



# City of Madison

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

## Meeting Minutes - Approved SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE

---

Monday, July 17, 2017

4:30 PM

210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Room 351

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 4:30 p.m. following verification the meeting had been properly noticed and a quorum was present.

**Present:** 12 - David Ahrens; Denise DeMarb; Stacie A. Reece; Michael J. Vickerman; Lance E. Green; Jesse J. Shields; Bradley Campbell; Jeannette E. LeZaks; Maria A. Schletzbaum; Richard A. Heinemann; Joseph M. Ryan and Evelyn H. Atkinson

**Absent:** 3 - Richard J. Pearson; Jason A. Vargo and August R. McGinnity-Wake

**Excused:** 3 - Rajan V. Shukla; Sam J. Breidenbach and Tracy E. Harvey

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Ald. Ahrens, seconded by Ald. DeMarb, to Approve the Minutes from June 19, 2017. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

Ryan disclosed he was a member of the Madison West Neighborhood Association which had comments on item 47681.

### NEW BUSINESS

Green as acting Chair noted that many members of public were here to talk on MOU and that perhaps we should have that at end of meeting, since first items were deemed to take shorter time. Moved by Ahrens to change agenda sequence to 47689, 47681 and 47645. Seconded by Ryan. Motion passed on voice vote.

1. [47645](#) Approval of Collaboration Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Madison and Madison Gas and Electric.

**Attachments:** [Sustainable Madison Committee Testimony.pdf](#)  
[Updated MOU- CLean \(A2838986x9DEB4\).pdf](#)  
[Updated MOU \(A2848383x9DEB4\).pdf](#)  
[Ver 1 - 47645.pdf](#)  
[MOU re Public Utility Regulations.pdf](#)

Green noted that the time was nearing 6:30 p.m. and asked the committee to consider extension of time to hear public comments on MOU. Committee voted to hear public comment, but moved vote on approval of the MOU to the next meeting.

[This Resolution was Refer to the SUSTAINABLE MADISON COMMITTEE Meeting of August 21, 2017.]

**Public Comment:**

Janice Knapp-Cordes. MOU wonderful piece of communication, but that it only states the City and MG&E agree to continue talking. It needs more specific descriptions of feedback on progress to remove greenhouse gases (GHG) from atmosphere.

Daniel Hast. Thanks committee for staying to hear public comment. Reject MOU or strengthen language for greater public accountability and specific reduction targets. Also wants meetings between MG&E and City to follow open meeting laws for more transparency. MOU doesn't mention that 2/3 of electricity comes from coal fired power plants which have a dramatic impact on health and carbon emissions. Need sharp decline in emissions within the next three years to avoid coastal flooding. City needs to compel MG&E to meet certain targets. He like 100% renewable energy target.

Melanie Foxcroft SASSY member from east side. Likes MOU framework but more public involvement is need within meetings-follow open meetings law. MOU should mention use of coal and the need to phase it out though a specific plan. Should also mention higher fixed fees MG&E charges since it was reason for MOU creation and that there should be a mention of a need to negotiate fixed fee reductions. Feel there needs to be a better City-utility partnership model similar to Minneapolis model

Yogesh Shamla. Solar enthusiast with panels on home. MOU needs to deal with connection costs. Address API-new technology to gather data from appliances and other devices and that apps should be developed and made available to public. Need more ways to offset energy use and encourage public participation and following of agenda. (SMC agenda had this item first)

Mitchell Brey. Has concerns with MOU. Is it valuable to have as is? Feels local utility uses soft words like "investigating", "researching" to cover inaction. Resolution should state 100% renewable target clearly. MOU and utility relationship needs more public oversight and collaboration to reach 100% renewable target. If MOU doesn't work City should explore buying utility.

Elizabeth Katt-Reinders. Sierra Club. What value does MOU create for City

and residents? MG&E target of 30% renewable by 2030 does not match City target and how can MOU shift that thinking? Likes small scale clean projects by MG&E, but how does MOU mover MG&E to get off coal fast? Does language of MOU close door to other discussions?

