

From: [Tim Kubala](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: garver vacant land
Date: Sunday, November 26, 2023 4:23:49 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

adam, please read below,

Date 11/26/2023 submission 1
To: adam kaniewski@cityofmadison.com
Subject: garver vacant land
From: tim kubala

adam and..... all those involved in the management of and in a position to determine the future course of development of Madison city parklands. S again we find ourselves at a pinch point with regards to pending future directives with immense consequences on the nature and character of our parklands. Of particular interest now, for purposes of this communication, is the development of city land behind the garver enterprise on the madison east side. We are currently presented with the opportunity to seize the moment and apply a courageous and enlightened vision regarding near future, hands on, involvement with these lands. The attractiveness and positive pull to the area of concern, for visitors and long term residents alike, is the perception of a pseudo wildness and wild life habitat with the standing near maturity (non manicured) status of the flora. That template aligns perfectly with the interests and passions of those who are sustained by the proximity of and access to an experience of the natural order. which is the self identification of many Madison residents that comprise the patch work of outdoor enthusiasts that daily enjoy the reputation of a town that favors a healthy eco system. Now we have the chance to maintain and enhance a vibrant segment of our cityscape with embellishments consistent with this purpose. Making your way up Starkweather creek, which bisects the area considered, or walk the path network in place, you experience the effects of the pseudo wildness available to the greenest of novices to the most earnest of outdoor enthusiast. This is dependent on the mixed age and density of plant life found throughout the parcel and particularly within the sunken watershed of Starkweather..

Here presents a chance at nurturing an urban green space that contains nesting habitat and a green space corridor passage unlike parklands elsewhere. The starkweather/garver complex could become known for its richness and uniqueness of its readily diverse inhabitants. As a portion of the larger sherry park holdings, the garver square footage is essential to the successful implementing of the stated parkland strategy. The listed options presented in the survey lack inspiration and foresight. Option 2 should be eliminated due to its limited creativity and general destructive effect on the natural elements that currently survive. The author of this layout should reexamine their support option 1or2. Trying to force a dog park, which was eliminated from approval recently, includes a chain link fence about the perimeter of 2.7 acres, is poor politics at best. How does that area as delineated enhance the neighborhood park experience? The same arguments against such a dominating feature that applied to the sherry park attempt apply here. That fact that the feature got moved across the creek doesn't eliminate the destructive effect it has on land use. Where is the consideration of community and neighborhood values we hear city planners throw around so loosely? The block like layout reflects a lack of imagination and limited expertise. What the hell is a plaza area as defined or a nature (??) based play area anyway? This tract of land is just not appropriate for dedicated use as a dog park. The concept of neighborhood parks as policy, is historically well established and applies in this instance. In no

way will the existence of a dog park enhance the quality of the park experience. Its forcing an established perimeter border to an established park into something its not suited to be. The concept of neighborhoods and the essence of community is completely devalued and dismissed, with the current city planning paradigm, as an essential constituent of a healthy township. And there is a cohesive neighborhood centered about fair oak avenue that has and deserves a proprietary relationship with the vacant city land.

Option 1! is only incrementally better. Where is the separating berm represented on map option 1? And a 2-4 foot high bermed exclusion barrier? Who put any real effort or thought into these proposals. Neither of these two options satisfy the emphasis or intent of the park's division's adopted land management plan as delineated in the DLMP. Artificially segmented with square corners (90 deg) and arbitrary edges of existing or planned future areas are inaccurately drawn and labeled incorrectly as to current vegetative status. Proposed dog park neatly coincides with a large stand of established shoreline grasses next to the starkweather bank and allows direct infiltration of dog feces to the river and lake system. The planning area boundary extends to within feet of the channelized banks of starkweather providing more square footage to conquer and convert by the mow driven park crews. The entire grassy wetland will suffer management at the cost of the yearly use as hunting grounds by great blue and green herons, belted kingfishers as well as resident red tailed hawks and great horned owl and others associated with it. There wouldn't have been a fledged brood of great horned owls w/option 2, the standing snags being essential to that equation. Absolutely no to option2!! Why is no action not an option? Neither options 1 or 2 represent the dominant feelings of the residents of district 15, there again bastardizing the legitimacy of this survey. Thank you for sticking with me, your consideration is appreciated.

