

## Begin Email String

**From:** Sallie Anna Steiner <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Sunday, February 3, 2019 2:57 PM

**To:** Knepp, Eric <EKnepp@cityofmadison.com>

**Cc:** Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>; Lerner, Sarah <SLerner@cityofmadison.com>

**Subject:** Re: No huge parking lot at James Madison!

Thanks for the feedback. I look forward to following this planning and construction as it proceeds.

Sallie Anna

---

On Wed, Jan 30, 2019 at 12:15 PM Knepp, Eric <EKnepp@cityofmadison.com> wrote:

Sallie –

Thanks for writing in on this topic. I'm fairly familiar with Richard Florida and his work with City Lab. A lot of interesting stuff there. While I too have concerns around how automobiles influence our culture/society, I do not see the work to plan for modest parking for visitors to JMP from across the community as elevating or prioritizing automobiles. The goal is to strike a balance and to do so in a manner that is considerate of the vast array of visitors to JMP and recognizing that for a significant number of Madisonians walking/biking/bussing to a park on the lake is not viable at this time. Madison Parks has worked a lot over the past years to improve multi-modal access to our park system (e.g. bike racks, paths, bicycle, bus stops). This work on promoting a multi-modal accessible park system is also embedded in the recently adopted Park and Open Space Plan which for the first time took a detailed look at walkability, bikeability, and public transit accessibility for the park system.

Staff have been working on an alternative design to be presented to the Parks Commission that incorporates feedback received. The parking near the proposed new shelter and active area is important in balancing the array of factors involved here. Certainly, we are taking a look at ways to reduce any disconnection from the greenspace and vistas for pedestrians (and to an extent passing cars). Leaving the parking where it is AND moving the basketball courts farther away (the movement of the courts has to my knowledge been almost universally supported) would in many ways replicate or worsen existing issues related to proximity of amenities for visitors to the park (not just those that drive).

Again, thanks for your input on this important topic.

Thanks,

**Eric M. Knepp**

**Madison Parks Superintendent**

608.266.4711

[www.cityofmadison.com/parks](http://www.cityofmadison.com/parks)

Like us on [Facebook](#). Follow us on Twitter [@PlayMadison](#).

---

**From:** Sallie Anna Steiner <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, January 28, 2019 6:47 PM

**To:** Zellers, Ledell <[district2@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district2@cityofmadison.com)>

**Cc:** Knepp, Eric <[EKnepp@cityofmadison.com](mailto:EKnepp@cityofmadison.com)>; Lerner, Sarah <[SLerner@cityofmadison.com](mailto:SLerner@cityofmadison.com)>

**Subject:** Re: No huge parking lot at James Madison!

Hello:

Cars don't need a place to rest; people do! The park should prioritize human bodies resting, not automotive ones.

While the current parking lot is indeed more "impermeable" as you say, I think this also keeps it out of the way and takes the focus away from parking and cars and prioritizes the green space and the view of the lake. There are few other places in Madison where one can drive or walk along a road and have a view of the lake, unimpeded by a layer of concrete and cars in view. I worry that a parking lot constructed all along the Gorham roadway would deprive passer-by of this already rare view and cut them off from immediate access to the greenspace. I think the parking as it currently exists could be expanded to make it more permeable than it currently is, but I think keeping the parking lot somewhat out of the way should actually be a goal with the park renovation.

Our social relationship with cars and roads already cuts us off from each other so much; why help them out more? [https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2018/07/how-cars-divide-america/565148/?fbclid=IwAR0uPtQwglIyhelPvqds\\_2z57vLgdxik9B2\\_xgJq0UJd\\_Ag676Boy1myjms](https://www.citylab.com/transportation/2018/07/how-cars-divide-america/565148/?fbclid=IwAR0uPtQwglIyhelPvqds_2z57vLgdxik9B2_xgJq0UJd_Ag676Boy1myjms)

Sallie Anna

■ E Gorham Street Apt ■

---

On Mon, Dec 17, 2018 at 10:15 AM Zellers, Ledell <[district2@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district2@cityofmadison.com)> wrote:

Hello Ms Steiner,

Thanks for reaching out about this important park.

