

**TLNA Council Meeting Minutes**  
**10 April 2014 7:00-9:00pm**  
**Location: Tenney Apartments, 302 N. Baldwin St**

Draft submitted 20 April 2014, Revised Draft submitted 26 April 2014  
 by Patrick Heck, TLNA Secretary

**Chair Person:** Joe Lusson

**Council members Present:** Joe Lusson, Patty Prime, Emily Reynolds, Patrick Heck, Richard Linster, Keith Wessel, Kevin Luecke, James Tye, David Panofsky, Tyler Lark, Jessi Mulhall, David Waugh

**Council members Absent (Excused, advance notification):** Bryan Post, Richard Entenmann

**Council members Absent (Unexcused, no notification):** Michael Ryanjoy

**Guests:** Officer Lewis, Ald. Ledell Zellers, Tom Maglio, Marla Eddy, Chris Gosch, Gigi Holland, Tim Olsen, Michael Druhan, Vikki Kratz, Tom Green, Avtar Roopra, Caroline Alexander, Carole Trone, Simon Puleo, Chad Vogel, Lonnie Richardson

**Next Scheduled Meeting: 8 May 2014**

<b>Agenda:</b>	<b>Actions/Discussion</b>
<b>1. Call to order</b>	1. Convened at 7:00pm
<b>2. Approval of March Minutes.</b>	1. March meeting minutes approved unanimously (motion by Patty Prime, seconded by Richard Linster).
<b>3. Welcome</b>	1. Introduction of TLNA Council members
<b>Introduction of guests.</b>	1. Officer Andre Lewis (MPD) 2. Ledell Zellers, District 2 Alder 3. Tom Maglio, Madison Parks Div. 4. Marla Eddy, City Forester 5. Chris Gosch, Bark Design 6. Gigi Holland, Tenney-Lapham (T-L) resident 7. Tim Olsen, T-L resident 8. Michael Druhan, T-L resident 9. Vikki Kratz, T-L resident 10. Tom Green, T-L resident 11. Avtar Roopra, T-L resident 12. Caroline Alexander, T-L resident 13. Carole Trone, T-L resident 14. Simon Puleo, T-L resident 15. Chad Vogel, T-L resident 16. Lonnie Richardson, T-L resident

<p><b>4. Report of Neighborhood Officer --</b> Officer Lewis or Sgt. Kleinfeldt</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Officer Lewis reported.</li> <li>2. Officer Lewis gave the results of a recent 2.5-hour long speed trap on East Johnson. There were 22 citations issued, many warnings, etc.</li> <li>3. He reminded all that bowfishing is prohibited in Tenney Park. There have been recent reports of bowfishing incidents.</li> <li>4. James Tye asked if a speed trap could be setup on Gorham along James Madison Park, particularly west of Blount St. Officer Lewis said he would look into it.</li> <li>5. Officer Lewis also gave a reminder that the Police Dept. site on the City website is the best place for looking at crime data, incident reports and to get contact info: <a href="http://www.cityofmadison.com/police/">www.cityofmadison.com/police/</a></li> </ol>
<p><b>5. New Business</b></p>	
<p><b>a. TIF for sustainable items, 800 Block E. Washington – Chris Gosch, Bark Design</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This agenda item was moved from 5c to 5a.</li> <li>2. Chris Gosch, Bark Design, presented.</li> <li>3. Chris gave a summary of the TIF request that the Gebhardt development team is making of the City for the Galaxie (800 block E. Washington).</li> <li>4. Joe Lussion asked if there was role for TLNA to play. Does TLNA need to advocate for their TIF request, particularly for the sustainability features? Chris explained the history of the TIF request. The rooftop farm was important to Metcalfe’s and the new grocer is amenable. Gebhardt said from the beginning that they would need financial assistance with the farm. They started TIF discussions with the city and included farm in the discussion, but the TIF amount was eventually halved. There is a possibility that the grocer will pitch in for the farm. Additionally, they have found a different vendor for the planting material with lower cost – the farm concept is still being worked.</li> <li>5. The biodigester has also been included in past TIF discussions. Late last fall, MG&amp;E said they would purchase it as capital expense, but have backed out. MG&amp;E now indicates they will pay for radiant heat up to \$200k rather than for the biodigester. Gebhardt is talking with the biodigester’s manufacturer and are still trying to make it work. It is TBD if any TIF subsidy will be requested. A European biodigester manufacturer is also being courted.</li> <li>6. The rooftop farm is the immediate priority and Chris said they will somehow make it happen. There is a Board of Estimates meeting next Monday and it could be discussed. A single TIF amount of \$4.417 million has been introduced that includes parking, soil remediation and the farm. That amount is a BOE recommendation. Ledell Zellers indicated that she doesn’t expect a big debate and expects it to go through. The criteria of the new TIF ordinance have been met, but with the farm and/or biodigester included, there will need to be an exception.</li> <li>7. Ledell said that the 29 April Council will be a big step forward. She asked Chris when groundbreaking might be – he said it can’t be scheduled yet.</li> </ol>

