



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved CENTRAL PARK DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

Wednesday, June 17, 2009

8:00 AM

Madison Municipal Building, Room LL-110
215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present: 10 -

Marsha A. Rummel; William W. Barker; Nancy T. Ragland; Joe Sensenbrenner; Bradley C. Mullins; Leslie C. Schroeder; M. Nan Cheney; Phyllis Wilhelm; Susan M. Schmitz and Truly Remarkable Loon

Excused: 2 -

Joseph R. Clausius and Amy T. Overby

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES - May 13, 2009

Mr. Loon stated that the minutes state Nan Cheney was present, but she was not at that meeting.

Also, #4, 12th paragraph, add last name after Tom (Dunbar), Center for Resilient Cities.

A motion was made by Loon, seconded by Rummel, to Approve the Minutes, as amended. The motion passed by voice vote.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

Ken Swift, representing the Madison Skate park Fund, appeared. He is very interested in seeing this process proceed. He attended a meeting last night at Wilmar in which there was talk about the two plans. Some people would like to use the "3" plan - the project could begin sooner even though rail goes through the site. Others thought the tracks should be moved, take a little longer, and get more funding. 3's plan allows a bigger space for Skate Park. He would like the Task Force to bring it back to the community to get their input on which plan to use.

Peter Wolff appeared. Mr. Wolff stated that he agrees with Mr. Swift. He said that recent history and the new plan involving keeping the tracks has been presented at a Marquette Neighborhood meeting. That plan alone was presented. There is some discomfort with the plan. Last night there was an entirely different presentation from Joe Sensenbrenner, representing CRC, which made it clearer that there is a decision to be made. Almost all the people there last night prefer old plan. Mr. Wolff urged the Task Force not to make a decision today about which plan should go into effect, but take it

back to the neighborhood and make a more complete deliberation of this whole issue.

Mr. Barker stated that the Task Force has not decided whether to go with the amended McCarthy plan or "3"'s plan.

4 Discussion/action on the McCarthy Plan as amended by the Task Force: Joe Sensenbrenner

Mr. Sensenbrenner stated that the city has many possible futures. The original full vision that emerged from the neighborhood 30 years ago would best serve the neighborhood, the region, and the entire city. He would like to make a proposal/framework on how to proceed.

1. That the attached exhibits (Exhibit A [McCarthy plan, as amended], Exhibit B [MOU]) be adopted as the first choice design, financing, implementation and operational strategy for the Park
2. That the Parks Division be directed to develop an annual maintenance and operating budget (M&OB) for said plan at levels of service comparable to [Millennium Park]
3. That the City Comptroller then estimate the Endowment necessary to reasonably fund the annual cost for the M&OB of the Park
4. That upon the passage of a resolution approving the basic elements of this resolution by the Common Council, the Mayor shall appoint a Central Park Full Vision Realization Team who will have 18 months to secure funds or commitments for such funds that fully meet the Endowment requirements
5. That all moneys so collected will be only available for the M&O of Central Park
6. That upon the certification by the Comptroller that sufficient moneys are secured, the Mayor shall appoint a Central Park Infrastructure and Amenities Realization Team who will have 18 months to secure funds or commitments for funds to construct the elements of the park design
7. That if either Realization Team does not achieve its goals, all moneys shall be returned to the original donor with any accumulated investment gains or losses
8. Be it further resolved that if the Endowment moneys are secured, the City will pay the cost of physically moving the railroad tracks now bisecting the Park currently estimated at approximately \$10 million, acquiring the current railroad right-of-way necessary for the Full Vision design currently estimated at \$YYYY, and the land necessary for the construction of replacement right-of-way currently estimated at \$ZZZZ. Moneys earmarked for pedestrian and bicycle improvements in the area and available pursuant to TIF District 36 may be considered, among other sources.
9. Be it further resolved that if either Realization team does not achieve its goals or the full vision design is otherwise deemed by the Common Council to be impossible or impracticable, this Task Force recommends Alternative Plan B prepared by "3" be vigorously pursued by the City.
10. That the many good people of Madison who have contributed their

time, energy, vision and resources especially the Center for Resilient Cities and Madison Gas and Electric Co., Schreiber Anderson Associates, JJR Inc. and Ken Saiki Design, Inc. be acknowledged and saluted for advancing careful consideration of this singular civic opportunity.

Ald. Rummel stated that the neighborhood wants to hear both plans side by side. The Task Force shouldn't make a decision today.

Mr. Barker stated that this has been going on for a long time. He doesn't see why the "3" plan can't be a transitional plan. If it becomes financially feasible to acquire other lands, or funds become available to move the rails, the City could move to a grander vision.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that a transitional plan was the instruction given to "3." Money from Rep. Baldwin would have to be held somehow for an uncertain period of time. Issue that needs to be included.

