

**Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee**  
**Tuesday November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2010**

APPROVED

**Present**

Bill Barker, Gary Brown, Katrina Forest, Kennedy Gilchrist, Rhonda James, Kevin McSweeney, Anne Readel, Sissel Schroeder, Phil Townsend, Susan Will-Wolf

**Also present**

Cathie Bruner (Preserve), Ann Burgess (Friends), Daniel Einstein (Campus Planning), Adam Gundlach (Preserve), Roma Lenehan (Friends), John Magnuson (Friends), Marcia Schmidt (Friends), Bryn Scriver (Preserve)

**Minutes**

The minutes from the Oct. 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting were approved with a few changes: Readel was mistakenly identified as Burgess in two places; Barker met with the chair of the bike/ped committee on Oct. 28<sup>th</sup> not Nov. 28<sup>th</sup>; and “GreenHouse” as in the Residential Learning Community has a capital *G* and a capital *H*.

**Public comment**

Gilchrist announced that Bill Cronon was elected president of the American Historical Association, a position considered one of the highest honors in his profession. Gilchrist also commended Gundlach and Scriver for a fine e-newsletter. Gilchrist recommended a talk by photographer and writer Eddee Daniel about urban wilderness. Lastly, Gilchrist mentioned that the Friends Board will discuss applying for a \$5000 National Environmental Education Foundation grant if there is interest from the Preserve Committee and Preserve staff. He asked for project proposal ideas.

McSweeney announced a change in city policy that no longer exempts the Arboretum and city Conservation Parks from a brush pile burn ban. Barker said the exemption was vetoed by the mayor without input. Gundlach said that he was told that the exemptions were revoked out of air quality concerns and concerns that city crews were not closely monitoring burning brush piles. Gundlach said the Preserve had been in the process of trying to acquire an exemption when the ban went into place. He said the Preserve could save time and money by burning brush. Right now, Gundlach says, staff has to haul cut brush off site where it can be chipped; then the chipped material has to be hauled to another location in the Preserve where it can be used to line trails. The current process involves repeat materials handling and fossil fuel burning.

**Bikes on Picnic Point status report**

Barker will talk with the UW-Madison Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee of the Campus Transportation Committee on Dec. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010. Barker stressed the importance of engaging the community in the bike discussion. Brown said the question that we focus on should be whether or not it is appropriate for bikes to be allowed in a nature preserve not whether it's safe to have bikes in the Preserve. The current trail meets all ADA accessibility rules. Although, Brown says, if people are

feeling threatened by a minority of bikes and are not going out to Picnic Point anymore that is a problem.

### **Facility Use Guidelines for Muir Knoll/Gard Circle**

According to Bruner the Facility Use Guidelines were developed by the Facilities Use Committee with the Grounds Department to protect campus lawn spaces. Muir Knoll including Gard Circle is a reservable space through the Central Reservations Office [262-2755]. Brown clarified that you do not have to reserve the space to use it but it is a good idea for official functions. Magnuson said that the current guideline language is not entirely clear that small groups can use the circle anytime its not officially reserved. Forest wanted clarification on why the space cannot be scheduled more than 1 time per month for activities that extend outside the circle. She hopes that it is used more often than that. Bruner said that it is to protect the vegetation. Will-Wolf suggested the guidelines should say something like, “the Circle can hold 34 people and can be used more often than 1 time per month.” It was also noted that Picnic Point fire circle reservations are made through the Physical Plant not Central Reservations so that is why they are not included in the Facility Use Guidelines.

### **Preliminary discussion about parking lots 129-130**

Brown said currently the parking spaces at lots 129 and 130 are set aside for Preserve users with free 3 hour parking. Over the last year or so he has seen a lot of people using the lots for commuter parking; by 10AM there are usually no open parking spaces which denies access to Preserve users. In the last semester Transportation Services has done more enforcement of the 3 hour parking limit. Transportation Services suggests metering lots 129 and 130 with multi-space parking meters that accept credit and debit cards. It might costs something like \$1/hour for the first 2-3 hours; then it would become progressively more expensive to park there for each additional hour. Any money collected above and beyond Transportation Services costs would go to the Preserve. Transportation Services would give the Preserve as many free parking permits for the 2 lots as it needs for volunteers, student groups, etc.

Both Readel and Will-Wolf do not like the idea of someone being able to park in the lots all day, even if they pay. They would like to see a hard and fast 3 hour limit. Brown said parking at the metered lots for a full day would cost more than an all day campus parking pass to discourage people from doing that. Barker asked if there needed to be more pointed signage that the lots are intended for Preserve users. Forest asked if there could be something on the meter where someone has to “check” that they will be using the Preserve. Brown said that would exceed the current technology. Magnuson said that he found that parking in lots 129 and 130 is not a problem on football weekends. Brown said that the 3 hour limit protects them on game days and as does lot 60 availability. Brown said the Transportation Department will implement a pilot program. There will also be a media release.

### **Budget process overview**

The operating budget, capital budget and work plan will all be separate documents. The drafts will be presented at the January Preserve Committee meeting. The Committee will vote on them at the February meeting. The second stakeholder meeting will be held on Tues. January 25<sup>th</sup> at 5PM in Room 132 WARF Building.

The Planning and Implementation subcommittee will prioritize the issues brought up by the stakeholders.

Schroeder asked why there was no money for the Research/Academic programs in FY2010. Bruner said no one applied to use the money in FY 2010. The fund was set up for student management of the Preserve. It was used in the past for the Tent Colony Woods research plots. Evelyn Howell's student will use the money in FY2011 to complete the Tent Colony Woods monitoring.

