"
- G. Comments that called for more **diverse career opportunities and competitive amenities** to help retain youth earned broad support.
- a. Example comment:
 - "Our city relies too heavily on state employees, UW employees and Epic employees. We need to be more business friendly to attract a wider variety of businesses so UW graduates will stay here."
- H. Participants stressed the need to **fight poverty and crime by identifying and addressing the long-term causes** of these issues.
- a. One comment called for the City to, "focus on fixing problems that cause crime instead of jailing those who commit crimes of poverty."
- I. Two comments advocated "for a need for a higher minimum wage to be a livable wage."

Resident Panels: 57 additional comments

- J. Community groups **strongly supported Strategy 1.**
- a. One community group called for childcare providers to be representative of different community groups noting, "The workers should have similar backgrounds/cultures to those they are assisting."
- K. Strategy 10 prompted many **diverse comments about working to close the educational achievement gap.**
- a. Community groups emphasized the need to increase access to quality education for underrepresented students and provide greater financial resources.
 - b. One community group, in particular, called for more diverse educators and administrators in the school district to represent the diverse community noting, "Provide greater support to Hmong students and hire more Hmong teachers and administrators."
- L. Community groups spoke out about the need to **prioritize economic development and opportunity for underrepresented community groups** to address socioeconomic inequalities.
- a. Example comment:
 - "Solving the economic dilemma will, to them, solve and close many if not most of the gaps and disparities that have been chronicled for decades in education, employment, wealth, incarceration, health, business ownership, and family stability."
- M. There was broad support to **"increase the racial and ethnic diversity of the workforce."** However, one community group "felt the City isn't equitable in its **support of the Hmong community** compared to the African American and Latino community." They urge the City to "hire more Hmong administrators or at least more Hmong working with the City to help open the door to City funding and support."
- N. Participants favored **supporting local businesses and entrepreneurs**, especially as it relates to underrepresented community groups. One community group, in particular, expressed concerns about the "complex tax forms" businesses must file and called for the City to provide financial literacy training.
- a. Example comment:
 - "There is no assistance for small businesses; the Department of Revenue lies to the people with complex forms and without someone to explain what to do."
- O. Comments regarding Strategy 5 referenced a **preference for "re-use of sites"** (i.e. the term "developable" may have been confusing).
- a. One community group noted, "There was confusion as to the feasibility of the goal. This confusion also supported feelings of less than genuine community engagement."


New Strategy Ideas

- i. Community members would like more resources and assistance to obtain financial, computer, and document literacy, especially as it relates to business and personal taxes. (Web, RP)
- ii. More diverse career opportunities and competitive amenities to help retain the youth. (Web, RP)
 - o Community members called for the City to “develop a dynamic, digitally accessible asset map.”
- iii. Support and collaborate with the City’s school districts to increase school capacity and opportunities for all students. (Web, RP)
- iv. Increase access to quality education and employment opportunities for underrepresented community groups. (RP)

Staff Discussion:

There is a significant difference among feedback from web participants compared to community groups and Community Meeting participants regarding equity-focused strategies. Underrepresented community groups explicitly call for the City to prioritize socioeconomic equity, including access to education and employment opportunities for traditionally underrepresented communities. While web participants provided comments that favored supporting students, small businesses, and closing socioeconomic disparities, they gave a low level of votes on strategies addressing these topics.

Additionally, participants would like an asset and amenities map to identify geographic needs and areas of development. Strategy 5 caused confusion and uncertainty among community groups, and garnered little support. Some comments relating to Strategy 5 referenced a preference for re-use of sites over “developable” (i.e. the term “developable” might have been confusing). Lastly, residents inquired about the feasibility of some of the strategies, and called for clear metrics, especially for Strategy 10 regarding the educational achievement gap.



Goal: Madison will be a vibrant and creative city that values and builds upon its cultural and historic assets.