Tim kubala

From: [Tim Kubala](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: garver north parcel development
Date: Tuesday, December 5, 2023 9:07:45 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

To: akaniewski@cityofmadison.com
From : tim kubala date: 12/5/2023
Subject: garver north parcel development submission 3

The designated play area is conservatively 1/50 of the area appointed for dog usage as indicated on the two published layouts, Olbrich Park development plan – north parcel. who decided on 2.7 acres as an appropriate acreage and who brought this up for reconsideration within approximately a year of being turned down in Sherry Park. Simply moving the dog park site the few feet across the creek cannot legitimize taking up the issue once again. The obligation to maintain the factual nature of information is a responsibility falling squarely on Adam Kaniewski's lap as project manager. There is a general lack of continuity between what is said by city officials at public input meetings and what is produced. A plan is all but decided before any public input meeting ever happens and the options differ very little.

The north development layouts lack sophistication. It essentially grants permission to mow the entire acreage including right up to the water's edge. The truth be told this effort to reintroduce the dog park is reliant on the mostly transient population of tenants of the new high rise apartment complexes (none of whom have shared this far Oak community for even a year). Residences that are hardly conducive to knowing your neighbor down the hall much less to the activity of building community relationships with owner occupants, some residents of better than ¼ century. What a fine embellishment to eventual parkland, 2.7 acres ringed by chain link fencing confounded by 100+ additional parking stalls. Both options offered as a choice require the clear cutting of 1/3 the standing timber, notable in light of being told in no uncertain terms that the wooded area would remain untouched as wilderness lands. 2 – 4 foot berms are useless for noise and sound abatement. Where does it say the city is required to enhance the privately owned living units and businesses with hardscape parking spaces. How about the novel idea that the profit nature of the concerned business in the presence of the new spaces as an overflow relief measure. The confused nature of drivers becoming walkers to get to the cramped Garver building becomes a pedestrian safety issue extending back out to Fair Oaks intersection. The need to continually develop empty spaces is not implicit and any motion in that direction should be engaged with the utmost caution and introspection.

From: [Tim Kubala](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: olbrich park development summation 4
Date: Monday, December 4, 2023 10:27:33 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

12/4/2023

Adam please consider the issues delineated below. Thanks for you time and effort. tim

The renderings released of the southern portion of the playground maps lack clarity and relevance to the public decision making process. For instance, its nowhere indicated that the proximal playground features, most notably, the new path will interfere with a functioning sledding hill, an immensely popular component of that quadrant of the park. Further muddled is exactly what happens to the eastern end of the new multi use path. How does this compliment the atwood street fiasco and the new third, path bridge? From the looks of it seems like the path is headed towards the breakwater and what happens at the exclusion barrier at the corner of lakeland and welch?? For that matter, how does the complete package of amendments suggested for that section of the park impact the front door and associated parking and entrance of olbrich gardens. There is no information attainable about such high impact features from these maps. Much is made of insufficient parking for a limited number of events and overflow parking from garver, yet there is no obvious egress to or egress from, the option proposed from these playground concepts. In fact, it is a playground isolated by roadways, a river and a lake. Review the original ideas of filling in open spaces with dysfunctional child entertainment before you plop down more parking stalls. Parking stalls must be integrated early in the design rather than as an afterthought.

i'm mostly concerned about the northern destruction of a good beginning to a notable parkland in the northwest quadrant of the extended city parkway. an overwhelming number of survey respondents favored green, preservation of what currently exist over a dog park of any size or style.