Vehicle parking tends to be controversial wherever there are cars seeking to find a place to "rest". This particular park is a community park, rather than a neighborhood park. As such, one of the goals of the proposed master plan was to maintain equivalent parking

availability. So the new parking in the park is a *replacement* of the current lot; it does not provide additional new parking. The intent also is to make the new parking area and drive aisles permeable. The current parking lot is impermeable. While viscerally my preference would be to get rid of parking in the park, that would not be equitable or fair since James Madison Park is used by people from across our community and is one of our most diverse parks in terms of ethnicity and race of users. A goal was to continue that park use.

Thanks again for your engagement and caring about Madison parks.  
Best,  
Ledell

Alder Ledell Zellers  
608 417 9521

To subscribe to District 2 updates go  
to: <http://www.cityofmadison.com/council/district2/>

---

**From:** Sallie Anna Steiner <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 13, 2018 6:17 PM  
**To:** Park Commission; Zellers, Ledell  
**Subject:** No huge parking lot at James Madison!

A simple request from your constituents:

Keep James Madison Park's green space and recreation space intact! No huge parking lot additions!

Sallie Anna and Krystian

■ E Gorham Street Apt ■

Madison WI 53703

**End Email String**

---

**From:** Jackie Suska <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2019 11:02 AM  
**To:** Lerner, Sarah <SLerner@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** JMP- Additional Parking Option

Dear Sarah,

We wanted to reach out to you before the next BOPC meeting on 2/13. Thanks again for meeting with us prior to the last one.

It's safe to say that many of us want the same thing from the master plan: a redesigned shelter, accessibility, and the preservation of what people love so much about JMP— open greenspace, nature, and views.

We appreciate that your team added two alternative parking solutions at the last meeting. While they are in some ways an improvement to the original design, the concerns accompanying the location and addition of a road through the park remain.

The location of the proposed new parking lot is what most residents opposed in the original plan. In light of significant public opposition, alternatives should be presented to the public that address these concerns while preserving accessibility. These two objectives need not be mutually exclusive.

We think it is also important to emphasize that there are currently **90 parking spots** between Gorham, Blount, and Butler that touch the park, with no hourly limit on evenings and weekends.

There are still alternatives to the current parking design that have not been formally presented to the public.

For example, the city could eliminate the road and parking between Blair and Franklin and instead offer an entrance on Blair that leads to a loading zone at the shelter (building on what exists now) with ADA parking spaces located nearby. You raised this option when we met prior to the last BOPC meeting but this proposal has also not been formally presented. Parking spaces could also be added to the newly configured lot behind Gates of Heaven (the design presented in option 1 and 2) which would keep the total number of parking spaces the same.

Another option is to keep the parking in its current location (with your more visible configuration) and add ADA parking along Gorham Street. Consider design options to provide an accessible drop off.

There are numerous benefits to not having a road through the park and keeping the parking in its current location.

- **Greenspace.** Preserving open lawn areas, trees, and unobstructed views from the sidewalk and street. This also allows for a larger area of lawn adjacent to the sports area for picnicking and watching sports, as the other side is a biofiltration area.
- **Safety.** Removing a cruising strip through the park and promoting biker safety by limiting entrance and exit points through the bike lane.
- **Visibility.** One larger, clearly marked parking area will promote visibility, and the location further away from the hill makes it easier to see and

promote vehicle, pedestrian, and biker safety. A driveway entrance on Blair for a parking lot is dangerous as there is decreased visibility because of the hill and the shelter (assuming it is on the east end). Cars routinely speed down this hill and are then expected to make a sharp right through the bike lane.

- **Accessibility.** A loading zone with ADA spaces near the new shelter would limit use of a driveway on Blair and limit access to only those who require closer proximity. This is a very small park. The walk from the current parking to the sports area is 2-3 minutes. To preserve the green and peaceful atmosphere of this area, we believe people would be willing to walk a few minutes through a park setting. The new, wider pathways will make it a safe and pleasant experience.

Thanks again for your consideration and for all of the work you have done on this project.