Goal: Madison will have a unique character and strong sense of place in its neighborhoods and the city as a whole.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Engage visual artists, writers, and performers as collaborators in public art by providing for a variety of artistic expression in the public realm .	22	20	27	69
2	Create and maintain historic districts and properties to preserve the special places that reflect our varied cultures and histories.	31	33	36	100
3	Balance the concentration of cultural venues within the downtown and UW campus with venues in other areas of the city.	18	19	30	67
4	Identify and protect historically and culturally significant First Nations/ Native American sites .	36	37	30	103
5	Integrate public art into City facilities, public spaces, and private developments.	36	28	29	93
6	Maintain and create memorable places through creative architecture and urban design .	36	33	22	91
7	Seek partnerships with arts and community organizations to strengthen arts and cultural programming , especially in underserved communities.	40	30	44	114
8	Partner with area cultural organizations to celebrate our multicultural city through events, exhibits, and by creating dedicated spaces where people can learn about other cultures.	35	23	43	101
9	Preserve defining views of the lakes, downtown skyline, and State Capitol.	55	40	23	118
10	Create safe and affirming spaces that are social outlets for marginalized residents, such as youth, people of color, LGBTQIA, and people with disabilities.	32	18	41	91

Key: **CM** – Community Meeting Feedback; **Web** – Website Feedback; **RP** – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support High support



Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: 12 additional comments

- B. Community Meeting comments varied greatly regarding topics like food, theater, access to nature, and more. There were no primary themes.
- a. Example comments:
- “Connect kids with nature!”
 - “In any event, culturally important food will be part of the experience”
 - “Provide financial incentives when designating privately-owned properties as historic landmarks.”

Website: 45 additional comments

- C. There were four comments discussing affordability. Specifically, these comments highlighted concerns about the lack of affordable housing throughout the city, and the lack of affordable activities to do during the evenings.
- a. Example comments:
- “Overall, I have welcomed infill and mixed use. We must not however push out the working class with high rents.”
 - “Push back against attempts to keep low-income housing segregated from wealthier neighborhoods.”
- D. **Open space** was discussed in six comments. These comments focused largely on the importance of **maintaining the quality of the lakes and improving community accessibility to the lakes**. These comments also discussed the need for more green spaces, including pocket parks and prairie restorations.
- a. Example comments:
- “Clean up the lakes, keep them healthy and provide access to lake shorelines. Convert more open space to prairie restorations and plant native trees to replace ash. Consider urban orchards.”
 - “Maintain green space throughout the city for gathering places and to support the natural health of the citizens and lakes.”
- E. Diversity was discussed in six comments, covering **gentrification, funding for spaces for non-white community members, public art created by diverse people**, and more. Overall, the diversity comments had a high level of support.
- a. Example comments:
- “Connect nonprofits with city organizations to create public art made by local youth, students, intergenerational. Stop/slow gentrification of S. Park Street; improve resources for original residents”
 - “Fund black, Latino, Hmong, and other minority cultural centers by direct funding without making it for white Madison liberal consumption”
- F. **The form of the city, including character, density, and ‘smart growth,’** was discussed in 11 comments. Six of these comments discussed the need to preserve and create unique buildings, noting that many buildings look “cookie-cutter.”
- a. Example comments:
- “Madison is not showing any creativity in the monstrosities that have been built lately. [In my humble opinion], it could be anywhere, USA: All angular, boxy, bad color choices, and cheap building materials.”
 - “Urban infill can limit sprawl and the conversion of high quality farmland to subdivisions. It’s not so good when the height of buildings changes the historic character of the skyline dramatically.”
 - “Build, baby, build! Adding density will bring more people closer together, which is the recipe for innovation -- both cultural and economic.”

Resident Panels:

- A. Much of the community group comments discussed the need for **a more diverse set of cultural programming**. More cultural programming included culturally specific libraries, museums, centers, courses, events, and other designated spaces.

