

Hi Tesha,

I do have some comments related to the issues summary document. I'm sure this will be a continued discussion, but I'm not sure how in-depth the discussion will be this afternoon, so I wanted to at least send over some of my main thoughts. Also, can I get a copy of any information presented regarding the Finance Committee Amendment? Thanks!

- If we're making a recommendations of CF of soil, does that include a max depth for measurement? I could potentially see that as a loop hole, so I think that should be documented with the CF requirement.

- Low-fencing may not be advisable if there is adjacent street parking, etc. as this would present a tripping hazard. Any fixed vertical structures should be a minimum of 2 ft. from the back of curb as well. Who installs and maintains this fence?

- A 12 ft. minimum setback to other objects around trees could also be difficult to achieve in many instances. As we're all aware, there are a number of other objects in the terraces (bike racks, pedestrian scale lighting and main street lighting, parking meters, fire hydrants, signs, etc.). A number of these items are related to public safety and/or to meet already established streetscape themes and amenities throughout the City. As a City, we also want to promote all modes of transportation, so terraces often include bike racks and pads for bus stops. How would all of these items be prioritized?

- Engineering has some reservations about making the soil volume or silva cell requirement with redevelopments. This will need to be a broader discussion, and I'm sure that's the expectation of the group. Not only is this a costly measure (roughly \$8,000 per tree), this is also something that would need to be mapped and marked with any digger's hotline requests. How does this information get tracked, mapped, etc.? What happens with any future utility work such as boring in a fiber optic line or new gas main? Could other options be considered, as well, such as green roofs? I believe the document also mentions additional private canopy trees as a consideration, so I like that as an option.

- I like the incentives idea, and I also think that pairing tree plantings with stormwater treatment is an excellent idea. The stormwater treatment areas can take up a significant amount of space, so being able to also plant trees in those areas would be beneficial. This could be applied both on private properties with their stormwater management devices to meet DNR regulations, or potentially with our terrace rain garden program.

- A large construction barrier (dependent on drip line) may be difficult to implement due to necessary utility work for sewer and water services to properties. We could look at extending the current 5 ft. requirement, using construction fencing around particular trees and/or reviewing the construction tolerances on a tree-by-tree basis, similar to what Engineering currently does during walk-throughs of project areas with Forestry staff, but that 5 ft. requirement has generally been the standard.

- We recommend maintaining the current minimum standard of a 5 ft. sidewalk in new developments. While ADA guidelines allow for public walks to be 4 ft. minimum, over time grass and soil start to build up around the edges, which would reduce the effective width below that

minimum. Also, the ADA required turning space for a wheel chair is 5 ft. minimum. This could be at intersections for street crossings, or anywhere along the sidewalk to turn off of the public sidewalk and up the front walk to any of the newly constructed properties. The current standard street sections provides a terrace width in a new plat of 8 ft. to the face of curb (7.5 ft. of grass).

**Jim Wolfe, P.E.**

Engineer 4

City of Madison - Engineering

Rm 115, City-County Building

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd

608.266.4099 (ph)

608.264.9275 (fax)

[jwolfe@cityofmadison.com](mailto:jwolfe@cityofmadison.com)