Best,

Jackie Suska

Add'l signatories:

Abigail Barnes

Alexander Einsman

Dawn O'Kroley

Joe Lusson

Bob Klebba

David Waugh

Perry Sandstrom

---

**From:** Nicole Kessinger <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, January 31, 2019 6:04 PM

**To:** Park Commission <[pacommission@cityofmadison.com](mailto:pacommission@cityofmadison.com)>; Zellers, Ledell <[district2@cityofmadison.com](mailto:district2@cityofmadison.com)>

**Subject:** James Madison Park project

Greetings,

I cannot find any concrete information as to the status of the proposed changes to James Madison Park. If the public comment period is still open, please add my concerns to the register.

As a daily user of the park, I am aghast at these plans. The removal of healthy trees should never be the solution utilized for the sake of additional parking, especially when a perfectly serviceable city parking garage is so close to the park. Considering that the attraction of the park is its open green space, reducing this space for parking is abhorrent. While this plan argues that overall green space is not reduced, narrowing the width of the current green space will certainly limit the amount and type of recreational activities that can be performed and the number of users who can enjoy the park together. While the overall plan has many positive goals, it is poorly designed in this regard.

I would also like to register that even as a daily user of the park, the public outreach was not effective. The plan site states there has been an extensive outreach to residents, yet most people I encounter were not aware of the plan. In a large park, posting a few signs does not guarantee that all users will actually see them. I feel only a token effort has been made in order to satisfy public notice requirements.

PLEASE reconsider these plans. I know there are so many of us who feel the same.

Thank you for your time,  
Nicole

---

**From:** Alexander Harding <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 6, 2019 9:28 AM  
**To:** Lerner, Sarah <SLerner@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** James Madison Park Master Plan comment - updates

Hello,

Please forward this if this is not the correct address for comments.

I wanted to follow up on the City's adjustments to potential parking placements on James Madison Park after public comments and feedback, as seen here:

[https://madison.com/ct/news/local/govt-and-politics/city-staff-propose-new-parking-alternatives-in-james-madison-park/article\\_9b89df82-2aff-502d-a725-1ca043bb17a3.html](https://madison.com/ct/news/local/govt-and-politics/city-staff-propose-new-parking-alternatives-in-james-madison-park/article_9b89df82-2aff-502d-a725-1ca043bb17a3.html)

I think that these changes are still **far** from ideal. While parking was reduced, it's still incredibly inefficient with a long drive and parking interspersed.

If parking is included, the parking should be far away on the edge of the park, shoved in a corner (like it is now), not the centerpiece of the park as seen from the road & sidewalks.

This plan adds driveways that interrupts people walking down the sidewalk, which makes walking more stressful.

As I've said in previous emails, the city should remove **ALL** parking, except for handicapped, increasing awareness for how to get to the park from parking garages (and vice versa), along with improvements to sidewalks to/from the parking garage.

Walking to the parking garage is a matter of a few minutes. **Parking inside the park (except for disabled park users) is not necessary.**

I also recently went to the park around 8-9pm to walk my dog. **Amusingly, all of the spots in the parking lot (the one close to the basketball courts) were taken, but NOBODY ELSE was in the park!** So I waited and people came and went, walking to

their city-subsidized free parking, down the sidewalk from somewhere else. Obviously not park users.

You could say that this is a matter of enforcement. I'd say it's a matter of poor park design, of adding free parking in a park where parking is in demand.

Just make people use the ramp! And make it easy with good signage indicating how to get to parking for users driving down Gorham!

Thank you  
Alex

---

**From:** Perry Sandstrom <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 12, 2019 5:33 PM  
**To:** Park Commission <pacommission@cityofmadison.com>  
**Cc:** Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** James Madison Park Master Plan

Dear Board of Park Commissioners,

The current James Madison Park Master Plan needs a do-over. Despite the best efforts of dedicated staff, this plan is still the product of an extremely flawed process. Elements of this plan would result in permanent degradation to the park that would be unacceptable if they were being proposed by a commercial developer. The envisioned shelter is of the same character as any of the oversized mixed-use commercial developments that increasingly blight the Madison landscape.

The new shelter repeats the same view-blocking mistake of the previous shelter's "silos", but completes this visual insult more thoroughly, and with features that are ultimately costly and unnecessary (including an elevator shaft). The city of John Muir, Aldo Leopold, Jens Jensen and Frank Lloyd Wright can presumably do better in its namesake park than an ill-conceived commercial-style building that fails to meet requirements for outdoor concessions, ignores our architectural heritage and looks like it would be a better fit on a beach in Southern California.

