



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved CENTRAL PARK DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE

Wednesday, August 5, 2009

8:00 AM

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

1 CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL - 8:00 a.m.

STAFF PRESENT: Mark Olinger and Kevin Briski

Present: 8 -

Joseph R. Clausius; William W. Barker; Nancy T. Ragland; Joe Sensenbrenner; Leslie C. Schroeder; M. Nan Cheney; Phyllis Wilhelm and Amy T. Overby

Excused: 4 -

Marsha A. Rummel; Bradley C. Mullins; Susan M. Schmitz and Truly Remarkable Loon

2 APPROVAL OF MINUTES - July 15, 2009

Ms. Ragland asked, in the future, if the motion could be underlined.

A motion was made by Cheney, seconded by Overby, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT

[15509](#)

Marquette Neighborhood Association Letter dated 7/15/09 re: Few Street Railroad Crossing

Mr. Olinger stated that hearings for the petition for the closing of the three crossings will be held on February 11, 2010. The City is engaging a consultant to put together the necessary documents for the Few Street crossing. He is recommending that the consultant work with "3" for design, aesthetics, safety plan, etc. By the end of September the City might have something back from HNTB/"3" to prepare its own application and submit to OCR for Few Street crossing. There is no contract yet. Meeting tomorrow with staff to talk about this project and others re: Capital Budget. Will reauthorize 2009 budget for expenditure in 2010 as potential match for the Baldwin earmark. Final tally for the earmark is \$3.149 million. Options we should think about are quiet zone, closing crossings during certain times of day, open to ped/bike, etc.

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

Mr. Olinger stated that the Task Force never really formally closed the loop on adopting or accepting "3" report. This could help us move forward after the Task Force concludes this effort.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that we owe something to “3” for the work they did.

Mr. Barker asked if we accept the report, then what happens.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that we had a motion that talked about the McCarthy Plan. She suggested accepting “3’s” report and pass it on to the Parks Department so they can do further studies/park plans.

Mr. Barker stated that in “3’s plan, the Few Street crossing is their grand entrance. If the OCR doesn’t agree, there’s a big flaw.

Ms. Schroeder stated that the treatment of Few Street crossing we all really like if RR is amenable to it.

Ms. Ragland suggested accept “3’s” report as a plan for Phase 1 of Central Park. She likes the idea that Central Park will eventually get bigger.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that was always implied.

Alder Clausius stated that it says “Conceptual Master Plan” right on the front of the plan. He sits on the Parks Commission too. This is a framework. He has no problem approving it.

Mr. Barker stated it gives the park a mission, sets up a structure, allows it to evolve and grow. There are viable evolutionary pathways in this document.

Ms. Cheney stated that conceptual does not mean first phase. She would like to see it a little more defined than that.

Ms. Schroeder thinks it should be less defined. We could get stuck on this because it’s too concrete.

Ms. Wilhelm stated she likes the word “conceptual.”

Ms. Schroeder stated if she reads it as Phase 1, then all of that must be done before you can move on to Phase 2.

Mr. Barker stated that we need political support and cash.

Mr. Olinger stated that it’s a lot easier to get funding if you have a document, even if details change as program gets refined. A budget, like that on pages 35-38, will be very helpful as the City moves into its capital budget deliberations. If we have Phases 1 and 2, we can say this is what we need. If those get approved, then we do the design, construction documents, etc. If we go to Council with no set ideas, there is no conceptual roadmap for how we get this thing built and our charges had development of plan and budget. An easier path to getting Brearly done than the Great Lawn because it’s in the TIF District. Will help with decisions about funding down the road.

Mr. Barker asked what was the City’s process with Rose Garden at Olbrich.

Ms. Ragland stated that it was privately funded by the Olbrich Botanical Society (OBS). It went through Parks Commission and Public Works. It went out as a construction bid.

Mr. Olinger stated that the Wilson Street improvements could potentially be funded by Earmark funds. There is funding for some of this to get done in next year or two.

A motion was made by Ms. Wilhelm, seconded by Ms. Ragland, to accept the Conceptual Master Plan as prepared by "3."

Ald. Clausius asked if this motion passes, does this get referred to Council. Mr. Olinger said that it would.