- B. Comments also stated that the **larger community is often not aware of cultural events**, stating, “Frequently people outside a particular cultural community group are not aware of the learning opportunities that already exist, due to lack of central mechanism for promoting these activities.”
 - a. Community groups discussed how they think diverse spaces and events should occur naturally, instead of being created by the City government. A community group stated that their “discussion led to why it doesn’t happen naturally. The answers were economic based (meaning people of color generally don’t have the disposable time/income to participate) and density based (meaning that there are not enough people of color in the city to create diverse spaces).”
- C. There were also comments stating that the **set of cultures celebrated in Madison is limited**. For example, members of the Hmong community felt that other cultures were celebrated in Madison, but that more could be done to celebrate Hmong culture. This community group also stated that there are **not amenities or services in the city that accommodate the Hmong community’s traditions**, including: “Currently it is difficult to find a funeral home that will allow the Hmong community to fully practice funeral rites that take 4 days (Fri – Mon). Thus having a Hmong Cultural Center that allowed the Hmong to practice their culture was really important.”
- D. Having **safe spaces** was also often stated as a priority, and something that community groups felt was lacking.
 - a. Example comment:
 - “Create safe and affirming spaces that are social outlets for marginalized residents, such as homeless.”

New Strategy Ideas:

- i. Adapt public spaces to meet the needs of diverse cultures and traditions. (RP)
- ii. Increase the dog-friendliness of the city, including at lakefronts and businesses. (Web)
- iii. Explore win-win ways to transform conflicts, reach consensus, build community, and raise consciousness. (CM)
- iv. More intergenerational services for older adults and youth. (RP)
- v. Increase inexpensive late-night activities (not focused on drinking). (Web)
- vi. Preserve existing art. (Web)
- vii. Place an importance on culturally related food at cultural and community events. (CM, Web)
- viii. Provide cultural presentations at elementary schools at a variety of times/days. (RP, Web)
- ix. Use Frank Lloyd Wright’s principle of integrating buildings into the natural landscape as a guiding principle for planners. (Web)
- x. Creative unique buildings. (RP, Web)
- xi. Promote training in architecture and craftsmanship to maintain the city’s structures. (Web)
- xii. Use cultural assets to help market the city as a unique tourism destination. (CM)
- xiii. Provide increased funding for new art projects. (CM)

Staff Discussion:

The strategies cover having safe spaces and multicultural events. However, the strategies do not discuss the need for spaces and resources for cultural traditions, like funeral services and family celebrations.

“Create safe and affirming spaces that are social outlets for marginalized residents, such as youth, people of color, LGBTQIA, and people with disabilities.” was given a high level of votes by community groups and Community Meeting participants, compared to other strategies. However, this strategy was given a low level of votes via the website, compared to other strategies – thus creating a low total of votes within the matrix.

Conversely, “Preserve defining views of the lakes, downtown skyline, and State Capitol.” was given the highest level of votes by Community Meeting participants and the website, but was given a low level of votes by community groups, compared to other Strategies.



Goal: Madison will be a leader in stewardship of our land, air, and water resources.

Goal: Madison will have a model park and open space system that preserves our significant natural features and offers spaces for recreation and bringing residents together.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Acquire parkland, improve facilities, and add events, especially in underserved areas of the city, while innovatively managing costs.	38	32	44	114
2	Use parks and open spaces as a framework for development of an interconnected greenway, habitat, nature access, and path system.	40	42	28	110
3	Develop a healthy and diverse urban tree canopy.	36	65	14	115
4	Improve public access to the lakes and seek opportunities to further protect shoreline areas.	46	40	39	125
5	Expand the use of green infrastructure (e.g. rain gardens, greenways, and pervious pavement) for stormwater management.	31	63	31	125
6	Reduce the use of road salt to prevent groundwater contamination.	26	44	28	98
7	Divert organic waste from landfills through municipal curbside pick-up and increased home composting.	35	44	21	100
8	Improve the recycling system by expanding markets for materials and eliminating barriers to recycling.	17	37	27	81
9	Make energy efficiency upgrades to City facilities and private buildings and increase our use of renewable energy sources to reduce pollution and address climate change.	33	32	33	98
10	Encourage food production practices that support safe conditions, sustainable management (e.g. soil conservation), and ecosystem services (e.g. pollinator protection) for farming and gardening.	24	36	25	85
11	Encourage all water utility customers to practice water conservation techniques to reduce demand for water.	14	28	27	69

Key: **CM** – Community Meeting Feedback; **Web** – Website Feedback; **RP** – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support

High support

Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: 32 additional comments

- A. Five comments gathered over four different Community Meetings discussed **the water quality of Madison's lakes** and suggest a system or regional approach to reducing toxins in the lakes.
- B. Three additional comments focused on energy, including **energy efficiency and preserving space for renewable energy production** at sub-stations in the city.
- C. Three comments addressed different issues associated with **waste and consumption, including suggestions to expand the city's compost program**, introduce fees for disposing of household waste, and expand education about what can be recycled and how to recycle in the city.
- D. Three comments called for **edible urban landscapes, including fruit trees and vertical gardening**.
- E. One comment called for **minimizing light pollution** in Madison.

