

**Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee**  
**Tuesday January 18, 2011**

**APPROVED**

**Present**

Bill Barker, Katrina Forest, Kennedy Gilchrist, Rhonda James, Melissa Jeddelloh, Sissel Schroeder, Laura Shere, Phil Townsend, Susan Will-Wolf

**Also present**

Cathie Bruner (Preserve), Ann Burgess (Friends), Glenda Denniston (Friends), Adam Gundlach (Preserve), Gisela Kutzbach, (Friends), Roma Lenehan (Friends), Bryn Scriver (Preserve)

**Minutes**

The minutes from the November 30, 2010 meeting were approved as presented.

**Public comment**

Kennedy Gilchrist announced that Gary Brown will be talking about water issues at the next Friends Board Meeting to be held in the Science House on February 1 from 7-9PM.

The Second Stakeholder meeting is set for January 25 at 5PM in Room 132 WARF.

The draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the Picnic Point Improvements Project will be presented on January 27 at 5:30PM in Room 132 WARF.

**Update on Picnic Point Improvements Project**

James said work has begun on construction documents. Construction will likely take place between June 2011 and Spring 2012. It will be up to the contractor to determine summer or winter work.

The Planning and Implementation subcommittee will take a look at the planting lists for the Picnic Point project at some point. Barker stated that details on the project, such as stone color, will not come back to the Committee except as informational.

**2011 Budget-review draft documents & schedule for approvals**

Bruner presented the draft budgets: the 2011 draft Operating budget, the 2011 draft Capital budget, and the 2011 draft Workplan.

The draft operating budget normalizes operating expense expectations based on past budgets. Capital expenses were separated out. The Capital budget included services from UW Grounds for work that goes above and beyond maintenance that they perform on a regular basis. (Plowing the Lakeshore Path is an example of maintenance.) The capital budget is money designated for distinct improvements other than on-going maintenance. It may include some Stewardship fund money but again, that money is for distinct improvements. The capital budget and the operating budget combined are the total 2011 budget amount. The operating budget is paid from Facilities Planning & Management funding and from gift funds. The work plan is a continuation of what

we have been doing, is as much as staff thinks is possible to do, includes the project submission from the Friends, and picks up on the stakeholder input and the Planning and Implementation subcommittee prioritized list.

Shere proposed the drafting of an agreement between the Preserve and University Housing as an addition to the work plan. The agreement would clarify use and care expectations in some fuzzy land areas adjacent to housing units as well as ways that housing could potentially assist with outreach efforts that serve residents. Barker said that this should be discussed by the Preserve Executive Team (PET). No action was taken to add it to the work plan.

Lenehan wondered why the plant budgets were different between 2010 and 2011. Bruner pointed out that some money for plants was moved out of the operating budget and into the capital budget and explained that plants are always linked to specific sites or projects and are not just a set amount of money each year.

Bruner congratulated the Friends on the good job they did with their Heritage Oak Project proposal. This was the only formal proposal that was submitted to the Preserve for consideration into the 2011 budget. Bruner noted that staff had worked closely with Friends members Kutzbach and Denniston. That proposal will be posted on the Preserve website.

Will-Wolf had some comments on the language in the Work Plan. Under the Land Management section she thought that it was premature to develop a Preserve burn plan in areas of the Preserve where there is no site vision statement, which includes most areas of the Preserve except for Biocore Prairie. She requested that the Planning and Implementation subcommittee think about vision statements for other areas of the Preserve. She also suggested changing the reference to manage vegetation in 'Muir Woods' to manage vegetation "around the edge of Muir Woods" or "Muir Knoll". She would also like to remove the text "to maintain lake views" from that sentence. Under the Administrative Support section, Will-Wolf would like to see more details added such as, maintaining site plans, archiving monitoring data, documenting work done, evaluating progress and success of techniques.

### **Discussion about Bikes on Picnic Point**

The Picnic Point Fall Visitor Survey Results Summary was distributed at the meeting. This was a repeat of the Summer Visitor Survey. Visitor data was collected by Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture staff for a total of 9.5 hours between Oct. 25-Nov. 6, 2010. The key findings related to bikes were: most people support bikes being allowed on the main path but oppose fast moving bikes.

When the issue of bikes was taken up in the past under Cronon as Committee Chair, a two-year test was instituted after which the bike issue was to be re-evaluated. The initiatives included media releases, signage asking bikers to bike responsibly, and more bike racks to encourage visitors to walk. Burgess said the vote in favor of the two-year test was passed by a 4 to 3 vote; most Committee members wanted a ban on bikes. The current rule that allow bikes to use the main path only was a compromise between those who wanted to allow bikes in the Preserve and

those who did not. The tip of Picnic Point is the main destination for users; that's where everyone wants to go.

Dr. Westman approached the bike issue from a non-ADA compliance angle, but that has been disproved. However if that approach were continued we could end up with an engineering solution (for example 2 paths out to the tip of the Point) that no one, even Dr. Westman, would be happy with.

Barker thought we should approach the bike issue from the angle of, what type of use is appropriate for this part of the Preserve? Is bicycling an appropriate use for a nature preserve?

He met with the UW-Madison Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee of the Campus Transportation Committee on Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010. He said there was a very vocal bike advocate on the subcommittee and the subcommittee was not prepared for the discussion. He feels like he gave them an opportunity to give input on the issue, and does not see a need to seek any further input from them.

Jeddeloh who had to leave early said that if the Committee decides to take up the issue she will take it to ASM and that a poll should be conducted to see what students think.

Denniston asked if bikes could be re-routed to the paved roads. Some thought it would be more difficult to enforce a switch from the main trail to the paved trails.

Townsend and Barker both felt that the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path was appropriate for bikes, whereas the dirt path to the tip of Picnic Point was not a compatible trail type for bikes or appropriate for mixed use. James said we need to be careful with that reasoning because the Howard Temin Lakeshore Path past the boathouse to the Union was not much different than the path out to Picnic Point.

Shere pointed out that there are few sidewalks in Eagle Heights and no sidewalks on Lake Mendota Drive. She said a lot of Eagle Heights residents walk down to Picnic Point where they can take their kids on the slower main trail with bikes and big wheels. With young children this may be the only way kids can get out to the tip and back. She stressed that this is the Eagle Heights residents backyard. Schroeder noted that Hoofers takes young kids to Picnic Point on bikes as part of their programming. Lenehan asked if imposing a bike speed limit would still allow kids to bike since they don't go very fast. Forest pointed out that they are discussing banning bikes, not kids.

Forest made a motion for the Committee to discuss the issue of bikes on Picnic Point and come to a conclusion. Will-Wolf seconded that motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Barker said next steps are to develop a process: survey results, polling students, holding public meetings.

Someone suggested that the UW could simply declare the path as a non-vehicular roadway. Barker said he did not want a fiat.

Forest suggested we should change the tenor of the discussion to a pro-bike one by stressing all the places you can bike in Madison. Townsend agreed with Forest that there are lots of places to bike in Madison besides Picnic Point.

The discussion should also be pro-nature preserve. However, Barker pointed out that most people use the Preserve for recreation and *not* nature study.

Townsend and Schroeder both thought that the focus should be on what makes the best user experience. Forest said the theme of the discussion could be, come out and enjoy your Preserve, or how to enjoy your Preserve. Bruner said the discussion could be an opportunity to attract a lot of positive attention to the Preserve.

Will-Wolf moved to adjourn the meeting and Schroeder seconded it.

### **Adjournment**

Submitted by Bryn Scriver