**b. Emerald Ash Borer – Marla Eddy, City Forester**

1. Marla Eddy, City Forester, presented.
2. She distributed handouts and gave a slide presentation. Included were maps showing where Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) has been found in Madison. Their first discovery, by a private company, was near Warner Park. Per their plan, they did a survey of city trees within a 2-block radius, found larvae, quarantined and continue to monitor. EAB was also found in Berkley Park, Whitetail Ridge, near Eastgate Cinemas and near Dutch Mill Park & Ride.
3. The plan is to work/survey outward in concentric circles from infestation sites. Pesticide treatment starts in 1 month. They expect enough money in this year's budget to treat about 1/6 of the street trees (there are ~21,000 street ash trees in total). They will probably need to cut down about 1/2 of the street trees.
4. Marla gave a history of how Madison got to this position with EAB, starting with Dutch Elm Disease. The City lost about \$7 million from Dutch Elm. As now, the replacement trees came from nurseries. They needed fast-growing trees that do well in nursery environment,s so the easy route was to use maple and ash – species that are now under attack from insects. Species such as gingko don't always do well in nurseries while oaks are comparatively slow growing, so maple and ash dominated.
5. The City has made good progress against Gypsy Moth. They spray and there is a native fungus that attacks its larvae.
6. The Asian Longhorned Beetle (ALB) is another problem - it loves maple trees. Currently, Madison's most frequent tree is maple with ash #2. We need to diversify so that infestations won't remove so much canopy. The City is trying to have 3 tree species per block. So far, ALB can't be killed – there is no chemical treatment for killing the larvae like with EAB. The only solution is to cut infested maple trees down. In Illinois, they've had success with cutting and it seems to be eradicated there. It is still bad in parts of the Eastern US and in Canada.
7. There are purple traps in ash trees (purple is the EAB under-wing color) that attract EAB at about 40% efficiency – not enough. The Common Council supported their branch-sampling tactic when they sample branches in a big plot and whittle them down to look for larvae. This is about 80% effective in detection. EAB is spread by wood, hence the infestations are often near I-94, the beltline, railroad tracks, Token Creek, camping sites, etc.
8. Marla then presented the City's EAB plan. They had public meetings and have discussed every option from clear-cutting through treating every tree. A hybrid plan resulted that went through 7 City committees and Common Council. They believe it is fiscally responsible and environmentally conscious (no soil treatment – just tree injections). The plan pertains only to city trees –private property trees are the property owners' responsibility.
9. Marla mentioned the concerns related to overhead wires. Power companies want to cut back under-wire trees to minimize the possibility

	<p>of dead limbs/trees (from EAB) falling on power lines. They won't be treating street trees under power lines. They also won't treat stressed trees or trees with diameter &lt; 10". Those are subject to removal and replanting.</p> <p>10. The chosen pesticide is TREEAge with a 2-year effectiveness. 1 liter is \$500 and it is done by direct injection. TREEAge is also used in salmon farming and in some fruit and vegetable production. A 15" tree requires one teaspoon of TREEAge per treatment every 2 years. Trees with diameter less than 10" tend to girdle from the wound and a new plug is used for each treatment, so the tree needs to be healthy and large.</p> <p>11. There is a Homeowner Toolkit on the City Forester site: <a href="http://www.cityofmadison.com/parks/services/forestry/">www.cityofmadison.com/parks/services/forestry/</a>.</p> <p>12. EAB prefers green ash, then white ash and then blue ash. Important for property owners to make a decision about the ashes on their private property. Woodpecker damage is an indicator of possible EAB infestation. Street trees are only 15% of the canopy – the rest are on private property or in parks.</p> <p>13. Parks Dept. has an adopt-a-tree program – tree must be in a park (not a street tree), be 10" or more in diameter and in good health. The adopter hires a tree contractor from the list of those licensed to work on city trees (see website). Homeowners can use the same contractor list for finding someone to treat their private trees. No city-funded treatments will be done in city parks – they will be funding treatment only for street trees because the visual and quality of life impacts are greater. Treating half of the street trees will be ~\$400k every two years. Preemptive removals scheduled for 2014 are already done.</p> <p>14. Forestry contact info: 608-266-4816.</p> <p>15. Ledell Zellers asked about the trees with yellow dots in Tenney Park- are they adoptable? No - only trees without yellow dots are adoptable. Unadopted park trees will be removed as needed on a phased schedule due to budget limitations. Along the river and in parks, they will first remove trees in poor condition or that are too small. Yellow marks mean they will be removed.</p> <p>16. James Tye asked why they didn't use 2 colors indicating (1) to be removed and (2) not to be treated. Marla answered that the lack of budget money means the result is about the same; they will eventually be removed. Another reason they plan to save street trees is that they have more targets - if unhealthy, they can damage property/cars or hit pedestrians.</p> <p>17. Richard Linster asked for more clarification on why they weren't saving trees under power lines. Marla said because they don't have nice canopies and many aren't healthy anyway, so they are a smaller loss.</p> <p>18. David Panofsky asked what percentage of trees are street trees in T-L. Marla didn't have those numbers but in some areas, 22% are ash and 30% are maple – it could be similar in T-L.</p> <p>19. Marla said that the replanting cost is about \$100 per tree. The City mandates that street trees be chosen from a list of smaller trees, e.g.,</p>
--	---