Website: 75 additional comments

- F. The **urban tree canopy**, a term which Imagine Madison is using to refer both to trees that are lining the streets and also trees that are in public spaces such as parks and plazas, was by far the most popular topic for website feedback in the *Green & Resilient* category. All 19 of these comments **were in favor of more urban trees** and preservation of existing trees. These 19 comments garnered a total of **402 votes of support**.
 - a. Three of the comments specified a desire for **underground power lines** in connection with street trees.
 - b. Some comments connected trees with new development, calling for **development regulations that are more supportive of planting new trees**.
 - c. Some comments tied trees to other city goals, like fiscal health and energy efficiency through passive cooling.
- G. Comments in support of **edible landscapes** were highly supported. Comments specified urban agriculture and fruit trees, citing benefits such as pollinator health.
- H. Eleven comments mentioned the cleanliness and **water quality of the lakes around Madison** and beach closings as an issue, which produced 166 votes of support. Many of these comments took a holistic approach to the problem, and suggested detailed strategies such as protecting against agricultural and chemical contaminants, preserving and restoring wetlands, increasing infiltration, and promoting or requiring green infrastructure in public parks and new development.
- I. Many web respondents called for greater stewardship of city land, and suggested that urban habitat, new park and public spaces, and urban farmland are promoted and preserved.
- J. Comments about energy were also popular, with three comments about **energy efficiency** and three about **renewable energy production** in the city, especially solar and wind.
- K. Three comments **about lighting and light pollution in the city** proved in conflict with each other. Two comments called for less bright lighting at night ("Adopt Dark Sky goals, protect the night skies for present/future generations, promote responsible outdoor lighting, educate the public/policymakers so children can see sky full of stars and planets.") while another comment called for more night lighting to keep spaces safe around the city.
- L. Ten comments called for **improvements to and expansion of the city parks system**.
 - a. Several comments called for greater amenities and programmed open spaces in the city parks, including more spaces to sit, picnic, play games, and exercise.
 - b. Three comments specified that dogs needed to be able to access parks, especially downtown, and that an off-leash dog park was needed downtown.

Resident Panels: 32 additional comments

- M. Several community groups explicitly stated **that this category of goals and strategies were not as much of a focus area for their communities, because there were other more pressing issues for them**. One community group expressed concern that these goals may stand in the way of the goals that are elevating and focusing on people of color.
- N. Three community groups suggested that **explicit statements about people of color and equity** be added to the strategies in this section.
- O. Community groups would like to see **equal investment** given to providing new parks and public spaces in underserved communities throughout Madison, and in maintaining existing parks in underserved communities.
- P. Several community groups also stressed the importance **of recycling education and increasing recycling**

services.

- Q. One community group commented that **privatized lakefronts hinder lake health**, as the public cannot take charge of clean-up efforts.
- R. Several community groups also connected youth engagement with this category, remarking that open space and **parks should be places for youth to participate in organized activities** to keep them active and engaged.
- S. One community group noted the trade-off between **reducing salt use in the winter and providing accessible public walking areas**, especially for older adults.
- T. The Hmong community groups especially felt that **public parks and open spaces could not accommodate the types of events and gatherings that are important to their community members**, nor do they provide appropriate facilities for traditional games such as *Tuj Lub* a top-spinning game that requires a special court.