Ms. Ragland suggested a friendly amendment to add "Central Park" to the motion.

Mr. Olinger suggested adding: subject to staff review and final adoption by the Task Force.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

5 Discussion on Final Report to Council

Mr. Barker thanked the Task Force for their efforts. We're getting close to being finished.

Mr. Olinger distributed some notes based on the Task Force's Interim Report (15 months ago). He made notes on what is needed (see attached). Perhaps the Task Force could get more detail on MOU and wrap up discussion at next meeting. Conceptual Master Plan - said document would be discussed at next meeting. Might have some more detail on budget. Try to break them out as Phase 1 and Phase 2. Pretty close to being able to finish the document. He and Mr. Barker will start working on it. Tentative Schedule: September 2 for next meeting (1st Wed.); conclude affairs on September 16; introduce Final Report to Council on October 6 for referral. Referrals will probably be to Ped/Bike, Parks and Plan Commission. Mr. Barker stated that he is available to answer questions @ meetings. Mr. Sensenbrenner stated he would like to do the same. Mr. Olinger asked if the CRC would like a presentation from the Task Force as they have never engaged the Board in a discussion. Mr. Sensenbrenner stated that mid fall would be fine - he has kept them up to date, but will get back to us.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that she will be out of the office from September 14-22. She would like to recognize Kevin Briski for his collaboration on the process.

Ms. Ragland stated that the Task Force should also express their appreciation to "3" and MG&E.

Ms. Wilhelm stated we should send a brief note to let "3" know we've

accepted their report and thank them for all of their work on this project.

A motion was made by Mr. Sensenbrenner, seconded by Ald. Clausius, to recognize and salute "3's" contributions of resources and professional expertise in advancing the overall goals of the Task Force. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Mr. Olinger asked everybody to go through "3's" plan and if there are any final questions or comments, and get them to us so we can make final changes to the document.

Mr. Sensenbrenner asked if there was an updated bare bones plan, i.e., showing location of Skate Park.

Ms. Schroeder stated we should allow some flexibility.

Mr. Barker stated the skate park needs a home so they can begin their fundraising.

Mr. Briski stated acknowledged skate park location. Gives them designation and site - Ingersoll by the point.

6 [15809](#)

MOU Subcommittee Report

Mr. Barker thanked Ms. Ragland for bringing the draft MOU (see attached).

Ms. Wilhelm asked Mr. Briski if he had comments on the draft MOU.

Mr. Briski stated this is all part of discussion that they have had with the MOU Subcommittee. The Parks Department is in support of this. They are looking for additional input. They have been part of the dialogue with the MOU Subcommittee.

Ms. Schroeder asked how many people all together on the board?

Ms. Ragland stated that it's a large board. It keeps the community involved.

Mr. Barker stated that a large board also divides the work up. It works for Olbrich.

Ms. Ragland stated that it would be up to 18 ambassadors for Central Park.

Ms. Overby stated that according to the numbers in the draft, it would be up to 21. She likes the language "for the first three years." When things are kind of rolling, you can cut it back.

Ms. Wilhelm stated that legal expertise will be needed regarding who holds title to the land, etc.

Ms. Schroeder stated that she is anxious about recommendations about number of festival events. Question about programming - Parks doesn't

want to be the programmers.

Mr. Briski stated that Parks has offered some opportunities for the department to be involved. They offered a number of different scenarios. Haven't fully developed staffing model. Could integrate the programming aspect into the Parks organization. Direct recommendation that you make it part of mall/concourse maintenance group. Programming side can be taken care of by recreational services. Can be as involved as you want or not. They're here at the table; they want to facilitate. They want to be a full partner.

Mr. Barker stated that the Parks Commission doesn't micromanage.

Mr. Briski stated they do report events to the Board as a monthly report.

Mr. Barker stated that major musical festivals will go through the full process in the beginning.

Mr. Olinger stated that he has sent a request over to City Attorney for assistance in drafting an MOU.

As there was no agenda item regarding action on the MOU, more discussion will occur at next Task Force meeting.

7 NEXT MEETING

8 ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Wilhelm, seconded by Overby, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:58 a.m.