

**From:** Susan Millar <sbmillar@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 7:24 AM

**To:** Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>

**Cc:** Susan Millar <sbmillar@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Comment for agenda items 4 and 5 on the June 29 meeting - Madison Yards proposal

Dear members of the Madison Plan Commission,

I write to convey opposition to the Madison Yards proposal, agenda items 4 and 5 for your June 29 meeting. In some ways, the developer has responded effectively to concerns expressed about insufficient sustainability features during your May 11, 2020 meeting. However, their June 24 revisions to the Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) have not substantially improved their May 11 TDMP. Their TDM Plan is so weak that I ask you to require that they change it in substantial and meaningful ways before you accept this proposal.

The developer and the Madison community all know that gasoline-powered cars produce a significant amount of carbon dioxide, which is warming our atmosphere, and changing the climate that supports us on this beautiful Earth. We know that, even as our population grows, we must rapidly reduce the miles driven in gasoline-powered cars. So how to accomplish this reduction?

As an analogy, imagine that something about your behavior is putting your health at serious risk, and you want to recover your health. Say, you are dangerously overweight. What do you do? You set a goal (say, lose 30% of your weight), and develop an implementation plan. The plan starts with a weigh in, so that you know your starting weight. Call that your baseline weight. Then the overall strategy is to implement changes in your behavior that research demonstrates have worked for other people. You work with a doctor, who regularly determines how well you are implementing these research-based strategies for reducing weight, and you achieve your goal.

So back to the Madison Yards TDMP. The developer has set a goal: *“reduc[ing] single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips to/from the site with a goal of achieving a 30% non-SOV (including non-motorized) mode split for the development.”* The developer has an implementation plan that is based on behavior change. But the analogy stops there.

The analogy stops there for two main reasons:

1. The strategies in the implementation plan are not informed by research on what has worked well for other communities.
2. The evaluation plan is close to useless.

The basic strategy of this TDMP is behavior change: to achieve the goal, the people who use Madison Yards need to change their car-driving behavior. The developers propose using three main strategies for achieving this desired behavior change:

1. Implement financial incentives/disincentives;
2. Modify the built environment in ways that make it easy for people to change their behavior in the desired ways;
3. Provide information about what and how to change.

Their proposed financial incentives/disincentives consist of charging residents a fee to park, and possibly include 10 pre-paid transit passes in new resident orientation packets.

They propose to modify the built environment in ways that make it easy for people to change their car-driving behavior by:

- Adding a BCycle station with 5 docs and 3 BCycles (a drop in the bucket for the residents of 189 apartments plus other users of the complex)
- Providing preferential parking for designated rideshare users (carpool or vanpool).
- Providing in offices/medical facilities “lobby amenities” including umbrellas , rain jackets, and other items available to facilitate midday walking trips during inclement weather.

They *propose* merely providing information about what and how to change by hiring TDM coordinators whose job descriptions consist of providing residents with information about alternatives to driving.

It is very unlikely that these strategies will make much difference in car driving behavior at Madison Yards. The developer does not provide information on the research they have conducted that shows that these strategies have worked sufficiently well elsewhere to achieve the stated goal. And the developer is not planning to inform us about whether their behavior change strategies will work. Where is the doctor, who regularly measures the change?

The only meaningful measurement is the baseline “trip generation studies” described in the developer’s 6/24 Attachment G. These studies consist of obtaining various types of data on numbers of car-trips and numbers of occupants, conducted within one year of the completion of each construction project, and apparently not thereafter. That’s it. They propose no baseline data collection on the use of alternatives to cars. Their “performance metrics” consist only of descriptions of what information TDM staff provide to how many people - which tells us nothing about actual change in people’s car-driving behavior. And there is no plan to collect data on whether car use declines. Far from “*achieving a 30% non-SOV (including non-motorized) mode split for the development*” over, say, a 5-year time period, car use is likely to increase over that period. And we wouldn’t even know, because they proposed to measure car trips only within one year of the completion of each construction project.

Thank you for considering the points I have made here.

Susan Millar, member, 350 Madison’s Community Climate Solutions Team  
2233 Rowley Ave., Madison, WI 53726

I was born when CO2 PPM was 310.5.

When my youngest grandchild was born, PPM was 393.1.  
At current rates, when he is 20, PPM will be 423.

See the attached data file from

NASA: <https://data.giss.nasa.gov/modelforce/ghgases/fig1a.ext.txt>

---

**From:** Chloe Robinson <crr96@cornell.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 29, 2020 12:40 AM  
**To:** Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** Opposition to Madison Yards Development

I am a member of 350 Madison's [Community Climate Solutions Team](#). With regard to the agenda for the June 29th Plan Commission meeting, I would like to register my opposition to the proposed Madison Yards development (Legistar #60242 and #60243). This project will set back, rather than promote, our community's efforts to achieve resilience in the face of a changing climate. It does not align with Madison's 2018 Comprehensive Plan, or Dane County's 2020 Climate Action Plan.