Inserting parking lots into an iconic greenspace is contrary to the pioneering vision of Madison's Park and Pleasure Drive Association, which we still benefit greatly from today.

If you take your oversight role seriously, you can not vote "yes" for a \$20 million plan that actually utilizes "porta-potties" as the accessible restroom solution for the Gates of Heaven facility.

This plan originally got my attention because I noticed CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design) was being used to rationalize degrading the look and feel of an iconic Madison public space by inserting what is essentially strip-mall parking into a cherished park. The claim was made early in the public engagement process (apparently around Nov. 2017) that 700 police "calls for service" warranted the relocation of the parking lot from its present out-of-the-way location to a more visible location along Gorham Street.

I asked the MPD records office for a [list of calls for service to the park from 2017-2018](#). I found that the vast majority of these calls (>90%) were in the category of "property check". I then requested "call notes" from a [random sample of ten of these incidents](#) to discover what a "property check" actually means.

It turns out that the vast majority of the 700 "calls for service" were self-initiated accounts of an officer visiting the park, with occasional observations that everything is OK, or that doors were checked, etc. They were not related in any way to externally generated police calls or criminal behavior. It also seems likely that many of the the 700 "incidents" cited were not even recorded by MPD officers, but rather by park rangers. By checking 911 and non-emergency records, it turns out there were only 41 total calls to the police during that period and many of these were about issues like parking or stray dogs. Few, if any, of these had anything to do with the parking lot.



I found it interesting that at least three other individuals independently researched these claims about police calls and also concluded they were false.

Any design that requires such misleading "spin" and exaggeration is likely lacking in standalone merit. A good plan would generally be celebrated and embraced by people who are familiar with the park and its users. The Police Department and Parks Department in Madison are probably some of the best in the country, but public engagement in this project has apparently been contaminated by mis-information about crime in an effort to "sell" what was apparently (and accurately) anticipated to be a highly unpopular plan. A sub-optimal result is almost guaranteed when fact-finding takes a back set to "spin", and favored solutions are conflated with project requirements.

Those issues aside, the primary limitation to the park's accessibility by vehicle stems from its location on a one-way street. Relocating the parking to two segments along Gorham Street does not solve this issue at all, and arguably makes the situation worse. Perhaps the initial pre-ordained parking "solution" eclipsed other design considerations once the crime narrative and other questionable rationalizations were in play. Was the alternative of including a [new bike-car entrance into the existing parking lot](#) from N. Butler properly vetted (e.g. as a ramp alongside Butler) ? This would have far less negative impact to the rest of the park while still addressing legitimate CPTED concerns regarding lot isolation and access by police and other users in vehicles.

Finally, actual physical safety would be compromised by the Master Plan's relocation of the parking lot along Gorham Street (even if split into two parts as in "option 2"). Adding a parking lot entrance that crosses a busy bike lane on one of Madison's best coasting hills will inevitably lead to cyclists being injured (or worse). The new hazard to cyclists is manifest when a driver sitting in traffic on Gorham decides to cross the bike lane into the new parking lot entrance on the uphill section. In the mornings, traffic can back up this hill, meaning that drivers executing such a turn may not always be aware of bikes that have coasted down the hill from behind as cars slowly approach the lot entrance.

In any design process, it is often difficult to obtain all the information required to make optimal choices, even in the best of circumstances. As volunteers on the BPC, you are probably aware that this is especially true of high-profile public projects, where complex trade offs and iterative design cycles may be required. I'm sure you agree that a pattern of institutional behavior that results in mis-information being thrown into the mix is not acceptable. An overall process that has city departments circling the wagons to gear up for "winning a fight" rather than finding an optimal design means our public spaces will continue to be homogenized by misleading, fear-based design choices and missed opportunities for excellence. Based on my observations, this will inevitably degrade the aesthetics of Madison's unique parks and green spaces, while diminishing their actual safety and utility.

Thanks and

Regards,

Perry Sandstrom

---

**From:** bob.klebba <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 13, 2019 8:40 AM

**To:** Park Commission <pacommission@cityofmadison.com>; Lerner, Sarah <SLerner@cityofmadison.com>; Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>

**Subject:** Changes to JMP master plan

Please review my attached letter. I appreciate your consideration.