New Strategy Ideas

- i. Require or encourage new development and new construction in the City of Madison to achieve a greater level of energy efficiency than currently mandated by the State. (CM)
- ii. Improve and expand the downtown waterfront, especially Law Park and the plan for a park over John Nolan Drive. (Web)
- iii. Address water quality of the lakes around Madison. (Web, RP)
- iv. Bury power lines to help expand and preserve the street tree network. (Web)
- v. Incorporate strategies not only about using renewable energy, but also about producing it. (Web)
- vi. Explicitly address issues of accessibility and equity in this topic area. (RP)
- vii. Create a public boardwalk along the lakefront areas, possibly for biking. (Web)

Staff Discussion:

Madison's urban tree canopy is one of the topics in the Green and Resilient category that received uneven support from different methods of community engagement. The issue of diversifying and expanding the network of street trees and city-maintained trees was the most popular draft strategy with those giving feedback through the website, with 65 votes of support for the strategy. There were 17 additional comments about trees through the website. In contrast, participants of community groups gave the tree canopy strategy the least amount of support of any strategy in this bucket and none of community groups provided any additional comments about trees.

This discrepancy is a great example of the diverse perspectives that Imagine Madison has been able to gain through this community feedback process, but also a reminder that Madison residents have differing priorities, which will have to be balanced in Phase 3 of this process.

The idea that more facilities and infrastructure is needed in public parks appears across methods of public feedback. The Hmong community groups especially felt that public parks and open spaces do not accommodate the types of events and gatherings that are important to their community members – it is worth noting that [St. Paul has recently incorporated some tuj lub courts in their public parks](#) to better accommodate the needs of the Hmong community. Some web comments also addressed the fact that some city parks are large, empty fields, with insufficient spaces for families to gather.



Goal: Madison will have efficient and reliable public utilities, facilities, and services that support all residents.

Goal: Madison will collaborate with other governmental and non-governmental entities to improve efficiency and achieve shared goals.

#	Strategy	Votes			Total
		CM	Web	RP	
1	Work with state and local elected officials to create a regional transportation authority as a mechanism to expand and improve public transit services in the Madison area.	56	36	35	127
2	Efficiently place community facilities , such as fire stations, to provide a high level of service to all neighborhoods .	16	9	29	54
3	Ensure that new development occurs in locations that can be economically and efficiently served with City utilities, facilities and services to minimize costs borne by the public .	21	22	27	70
4	Work with adjacent municipalities and regional jurisdictions to preserve long-term options for orderly and efficient city expansion .	24	13	14	51
5	Co-locate community facilities such as libraries and community centers, and design for future adaptability to improve service provision and reduce capital and operating costs .	35	24	27	86
6	Establish partnerships with other governments and entities to improve service delivery and reduce duplicative services .	24	18	21	63
7	Pursue regional solutions to regional issues such as transportation, land use, open space, water quality, and environmental resources.	54	31	19	104

Key: CM – Community Meeting Feedback; Web – Website Feedback; RP – Resident Panel Feedback

Low support

High support

Within each type of feedback (Community Meetings, Web, and Resident Panels), the count of votes are displayed as a different color from low to high, helping to visually rank support for each strategy within each feedback method. This gradient is meant as a summarization tool only, and is not meant for statistical analysis.

Community Meetings: Nine additional comments

A. Community Meeting comments varied greatly regarding Services and Facilities covering topics like behavioral health services, open data, improving city facilities, and more. There were no primary themes.

a. Example comments:

- “Access to mental health and healthcare services.”
- “Open all city data sources and flows to public access with good interfaces, develop smart city.”
- “Increase affordable/free access to internet”
- “Actively involve all city departments in resilience planning to enable the city to meet the goals set forth in the ‘adaptability’ lens.”

Website: 24 additional comments

- B. Regional transit comments (two total) and public transit comments (six total) received high levels of support.
- a. Regarding regional transit, one comment stated: “We need regional mass transit that includes, Madison, Middleton, Monona, Maple Bluff, Sun Prairie, Fitchburg, Waunakee, Oregon, McFarland and points in-between.” Another comment echoed this sentiment, but included Minneapolis and Chicago as connection points.
 - a. Regarding public transit, multiple community members expressed the need for bus service later in the evenings – highlighting the long wait times at transfer points. A website comment stated that bus service later in the evening would be especially useful for those “who work at night and for residents and visitors who would prefer not to drive after nightlife/entertainment.”
 - These sentiments were repeated in comments within the Neighborhood and Housing, and Form and Connectivity topics.
- C. High speed internet service was discussed in three comments. Specifically, these comments stated the need for free Wi-Fi in public spaces, faster internet speeds, and increased access to internet service. An example comment stated, “The current [internet] options in Madison are unreliable and too expensive. Better internet service can contribute to equity of access.”
- D. The comment, “City-wide composting, please!” received the highest level of support of all comments in this category.