Sincerely,

Chloe Robinson

---

**From:** Emily DeVore <edevor13@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 28, 2020 5:26 PM  
**To:** Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** Madison Yards Item - Plan Commission Meeting

Hello,

My name is Emily DeVore and I am writing in opposition to the Madison Yards Development (Item #4 at the June 29th Plan Commission Meeting). This project does not align with Madison's sustainability goals and does not propose adequate solutions for our changing climate.

As a millennial living in downtown Madison, I would be a targeted audience for this development. As proposed, this is not a desirable living community for me. Before this project is allowed to move forward, the developer should explicitly address how the physical environment will support biking and walking while deemphasizing vehicle miles traveled. They should commit to green infrastructure adaptations that will decrease water issues related to climate change. The buildings being constructed should also produce their own energy and consume less. Additionally, I value diversity in my community and would always prefer to have a mix of residential unit sizes and affordability rates. The developer needs to be more transparent about how they will address these types of goals, which are echoed in the Madison Comprehensive Plan and Dane County's Climate Action Plan.

Regarding the issues above, I specifically support the following development needs:

- Solar panels on top of the 5,000 square foot commercial building as well as the residential buildings. One-to-two story buildings are better suited to supply more of their own energy from solar panels than high rise buildings.
- Separated bike lanes, preferably connecting directly to existing routes like Southwest commuter path
- Traffic calming devices on all streets

- Stormwater management, including wide terraces between roads and sidewalks that can support rain gardens; pervious surfaces at parking areas and sidewalks; and rain water retention and harvesting systems
- Electric vehicle and bike charging stations
- Affordable housing units
- Buildings that meet Living Building Challenge guidelines, which take a holistic view of developmental impacts. Larger districts like this one, rather than individual building development, can more realistically reach many sustainability goals. One example is the use of high efficiency technology for cooling, heating, and electricity generation at a lower cost when shared among multiple buildings

I think these infrastructure improvements are necessary for a healthy community that will attract young professionals.

Thank you for your attention,  
Emily DeVore

---

**From:** Douglas Pensack <dspensack@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 28, 2020 12:10 PM  
**To:** Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>  
**Subject:** Madison Yards Development

To the Planning Commission: I oppose the Madison Yards project (Legistar #60242 & #60243). We are in the midst of a climate crisis which gets worse every year, yet you are approving housing projects like this without any provisions for green technology, including solar power, electric car charging, etc. We need to do better; YOU need to do a better job by making it clear that this "old school"-type of construction is no longer acceptable or adequate.

Douglas Pensack  
Madison, WI

---

June 25, 2020

Dear Plan Commission,

Thank you for your dedication and service to improving Madison's built environment. Having attended several of your past meetings, I am impressed by your attempt to encourage proposals the be more aligned with *Madison's Comprehensive Plan*, *100% Renewable Madison* and *Dane County's Climate Action Plan (CAP)*. I am asking that as you review the "Madison Yards at Hill Farms" proposal (*Legistar #60242 and 60243*) on June 29<sup>th</sup> that you continue to promote a greener Madison.

Madison Yards is an important project with significant impact on Madison's livability and as an opportunity to promote Madison's goal of 100% renewable energy and zero-net

carbon emissions goal in the next decade. I understand that you are hamstrung by State code and ordinances in your decisions to approve or disapprove projects but there are aspects of Madison Yards that need reconsideration and commitment from developers and builders: The *CAP* states that buildings consume more than 47% of all the energy used in the U.S. and about 75% of the electricity generated in the U.S. The new buildings at Madison Yards, consistent with the *Madison Sustainability Plan* should, at least, install rooftop solar, use highly efficient, all-electric heating, cooling, and appliances, and use bird-friendly glass.

Traffic congestion is already evident on University Avenue and Segoe Roads. Introducing Madison Yards to that area may increase desired density but the proposed plan needs to improve its multi-modal transportation options and connections from the proposed buildings to the existing surrounding transportation network (e.g., bike paths). Madison Yards fosters single vehicle transportation. The plan needs to improve the walkability and biking environment throughout the site by installing traffic calming devices and wide sidewalks on all proposed internal streets. The project should enable electric vehicle use by including charging stations for cars and bikes.

Again, I appreciate your work and hope you will consider my concerns as you discuss Madison Yards plans for Lots 3 and 6 and their overall project. We can work together for a greener Madison.

Sincerely,  
Peggy Rosin  
1515 Vilas Avenue  
Madison, WI 53711

---

**From:** Claire Swingle <claireswingle@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Friday, June 26, 2020 4:04 PM

**To:** Planning <planning@cityofmadison.com>

**Subject:** Madison Yards Development

I, Claire Swingle, strongly oppose the proposed Madison Yards development (Legistar #60242 and #60243). This project will set back, rather than promote, our community's efforts to achieve resilience in the face of a changing climate. It does not align with Madison's 2018 Comprehensive Plan, or Dane County's 2020 Climate Action Plan. It does not include plans for solar panels, electric vehicle charging, all electric buildings, or other climate forward infrastructure and we need to stop sinking money into projects that do not get us to where we all know, and have agreed, we need to go. I am a supporter of 350 Madison's [Community Climate Solutions Team](#).

Thank you for noting my opposition. Kind regards,  
Claire