Schroeder commented that this is a bargain budget for the Preserve. All were reminded that the Preserve benefits from the Friends group and in-kind support from the UW. Will-Wolf asked if we will continue to get support from the Grounds Department. Bruner said we do get their assistance in their down time. Barker stated that 20% of Brown's salary is a donation from the UW and it is sort-of a recognition of the Preserve's success so far. Brown also noted that Rhonda James' time is not calculated in the budget nor the Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture interns. Barker added that none of the Preserve Committee's time is captured here either.

#### **Picnic Point Improvements (action item)**

Brown said the Picnic Point improvements meeting was well attended and the project proposal was generally well-received. Although a handful of people don't want anything to happen out there. Schroeder agreed with Brown saying there was a vocal contingent opposed to the project at the meeting but that most were favorably inclined toward this project option over any other. Magnuson said the mood of this meeting was different than previous meetings. He credited it to staff responsive to comments in the past. Burgess added that at the meeting Bill Cronon tactfully pointed out that many of the people who were opposed to the project were older and he suspects they think about Picnic Point the way it used to be not the how it is currently. Brown said he felt he and Alan Fish made a good case to protect the space from the use its getting.

Schroeder added that she liked the idea that this is just the 1<sup>st</sup> stage in a long-term project to protect Picnic Point, and she congratulated those involved with working with the donors—keeping the project alive by keeping the donor interested while honoring the public's concerns.

Barker said he hoped that everyone could support the project.

A motion to approve the project was made by Forest and seconded by Schroeder and passed unanimously.

Brown announced that the next steps will be getting detailed construction documents; creating species lists; working with the donor on plaques and stone color, etc. He also announced that an Environmental Impact Assessment meeting is scheduled for Jan. 27<sup>th</sup> at 5:30PM in Room 132 WARF Building.

#### **Preserve Mounds Management**

Einstein presented the issue by stating that over the last many months the Planning and Implementation subcommittee has been discussing mounds management issues,

especially vegetation management on the mounds. Einstein said the policy presented today is a shift from the previous discussions. Currently he is working on creating a broad policy statement that would be a UW Campus Planning Committee policy not a Preserve policy. A vegetation management discussion can come out of this policy later. This UW policy would cover the mounds on campus and in the Arboretum. Barker would like to see agreement between the UW, Edgewood, Madison City Parks, and Dane County on mounds management. He also wants to know the Native perspective.

Einstein explained that his intent with the language in the draft policy presented today has at least two dimensions: 1) protect the structural integrity of the mounds and, 2) preserve and restore the cultural and landscape context of the mounds. He stressed that ancient monuments and cemeteries have cosmological significance. He wants the committee to think about the mounds within a broader landscape setting. Therefore he included the following text, "...the university is mindful of preserving views of the individual mound contours, and longer views toward water features and the sky." Brown made it clear that there is no intention to clear cut trees in order to re-establish views..

Barker and Will-Wolf both thought "longer views toward water features and the sky" and "...the broader landscape setting" from the 2<sup>nd</sup> point under *Burial mound management goals* were too general. Barker was especially uncomfortable with this without having a Native perspective on the larger context of the mounds. Brown said he supported the ideas expressed in those sentences saying that where the mounds were sited is important.

Barker asked if the term "Native American mounds" was more inclusive and if it should be used in place of "burial mounds" He was told that the terminology the State of Wisconsin uses is, "burial mounds" and that even if a mound does not have a burial they were almost always related to mortuary activities.

Schroeder pointed out that the mounds are not just "regionally unique" but also internationally unique. She would like to see the last sentence of the first paragraph under *Background* to read, "These cultural resources are both rare and regionally and internationally unique."

It was decided that Schroeder can help spearhead consultation and interactions with the tribes about mounds management. She cautioned that the tribes will not all agree but that it is indeed important to include their voice in the discussion. She said she would share the draft policy with the tribes at some Dec. or Jan. meetings with tribal representatives.

The policy will need to go to the Arboretum Committee too for input.

In response to a question from McSweeney, Brown explained that the buffer zone is the area around the mounds where there can be no new soil disturbance without a permit. Einstein explained that under the burial site preservation law a mound site can get an additional level of protection by cataloging the site with the Wisconsin Historical Society. The UW mounds have been cataloged with a minimum 25-foot buffer. By state law the buffer has to be a minimum of 5 feet. When this law was

made the Wisconsin Historical Society recommended a 25 foot buffer but the governor used a line item veto to change “25 feet” to “5 feet.”

Einstein said that existing structures within the cataloged site, such as sidewalks, do not need to be removed, although the campus is planning on removing a sidewalk segment near the Observatory Hill mounds.

A motion was offered to make the following changes to the draft policy:

1) Change the last sentence of the first paragraph under Background to read, “These cultural resources are both rare and regionally *and internationally* unique.”

2) Remove the words, “...and longer views toward water features and the sky.”

From the last sentence of the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under *Background*.

3) Remove the words, “...and the broader landscape setting” from goal no. 2.

4) Under goal no. 5 change the word “Provide” in *Provide for compatible land uses on and adjacent to mounds* to “Facilitate” and change the words “manage mounds sites for” to “facilitate”.

Einstein asked if a vote could be taken on each item separately but was denied by Barker; the meeting was already over time

The vote passed.

Will-Wolf moved to adjourn the meeting and Forest seconded that motion.

## **Adjournment**

Submitted by Bryn Scriver