Resident Panels:

- E. The need for spaces specifically dedicated to particular community groups was stated multiple times. Two examples are having a Hmong cultural center and a Hmong funeral home, and having a housing shelter for LGBTQIA+ community members only. Furthermore, there were comments stating the need for an increased sense of safety and affirmation throughout the city generally.
- a. Example comment:
 - “Trans womyn, femmes, and nonbinary people of color, especially Black trans womyn need to be welcomed and affirmed within the facilities and facility spaces they claim are for them.”
 - Note: Culture and Character currently has a strategy regarding creating safe spaces.
- F. Community groups expressed the need for public facilities and services to be expanded to areas of the city that are currently underserved. For instance, there was concern that fire stations are not distributed evenly throughout the city. The need for public services also included public transit, with comments expressing the need for more frequent bus stops, and for a regional transit system connecting Madison to nearby cities, like Milwaukee.
- G. A need for increased accessibility to government facilities and programs was stated multiple times. For example, community groups stated that government facilities typically have hours of operation that make it difficult for many to come to the facilities. Community groups also expressed that government programs, like committee meetings, are often difficult to attend as well, due to the time-of-day that they take place.
- a. Example comment:
 - “Significantly expand the hours of operation for public service centers (e.g. City Hall, anywhere that residents must make appointments to participate and flourish as individuals and as part of their communities/civic life). People should not have to leave their jobs in the middle of the day and/or feel their job security is threatened in order to secure these necessary services.”
- H. Providing incentives for businesses to be inclusive was also stated as an idea.
- a. Example comment:
 - “Accord seals or stamps (e.g. Better Business Bureau) to independently owned local businesses that drastically improve in the areas of centering, affirming, and making their facilities/services safer for QTPOC, TNBGNC, and multiply marginalized individuals and communities. Examples of this include: constantly correct pronoun and name usage, gender neutral bathrooms, explicitly stating their spaces do not tolerate racism, sexism, transmisogyny, ableism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, etc.”

New Strategy Ideas

- i. Provide incentives for businesses to be inclusive. (RP)
- ii. Expand the number of days that public facilities are open and their hours of operation, including community centers. (RP, Web)
- iii. Diversify the times-of-day that government meetings take place, including committee meetings. (RP)
- iv. Open City data for public access, with a user-friendly interface. (CM)
- v. Renovate City facilities (to support workers and foster creativity). (CM)
- vi. Increase the number of locations that provide free Wi-Fi. (RP, CM, Web)
- vii. Increase access to mental health and healthcare services. (CM)
- viii. Increase the number of Park and Ride areas for those that live in outlying areas who work in central areas. (CM)
- ix. Create covered bike parking at bus stops. (Web)
- x. Facilitate the development of regional mass transit. (RP, Web)
- xi. Increase the frequency of bus stops at night. (Web)
- xii. Increase the number of police officers. (Web)
- xiii. Place utility lines underground, where above ground lines are still present. (Web)

Staff Discussion:

An overarching theme was the need for greater access to public facilities and government processes. It was apparent that the times-of-day that public meetings take place is not convenient for many. Additionally, the hours of operation of public facilities was also stated as inconvenient. The inability for community groups to participate in government processes and visit city buildings greatly inhibits their ability to receive needed services and express their opinions, needs, and desires to the City of Madison government.

“Efficiently place community facilities, such as fire stations, to provide a high level of service to all neighborhoods.” was given the most votes by community groups with 29 votes. However, this strategy was given the least votes via the website with 9 votes.

“Pursue regional solutions to regional issues such as transportation, land use, open space, water quality, and environmental resources.” was given a high level of votes via the website and Community Meetings, compared to other strategies. However, it received a low level of votes from community groups, compared to other strategies.