Bob Klebba

[REDACTED] E Gorham St

Madison WI 53703-1522

608-[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@gmail.com

Board of Parks Commissioners

13 February 2019

Dear Commissioners :

I'm sorry I'm not able to attend tonight's meeting. Nevertheless, I have some concerns about the latest changes to the James Madison Park master plan.

First of all, I am concerned that the latest plan does not follow the input received during the public process.

During the general and stakeholder meetings I heard the following :

- Strong support for maintaining a volleyball court. The latest proposed plan has no volleyball court. The current volleyball court is heavily used in the summer and should not be eliminated.
- Only one or two meeting participants thought increasing parking at Blount St. might be needed. Furthermore, the proposed configuration adds only 4 parking spaces, yet more than triples the paved area. It is an exceptionally inefficient design that adds unneeded pavement very close to Lake Mendota.

Overall, I appreciate this latest version's respect for green space and reduction in number of parking spaces in the park (with the exception above). There are many great features and improvements in the proposed plan that are worthy of the Board's approval. I ask you to make sure you are also comfortable with the changes I feel disrespect the public process.

Sincerely,

Bob Klebba

[REDACTED] E Gorham St.

[REDACTED]@gmail.com

608-[REDACTED]

---

**From:** dpwaugh <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 13, 2019 12:17 PM

**To:** Park Commission <pacommission@cityofmadison.com>; Lerner, Sarah <SLerner@cityofmadison.com>; Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>; David Waugh <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

**Subject:** James Madison park

To: Sarah Lerner and Park Commissioners

Dear Sarah,

Thank you for the extraordinary effort you have put into this process. At this last hour I would like to make a few comments that I hope you will consider:

1. The city and consultants did a terrific job reaching out (I think it was mentioned that 20,000 contacts were made.) However, I am not sure there was much of any follow up when the plans were put forward to make sure they align with those 20,000 points of contact. Very few people attended meetings AFTER the plans were developed. Certainly you should NOT add parking to Blount street as that was never vetted by public meetings.
2. There was discussion at Parks about a West side shelter location interfering with events at Gates of Heaven events. As far as parking goes, you did not increase the number of stalls so when you consider the increased events of a new shelter, it really doesn't matter where you put the parking – there will be conflicts.
3. I heard concerns expressed by the head of parks about costs for adding pavement. It strikes me that most people unhappy with new parking would be perfectly content with leaving the parking where it is currently behind Gates Of Heaven. The sight lines into that parking are perfectly fine from Butler street.
4. A final point that has not come up often : there is a lot of steep terrain in that park that is unusable for programming. If you kept the existing shelter as a boat rental and bathroom, and built the new shelter into the hill on the west end, you would capture that unuseable acreage as usable space. There could be a lot of programming on the roof if it was flat.

Thanks again for your hard work on this project.

David Waugh

 E.Gorham

Madison

---

**From:** John Jacobs [REDACTED]@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 13, 2019 4:58 PM  
**To:** Park Commission <pacommission@cityofmadison.com>  
**Cc:** Zellers, Ledell <district2@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** James Madison plan - "over 700 police calls" - Green dots or Red?

Dear members of the Board of Park Commissioners,

I'd prefer spending my time talking about the merits of Parks' James Madison Park plan and possible alternatives. But in the interest of honesty, fairness, and good government, I can't let Superintendent Knepp's non-answer to the questions of how and why Parks' planning team repeatedly used "over 700 police calls" in their selling of the awful parking plan go unquestioned.

At your January 9 meeting, one of the commissioners asked about the police calls. Superintendent Knepp responded: *"This commission's not going to be Trumped by misleading data with (garbled) ... I don't want to get too far into the weeds about the details of the police calls, but this park is not designed around police calls. We don't ever design around police calls. Certainly the data and how things are recorded or not, we can get down that road. But this commission is not going to be bullied by a misled number. It wasn't early in the process it's never been a core component of the design."*

The extent which police *incident reports* drove the plan's formulation may be debated, but there's little doubt that proponents of the plan misled the public and Alder Zellers with unfair fearmongering by citing "over 700 police calls" as an element of their sales pitch to gain approval.