Owen Rienders- 13 year old. 30% renewable target by 2030 will not be enough. Goal is to get to 100%.

Katie Sabalonex 30% target by 2030 is not enough for her and her daughter.

Devin Martin—Sierra Club organizer. Many cities committing to 100% target. Make the goal a reality. Need to move off coal by 2035. Our future depends on it. Be a leader in clean, safe, reliable energy.—had 78 comment sheets and letter to add to record.

Jessie Elgin—Invoked image of state flag. Mining and farming-state motto--Forward. All point to pushing progress and a new direction. Feels WI has been progressive and focused on natural environment. March for Science was strong here and proved that people cared about science. All have to work towards 100% renewable, locally generated renewable. And more than 30% by 2030.

2. [47689](#)

Establishing an Urban Forestry Taskforce to make recommendations to the Mayor and the Common Council regarding the promotion of a vibrant, healthy and sustainable urban forest and tree canopy.

Green stated the Taskforce was a recommendation of the Street Tree sub-committee and that it would review all policies related to trees. Motion made by Ald. DeMarb to approve creation and seconded by Ald Ahrens to RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL TO ADOPT - REPORT OF OFFICER. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

In discussion Ald. Ahrens stated that four residents and city staff from Parks, Planning, Engineering Traffic Engineering and two alders would review city policies and procedures related to the urban canopy. Initial target was to meet bi-weekly and produce plan by year end for Council to review.

3. [47681](#)

Adopting the High Point-Raymond Neighborhood Development Plan amendment as a supplement to the City of Madison Comprehensive Plan, to provide more detailed and contemporary planning recommendations for the planning area, as a result of land use, transportation and other important changes over time.

**Attachments:**

[HPR TEXT 0620.pdf](#)  
[HPR\\_Maps\\_0623\\_revised.pdf](#)  
[HPR\\_Summary\\_of\\_Changes.pdf](#)  
[HPR\\_Jeffy\\_Rationale\\_revised\\_0623.pdf](#)  
[HPR\\_PC\\_staff\\_report.pdf](#)  
[HPR\\_PC\\_PPT.pdf](#)  
[Ald. Harrington-McKinney Jeffy Trail Memo.pdf](#)  
[Conway\\_comments\\_06-16-17.pdf](#)  
[Steinhauer\\_comments\\_06-20-17.pdf](#)  
[Registration\\_Statements\\_PBMVC\\_6.27.17.pdf](#)  
[Tn\\_of\\_Verona\\_comment\\_on\\_High\\_Point-Raymond\\_Plan.pdf](#)  
[MWNA\\_PC\\_Letter\\_7.20.17.pdf](#)  
[MWNA\\_Jeffy\\_Extension\\_2-page\\_talking\\_points\\_.pdf](#)  
[MWNA\\_Comment\\_Letter\\_on\\_Update\\_to\\_The\\_High\\_Point\\_-\\_Raymond\\_Neighborh](#)  
[Madison\\_West\\_Neighborhood\\_Association\\_Comments\\_Re\\_Jeffy\\_Trail\\_.pdf](#)  
[Jeffy\\_Trail\\_Public\\_Comments.pdf](#)  
[Deng\\_comments\\_07-24-17.pdf](#)  
[Blustein-Wang\\_comments\\_07-24-17.pdf](#)  
[Stuhr\\_comments\\_07-24-17.pdf](#)  
[Steinhauer\\_comments\\_07-25-17.pdf](#)  
[073117\\_Jeffy\\_Trail\\_Memo\\_D1.pdf](#)  
[Jeffy\\_Trail\\_amendment\\_1.pdf](#)  
[8/1/17\\_Metro\\_Transit\\_Jeffy\\_Trl.pdf](#)  
[Ald. Harrington-McKinney\\_Amendment.pdf](#)  
[High\\_Point-Raymond\\_Recommendation.pdf](#)

Motion by Ald. Ahrens to accept plan, but delete 2 paragraphs on page 13 about Jeffy Trail and the extension section on page 9. Vickerman seconded.