Mr. Schmitz stated that she would like to hear Park Superintendent Briski's thoughts on some of this.

Mr. Briski stated that it's not appropriate for him to speak on pros and cons at this time. The skaters would like to move forward on the skate park. This is a good opportunity to move forward on the first phase. The Parks Division wants to be a partner in this endeavor. This could be a grand City park and Madison Parks wants to be a party to that. Parks will help, in any way, to facilitate these plans to the benefit of the residents. There has been valuable input taken here. Parks wants to make sure it's expedited in a timely process. They will facilitate the maintenance and operations. There have already been discussions on a staff level. He introduced Kay Rutledge, new Parks Planning & Development Manager. He understands there would be an endowment that would pay for maintenance and operations. He feels that "3"'s plan gets us to a point to start where some of the other opportunities of moving tracks, etc., could take place down the line.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that it's hard to remember details of the original McCarthy plan. Mr. Olinger made copies and distributed to the Task Force (a copy of which is attached to these minutes).

Mr. Loon stated that the City has not committed any funds to this. Any funding for park or maintenance is going to have to come from somewhere else. Mr. Barker stated except for Tammy Baldwin's earmark funds. No other funds have been identified at this time. Center for Resilient Cities (CRC) hands it off to a private group to fundraise. Mr. Loon stated it's not clear in the MOU. He asked who are the parties involved? If the funders aren't willing to fund one plan or another, we're proposing something that's not going to be done.

Ms. Ragland said that a draft MOU was developed yesterday at the Subcommittee meeting. Using the Olbrich Botanical model was preferable with a sunset clause. It would include fundraising. Create a Board to

provide oversight and fundraising with policy oversight by the Parks Commission.

Mr. Loon asked who are the parties involved. Mr. Barker answered the City, and Parks Division. CRC would act as a proxy for this new group.

Mr. Sensenbrenner stated that the CRC does not want to run a park or foundation. It would not be housed or run under CRC.

Ms. Schroeder stated that she thought the MOU was going to have more detail, say who is on the Board, concerns about use of park - limiting festivals, etc.

Mr. Barker said that the Parks Commission should set that group up.

Ms. Ragland asked that after looking at Mr. Sensenbrenner's nine-point plan, what do we have to lose. She commended "3" for an outstanding job. She is enthusiastic about giving it 18 months to see if we have community support. She suggested using "3"'s plan for a fallback.

Mr. Loon questioned that if we can't raise money for a big park, how can we raise it for a small park? He doesn't like the RR cutting through the middle of the park. Both plans have wild cards in them that we don't have control over. He suggests going for the whole thing - can always downsize.

Ms. Cheney stated that the park is going to be there a long time. Building a bridge on North Few Street is a considerable expense and wouldn't be necessary if the tracks are gone. 18 months is short if you think about how long the park will be there. She suggests going back to the community and showing them the alternatives that they're not aware of. Ms. Schroeder noted that it's not a bridge, just an at-grade crossing.

Mr. Olinger stated there is a 20% match from the City regarding the earmarked funds. Final number is a little less than the \$3.5 million. The money is available until expended. The original intention was for a regional park that supported the neighborhood to the south, but also the emerging business/employment neighborhood to the north. It's also about East Washington Avenue, as an economic development tool to spur other activity. It's not just for the Marquette neighborhood. It could be a huge amenity for the entire area. The original idea was that this was not a City park; that the Urban Open Space Foundation was going to do all the fundraising. A significant amount of funding was to be brought to this and this has not been seen. If this is put on the back burner for another 18 months, nothing will get done. This is a smaller park than the original McCarthy plan and that the Task Force has already made significant changes to the McCarthy plan. The McCarthy plan, as originally proposed, cannot be built with the reduced acreage recommended by the Task Force. We would need another whole programming process to figure out how to get the original program into the revised acreage. Should look at big picture. Difficult to add to something once it's there. If you've got money, use it now. We are fighting to keep TID 36 open; it's in danger of closing. We should be able to keep it open next

year, but unless we have something planned, it may be targeted for closing by the end of 2010.

Mr. Barker stated that \$10 million to move railroad is too much money. Mr. Mullins stated that this can't be a burden to the City. If there's money, \$10 million shouldn't be used to move tracks. There are other needs. It would be at least two years out, if we go with Mr. Sensenbrenner's proposal, maybe three, if you know whether you have money just for maintenance. He likes Mr. Barker's idea of moving forward with something more plausible like the "3" plan. It's not the ultimate answer, no matter what the Task Force comes up with, there are a lot more City channels to go through before adoption. He acknowledges that "3"'s plan doesn't morph into McCarthy plan because significant changes have been made. However, "3" puts a park there.

Ms. Schmitz stated that the McCarthy plan was designed, presented and then changes and amendments made. It never seemed like there was real overall support until we got to "3"'s plan. There is more broad community support for "3"'s plan. Going back to McCarthy plan is opening a can of worms. Not broad support for this. Have to start somewhere.