I took a random survey of the survey results whose excerpts you compiled and published by making a tabulation of pro dog park versus green space preservation and enhancement. pages 30 to 35, I counted 31 pro conservation/preservation voiced opinions vs 5 for a dog pr. 31 to 5. doing it again for pages 36 to 40 revealed, 46 for a green approach, 10 for dog park. In case you missed it: that's ' 76 for a sustainable green, 15 for a dog park. Further cursory investigation down the line showed the same ratios. Shame on any attempts at forcing the dog park issue again. residents and dog owners of the fair oak neighborhood have spoken loud and clear. Let the dog park die.

From: [sarah.bauman](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: Wildlife
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 5:57:51 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Has there been consideration or studies/ analysis of how this project will impact current wildlife populations living in the North Parcel Olbrich area?

I have heard of coyote sightings in this area and have seen nesting turtles, frogs and many different species of birds.

Thanks,
Sarah

From: [Paul Noeldner](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#); [Freiwald, Ann](#); [Lance Green - FSC MNC BNA Leader](#); [All Alders](#); [Knepp, Eric](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comments on Madison Parks Project Update: Olbrich Park - North Parcel - Paul Noeldner
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 7:40:03 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi Adam - thanks for hosting the public meeting. Here is a written copy of my verbal comments at the Dec 7 public Zoom meeting about the Olbrich Park North Parcel. I did not read it all verbally in the interest of sharing time with others. Please include the input below in the public record. Thank you!

Cc Eric Knepp, Lance Green, Alders Burris and Myadze fyi

Olbrich Park North Parcel

Public Comments - Dec 7, 2023

Paul Noeldner speaking as an active Madison Parks nature recreation public engagement volunteer.

We need to look at the big picture, not just parcel by parcel. Madison Parks and Engineering Greenway Natural Areas offer numerous benefits to the general Madison public. City management of Parks and Greenway Natural Areas helps meet climate, water, pollinator, tree canopy, public physical and mental health, equitable access to nature, lower infrastructure and management cost benefits, consistent public usage guidelines, and sustainable urban ecological biodiversity goals. It can be argued that in a time of unprecedented climate change, all of our remaining undeveloped and unmowed natural areas and borders in Madison Parks and Greenways should be managed with a priority on preserving and sustaining native Wisconsin plants and wildlife biodiversity. This also helps Madison offer daily opportunities to all citizens for free healthy public enjoyment of eco-friendly activities and nearby nature in every Madison neighborhood.

The Olbrich Park North Parcel site behind Garver is already small and parts are degraded but all of it is restorable and valuable as a natural area. This parcel behind Garver is ecologically critical as a historic wetland natural area and because it is at the junction of the two main branches of Starkweather Creek. The survival of healthy sustainable populations of native birds, bees, butterflies, turtles, frogs and other wildlife all along the creek depend on our vision and saving this as a natural area.

The presence of dogs on leash on walk paths greatly impacts native bird nesting, especially in small natural areas and corridors. Dog walking should not be allowed on nature trails or in unmowed natural areas. New off leash dog parks should only be established on already existing mowed open space, not by taking away remaining natural areas where native species live that have no place else to go. They can't just walk on a sidewalk. The ecological science should outweigh perceived public demand in our remaining natural areas.

Please put all additional parking on existing nearby Olbrich open space and lawn areas that are within easy walking distance, and prioritize bus, walk and bike access to the natural area.

Please do not shortsightedly take part of the precious small remaining open space that could be restored as part of the natural area as a dumping ground for Olbrich Gardens waste right next

to the creek and busy bike path and Garver events! Put the Olbrich waste on an existing unused Olbrich mowed area that is easier for equipment to access with less disruption to nature and to the public, and put a fence around it. By way of example, UW Madison has decided to quit using the Lakeshore Nature Preserve as a waste dumping and storage site with trucks coming and going all the time in what is otherwise a wonderful highly utilized natural area. Instead, UW planning is getting the waste and equipment traffic out of the natural area and instead emphasizing the terrific natural public values by adding a Nature Outreach Center to their plans. Madison planning should take a lesson from that and adopt the same vision by saving all of the remaining natural area and ideally add a Nature Center to the plan, not a waste dump.