Mr. Knepp's assertion that the number of police calls were not involved in the planning process is at odds with evidence in the James Madison draft plan and supporting documents. That the period of calls is from 1/1/2017 to 11/18/2017 suggests that Parks had gathered the police call information before the formal planning process began in January 2018. I suspect they got the information from the MPD either on or soon after 11/19/2017. There's no good reason to omit the end of November and all of December 2017 unless the data was requested before then.

A participant in the stakeholder meetings, [Alexander Einsman wrote to the BPC on 12/11/2018](#): *"During the process of developing the master plan, many of the stakeholders continued to voice concern about the expansion of parking all along the park. This was continuously represented as a non-negotiable aspect. .. I recognize that part of the rationale for changing the parking lot location is due to police calls."*

[The 9-12-2018 stakeholder meeting notes](#) (Engagement Summary page 181, pdf 184) show a member of the design team, Zia Brucaya of Urban Assets saying: *"MPD is happy with the parking configuration. More eyes on the street and easier to police."*

At the Urban Design Commission's October 3, 2018 meeting, [JMP planners told the commission](#): *"During the initial data gathering phase of the project they heard about safety concerns, they talked to Police and learned there had been over 700 calls to the park in 2017, with 81 calls directly addressed to the Gates of Heaven area. As they worked with Police and Traffic Engineering, the reconfiguration of parking will make it much easier to monitor and access."*

The planners not only used "over 700 calls" as justification for the reconfigured parking, they even specifically mentioned that Gates of Heaven area (near existing lot) as being responsible for 81 calls. How does Eric Knepp reconcile the statements above with *"We don't ever design around police calls"* he told you on January 9?

There are other instances where planners mention the *police calls* or *incidents*. I can list them too if you wish.

I doubt the the neighbors who were fighting the awful parking plan in good faith for months resorted to such dishonesty to make their case.

- - - - -

**Green dots or Red?**

I believe the planning team may have misled the January 9 Parks Commission about the levels of public support for the awful parking plan. It appears the planning team picked data to show you that favored their plan but omitted data that did the opposite.

Mr. Saiki spoke about the police calls in [Brenda Konkel's video](#) starting at 1:24:00

Parks staff and Ken Saiki picked a slide labelled "Plan Development" (image below) which Mr. Saiki said showed "very positive feedback" for the parking design from the third public meeting on May 14, 2018 when the non-negotiable parking plan was first shown. Mr. Saiki said "... green dots are good. You can see all the green dots on the parking areas."

But, Parks and Mr. Saiki chose to **not** mention or include data from the fourth and final public meeting on September 24, 2018.

At that meeting, red dots (dislike) outnumbered green dots (like) by 3:1 generally or 6:3 including various features.

The information shown below was copied from pdf page 44,45 of [JMMP Engagement Summary](#).

*"Following the draft master plan presentation, participants worked in nine table groups to review and comment on the draft plan. Groups were directed to place red dots on features that members unanimously disliked, yellow dots on features that members had mixed feelings about, and green dots on features they unanimously liked."*

*"The following are combined dot votes and notes made by nine table groups on the draft master plan."*

Design Feature	Green Dots	Yellow Dots	Red Dots
<i>multiple path green space disruption</i>		1	1
Parking lot - general	1	1	3
Parking lot - linearity	1	1	2
Parking lot - congestion of activities		1	
Parking lot - sharp angles and access		1	1
Parking lot - ADA accessibility	1		

Good government depends on honest communications from city hall. Citizens, alders and Parks Commissioners shouldn't have to file public records requests and analyze a bunch of data to get the truth. How can we trust a plan developed with such slant?

John Jacobs



James Madison Park

34 views

👍 0 🗨️ 0 ➦ SHARE 📌 SAVE ...



**Brenda Konkel**  
Published on Jan 11, 2019

**SUBSCRIBE** 157

This is a sad tale of a planning process gone awry, despite all the claims of using the equity tool and doing vigorous outreach. Here's a thing, you have to LISTEN to the input and incorporate it - not just collect the input. They will be discussing this item again next month. The biggest issues

[SHOW MORE](#)