Ms. Cheney stated she believes that light rail is going to happen.

Mr. Loon suggested using "3"'s plan as the core for a new McCarthy plan. Could proceed with Skate Park.

Mr. Barker stated that the Great Lawn should also be included. Sands' property is also an open question. Great Lawn and the Skate Park are doable.

Ald. Rummel stated that the McCarthy plan is so different from "3"'s plan. "3"'s plan can't really turn into the McCarthy plan. She sees "3"'s plan as the next step. Intersection of North Few Street is key. Need to cross it to get to the other side. Can't have a transition without that.

Mr. Olinger stated there is a preliminary meeting with counsel for the Office of the Commissioner of Railroad regarding Rail on July 8th.

Mr. Barker stated that he heard that Brearly Street may be closed, but open to pedestrians and bikes. Living wall on Ingersoll Street might be such an interesting feature that people want to keep it. The Large Lawn is the same whether it's the McCarthy plan or "3"'s plan.

Ms. Ragland stated that .8 acres is incredibly small for a performance area. 2.6 acres is very small for a park.

Mr. Barker stated that the Task Force could make a valid decision that this is not a good place for a park. There could be a Skate park, community garden, and dog park. Could be done in six months. Dispense with fundraising problems. Call it the "Barker plan."

Ms. Wilhelm asked what would be the objection to thinking about the "3" plan?

Mr. Sensenbrenner stated that the critical ingredient is new money. Without it either plan is possible. Can't raise money for a neighborhood park. There is potential interest to raise the money. It would have to be fundraised for either plan.

Mr. Barker read an email from Ms. Overby. Ms. Overby feels that "3"'s plan is more viable than the McCarthy plan because it's more realistic. Fundraising over the next two years is particularly problematic.

Mr. Mullins stated that either plan will require fundraising. MOU doesn't talk about fundraising process or timeline. "3" requires similar fundraising plan as McCarthy plan.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that some implementation is possible with "3". Mr. Mullins suggested starting with "3"'s plan. Mr. Barker noted that Ms. Schroeder amended his plan to include a festival area.

Ms. Schroeder made a motion to ask the City Parks Department to take a look at the Barker plan with a subcommittee of this Task Force and report back a month from now. It could be a transitional stepping stone to a possibility of moving the rail (McCarthy plan). Ald. Rummel seconded the motion.

Mr. Barker stated that this demonstrates that there is a huge need for open space. His plan offers the most pressing needs - affordable - transitional. People will use this. They use it now.

Ms. Wilhelm questioned whether the Task Force was abandoning "3"'s plan. What's the unifying theme? What's going to create that sense of place instead of four different activities? Mr. Barker stated that we're not abandoning "3"'s plan. We've heard from the community and they want gardens, Skate Park, and festival grounds.

Mr. Olinger stated that none of these activities are eligible for Baldwin's earmark funds. A seven (7) acre park can still be a dynamic place to be. The language for the earmark talks about ped/bicycle improvements. Improvements that would enhance or build upon, such as improvements to Wilson Street mentioned at last Task Force meeting are eligible.

Mr. Sensenbrenner spoke in favor of Leslie's motion. This idea started 30 years ago and was renewed 10 years ago. Take a step back and think about it, and the distance that we traveled.

Mr. Barker stated that his idea is a realistic starting point. What can we do realistically in the short term that doesn't preclude transitioning to something else?

Ald. Rummel stated that we don't know about the Few St right-of-way. Not ready to make a decision.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that this is a total disregard for "3"'s plan.

Ald. Rummel asked whether this would be an existing subcommittee or new.

Mr. Olinger stated that it could be discussed by the Design Subcommittee, or the entire Task Force.

A vote was taken. Motion passed 5 to 4. Nos (Schmitz, Mullins, Rummel, Wilhelm). Meet a month from now to review with Parks staff the "Barker plan."

[15349](#)

Central Park McCarthy Plan 12-1-2004

5 Discussion/Action on Master Plan and Draft Final Report, as Prepared by "3"

6 MOU Subcommittee Report

7 Update and Discussion on Proposed Railroad Crossing Closings

8 NEXT MEETING

Mark Olinger stated there is a staff meeting on July 7th. The Task Force needs to make a decision on North Few Street access. If we go into a hearing with no particular plan, we aren't going to be successful. It was sense of Task Force that the City should take an aggressive stance on Few Street crossing and petition the OCR for said crossing.

Mr. Olinger stated that the Task Force is supposed to end their business on June 30th. Will talk to Mayor about extension.

Normally the Task Force has met on the 1st & 3rd Wednesdays of the month @ 8am. That was acceptable to members. Tentative next meeting on Wednesday, July 15th.

9 ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mullins, seconded by Rummel, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 9:44 a.m.