**Mathew Stanford spoke for Madison West Neighborhood Association and stated that main concern in Plan was the extension of Jeffy Trail to Raymond Rd. He provided background on land purchase by City and how the old plan did not anticipate Ice Age trail and bike path when it was written 10 years ago. Neighborhood is opposed to extending Jeffy Trail and 80% of members want to leave it as a bike path. Extension would cost \$460K and impact zoned conservancy areas around bike path. He asked that SMC recommended removal of the extension to the Plan Commission.**

**Alder Barbara McKinney whose district contains the neighborhood agrees with the neighborhood and requests extension be removed from the plan. Says neighborhood has been consistent about no extension of the road since she was elected to represent the area. Asked that her memo be added to minutes. (Already linked in LegiStar.)**

**Vickerman asked about commercial zoning on north side of Raymond. None.**

**Green asked if anyone wanted connection? McKinney says no, and that extension was even removed from 2016 capital budget.**

LeZaks asked for staff's position on plan. Staff will speak after public input.

Don Marx, resident of neighborhood. Former Real Estate Manager for City. If Jeffy Trail does not go through nothing else in the plan will change. He said that the 80% who voted for it to not go through account for 420, so the number opposing extension is not insignificant. The green space enhances uses of the area for all neighbors.

Ahrens acknowledged Marx's earlier City role and asked if green space would enhance property values. Marx feels it does and he states that the extension of Stratton Road in the plan will have a more dramatic impact on the neighborhood than if Jeffy Trail is enlarged.

Dan McAuliffe of the Planning Division spoke for the City and reviewed the overall plan, not just the Jeffy Trail sections for the Committee. Old plan was done in 1997 and the area still has about 500 acres of undeveloped land. There is a need now for significantly more storm water management, better connectivity with the internal street network and more park land. Raymond is planned to be disconnected from County M/Junction Rd and at least two cross streets may be developed at the north end of the planning district. Without Jeffy Trail extension there will be no southern exit from the neighborhood. Fire feels that 1:31 minutes would be added to emergency response time, although they would still be within the regulation 5 minute response time border. McAuliffe also explained how previous citywide neighborhood input had lead to the codification of some of the policies laid out in neighborhood plans. He showed street design options and stated that the bike path covered City infrastructure like sewer and water pipes already.

Several members asked specific questions about street connections and if Jeffy Trail connection was needed given the Raymond Road disconnect.

DeMarb asked why was it important for SMC to hear about this Plan. SMC vote should be on specific elements of sustainability within the plan which she does not see. DeMarb asked staff to come up with a check list of sustainable features to discuss when reviewing neighborhood plans. Van Lith will work with Hoffman and Legislative Analyst for Council to create checklist.

Ahrens stated that all neighborhood plans come to SMC. Hoffman clarified that only those plans that she heard about came to committee. Ahrens stated that all plans impact environment, economy and social elements of a neighborhood. Reece asked if environment impact statements were done on neighborhood plans. McAuliffe said no, but that environmental corridors were assessed in central urban service area (USA) were assessed by CARPC and the Plat plans needed to confirm to USA guidelines. LeZaks asked what is biggest issue with not connecting Jeffy Trail? McAuliffe said overall that connectivity barriers should be removed from plans. The extension removes a cul-de-sac from the area and connects people. Precedent setting is another thing to consider.

A motion was made by Ahrens, seconded by Vickerman, to Return to Lead with the Following Recommendation(s) to the PLAN COMMISSION.

Motion by Ahrens to accept plan, but delete 2 paragraphs on page 13 about Jeffy Trial and the extension section on page 9. Vickerman seconded. Discussion on how plan fits with Sustainability Plan. DeMarb asks if housing was considered in new plan? McAuliffe says that it was in a general way given the focus on land use and that the plan only has 14 units of density per acre, but that it is an increase of about 3600 housing units. DeMarb feels it doesn't take into account population growth predicted and this should be considered. If it doesn't contain housing and growth issues she would vote against accepting plan. Discussion on density by members and McAuliffe, who states that the City's overall density is 7 units per acre—very low.

Green calls vote. Eight in favor of accepting, three not in favor. Motion passes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Reece, seconded by Shields, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote/other.