Look at the wonderful Pheasant Branch Creek Corridor a model for Madison to preserve this area as part of a connected East Side Starkweater Creek Corridor with paths for eco-friendly nature recreation and preserve beautiful sustainable native trees and habitat and vibrant natural life all the way from Lake Monona to the creek headwaters for the enjoyment and value of neighborhoods all along this community connecting corridor.

Thanks for taking these recommendations into planning consideration.

Paul Noeldner
Volunteer Madison FUN Coordinator
Wisconsin Master Naturalist Instructor
136 Kensington Maple Bluff
paul_noeldner@hotmail.com
[608 698 0104](tel:6086980104)

Public Ethics, Facts and Fairness Trump Personal, Family and Religious Values and Profits in Public Decisions in Democratic Government, Laws and Institutions in a Free Civil Society. Simply put being civil is just like sports. Fair rules mean everybody can play hard and cheer for our team, but not keep some people out of the game, skip paying our fair share, wreck the playing field, or cheat to win.

/

(:>)

/

From: [Nan Fey](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: Re: Olbrich Park - North Parcel Quesion for 12/7 public meeting
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 6:19:40 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Learning the soil is contaminated and food cannot be grown in it directly, further supports investigation of creating an “accessible, raised bed community garden” near the new parking lot. As far as I know, there are only a few scattered accessible raised beds in Madiakon community gardens.

On Dec 7, 2023 at 5:51 PM -0600, Nan Fey <nanfey2@gmail.com>, wrote:

Hello,

The City’s Comprehensive Plan has recently been updated to include “community gardens and urban agriculture” on the list of appropriate land uses in the Parks & Open Space category on page 25, and the Common Council’s Farmland Preservation Task Force Report of 2023 includes a recommendation that Parks plan proactively for growing space.

It is a rare opportunity to plan a new park, when it’s possible to consider and accommodate a range uses. What planning efforts have been undertaken thus far to include “community gardens and/or urban agriculture” in the new Olbrich Park - North Parcel? If these options haven’t been considered, why not, and what can be done to include them in future discussions?

Thanks for considering this issue and these questions, whether during tonight's public meeting or in the coming weeks as the plan options are revised to account for public input.

Nan Fey

Former Chair of Madison’s Plan Commission and Madison Food Policy Councils
Chair of the 2023 Common Council authorized Farmland Preservation Task Force

From: [Liz Vowles](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: Olbrich Park - North Parcel Park
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 7:47:29 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi, I worked at Madison Kipp for many years, until 2010, and spent many a lunch period walking in this wild area, and appreciating the magic of such a place surrounded by city. It didn't need improvement for me, and, I suspect, for many other walkers. It was simply there, for the birds and animals and cottonwood trees and those of us who found it.

Liz Vowles
Madison

From: [Kiley](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: Olbrich North Parcel Feedback
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 7:17:24 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hello,

I attended the public hearing but was not able to provide spoken comment due to time. Below is my written feedback.

As a resident in the neighborhood and someone attentive to both the needs of our human and nonhuman residents, I would emphasize that an off-leash dog park or managed prairie/woodland with on-leash walking areas would be less threatening to wildlife than the existing brown-field. As a dog owner, I would be immensely pleased to have either of these options available. If the site is not used for an off-leash dog park, please continue to allow on-leash walking. Contrary to some of the commenters, sidewalk strolls are often insufficient mental stimulation for dogs and also much less pleasant for their owners.

I am enthusiastic about this opportunity to transform the dirt mound and gravel grinding area into a greenspace everyone in the neighborhood can enjoy!

Be well,
Kiley

From: [Bryan Dean](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#); [Martinez-Rutherford, Dina Nina](#)
Cc: [Anne Aaker](#)
Subject: Olbrich Park - North Parcel Park Development Plan
Date: Thursday, December 7, 2023 6:19:07 PM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi, Bryan Dean here, I am just writing, for myself and for Anne Aaker, because we missed the comment period but still wanted to be part of the process. We are also missing the meeting that is taking place tonight unfortunately.

Of the two options presented here

<https://www.cityofmadison.com/parks/projects/olbrich-park-north-parcel-park-development-plan>

We would say that we are more in favor of option one but we would love to see two changes to that design.

1: The idea that we need more parking (75 stalls) in the Garver area seems silly to me. I think we need to ask why we need to provide a parking lot that will sit empty 98% of the time and only really fill up during events at either Garver or Olbrich. The vast majority of the time there are no events. Can people not walk a short distance in those other 2% of instances? I live in the neighborhood closest to Garver and Olbrich and people often park on my street and walk over. This is not some hardship for either myself or them. It is a very short walk. Additionally if there is a wedding at Garver usually the parking lot at Olbrich is empty. Very very rarely is there something so attended that both are full. Additionally both of these spaces are very near to bus lines and directly on the bike path. We should be encouraging both of those modes of transit and not more cars. Cars and all of the issues that come with them are a problem to be solved not to be catered to.

2: The plan calls for an "open field area". I think that is a massive waste of space and time. Directly across the bike path and tracks there is already an open field area. I see it every day, almost always empty, absolutely mowed regularly. If there was a need for an open field area at Garver it already exists. The North Parcel Plan should take that proposed open field area and add it to the managed meadow trails area.

In summation we do not need more open asphalt parking area and we do not need more empty mowed areas over by Garver. There is plenty of that currently.

Thank you, we can't wait to see the meeting notes and hope to make it to the next meeting. Thanks for your consideration.

From: [Alexis Bourgeois](#)
To: [Kaniewski, Adam B](#)
Subject: Re: Olbrich park feedback
Date: Friday, December 8, 2023 9:05:35 AM

Caution: This email was sent from an external source. Avoid unknown links and attachments.

Hi Adam,

Thanks for your prompt response! Somehow it got lost in my inbox. That's interesting, I've never seen any exercise equipment on this side of town (though I certainly could be missing it). Some of that kind of equipment seems like overkill - just a few bars at different heights (for pushups, pullups, etc) and a platform to do step-ups would seem sufficient. I wish there had been some kind of usage study done before that park had been pulled. I think you all would have been surprised with the slow but steady stream of adults working out down there. I think the location had a lot to do with it - right off a well trafficked part of the bike path and looking out at the lake. And, as has been noted, there was really no one else ever down there so it didn't feel awkward doing public workouts. Not to mention that part of the park has this whole wellness vibe going on with that hill. Definitely see fitness and yoga classes meeting-up there, too. Anyway, I hear that it's not a priority. Thanks for hearing me out.

On another but related note - Garver. Thanks so much for hosting the meeting last night! I loved the idea that if there is a dog park it could be housed at OB sherry. Our family would also be a huge fan of some kind of bike feature over there. We do drive to Aldo Leopold, Maywood Park in Monona, Quarry Park and Black Hawk to use their pump tracks and trails. It would be nice to have something like that on the east side. I also know that there seem to be a fair amount of families with kids living in that apartment building across from the Garver apartments on Fair Oaks that might enjoy some of that, too. We have a lot of great parks on the East Side - it would be nice to have some different features in them as you're building them out!

Tangentially, and you're probably not the person for this - but the East Side/ North Side needs a pool!!! I feel strongly that access to public pools is an equity issue that Madison needs to work on. That's really my soapbox! I feel like the conversations around what to put in a park when we have a million of them is less important to me.

Anyway, thanks again for hosting that meeting. I'm so impressed with how patient, kind and knowledgeable you are - I am sure it can be a grueling process at times. But yay, for public spaces and the conversations that they elicit.

Best,
Alexis