	<p>crabapple, that won't impact the power lines as much as current trees. How much to replant all 21k street trees? Marla said only 12k are treatable and that would be about \$800k for one treatment.</p> <p>20. James Tye asked if any E. Johnson street trees will be impacted by the reconstruction project and will any of those be treated. Marla said, yes, that those that qualify will be treated. She noted that the treatment cost calculations are for a single treatment, but they need them for their lifetime. She also said the Parks Dept. needs more resources for replanting (for staff/trees). Common Council still has to address this.</p> <p>21. David Waugh asked if the estimated treatment cost is for the city or a private property tree owner. Marla said for private trees it will be \$10 to \$15 per inch diameter. For the city it is about \$7/inch. David asked if there is a mechanism for adoption for under power line trees? No - not according to the plan passed by Council.</p> <p>22. Patty Prime asked how much it is to adopt a park tree. Marla said it is the cost of treating the tree – perhaps \$150 for 1 two-year treatment. Every two years the adopter will get an email asking if they would like to adopt again, i.e., pay for another treatment. Marla said there are about 500 ash trees in Tenney Park alone.</p> <p>23. Paul (last name unknown) asked why MG&amp;E can't start burying their lines. He said that we are paying with the loss of our quality of life because MG&amp;E won't pay to underground. There was discussion about a particular species on the replanting list – a Japanese tree lilac. He thought it was invasive, Marla said it wasn't. She reiterated that you can't pick your own street tree species replacement – they are city property.</p> <p>24. Tim Olsen asked if we can plant any species in our own yards. Marla said yes, but there are recommended trees on their website. They hope for diverse species so we don't repeat the mistakes of the past.</p> <p>25. Caroline Alexander said that without larger street trees, our homes will be hotter and streetscapes uglier, so why can't we adopt? Marla said that the plan is a balance and will address the need for diverse species. She noted that ash trees will be phased out – they will not be removed all at once.</p> <p>26. Marla said that the City is competing against other cities for nursery trees. There are shortages due to the recent economic downturn, so nursery land has converted to cropland – there is no quick turnaround of tree stock.</p> <p>.</p>
<p><b>c. Tom Maglio, Parks Division update on 2014 CIP project – Tenney Beach parking lot reconfiguration</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This agenda item was moved from 5a to 5c.</li> <li>2. Tom Maglio reported.</li> <li>3. Tom passed around plans for the Tenney Park lot reconfiguration, next to the beach shelter. The project money is in City's budget. The existing parking lot has one of worst surfaces in the city and is not a good design. The new lot will cut down the parking lot size by 40%, yet lose only 5 stalls. Currently, there are 34 stalls with 1 accessible while the new configuration will have 27 stalls with 2 accessible.</li> <li>4. A wet retention pond will also be added to prevent runoff. It will work</li> </ol>

about 70% of the time (small storms). James Tye asked why not have more green area closer to lake, i.e., why not move the lot away from the lake? Tom said it would be twice the cost because it would be total removal rather than a resurfacing and partial removal. He stated that the removal material is all recycled. James said that parking lots on lakes are not a good idea. Tom stated that the view is still good, even with the lot.

5. Tim Olsen said that he prefers an even smaller lot, lakeside or not, to discourage driving. He asked if the retention pond could be an irregular shape, rather than a rectangle, like nature. He asked about the lot's ability to handle ATV parking and ice fishermen. Friends of the Yahara River Pkwy say that the existing lot is not designated to handle this; those vehicles should park in river lots.
6. Michael Druhan who lives next to the lot says he wants more parking. The park and lot belong to all of Madison and the lot is full all year. Ice fishermen need a place to turn around; canoes launch and families love to park there. He added that the most important need the lot serves is increasing beach-user diversity. Many users don't live nearby, so they must drive. The park/beach need to be accessible to more types of people.
7. Richard Linster said we should consider if and how the lot size reduction impacts neighbors. He asked why they chose a reduction of 5 spots. Why not more? Why not less? Tom M. said that the adjacent grass area should be near the shelter rather than having the lot up against the shelter. The nearby play area will be rebuilt in future years, so want grass near there. Richard L. asked if the reduced size will allow easy turnarounds. Tom said yes - it is 62' across, which is plenty of space.
8. James Tye asked how many years the lot has been there. Tom M. wasn't sure but thought since the 1970s. James said the project is a major investment, so the City should look at all options. James said there is a new state law that restricts building anything within 300' of the lakeshore. Cities don't have to follow that law, but villages do – he thinks Madison should follow the spirit of that law. Tom M. said it is a refurbishment, not a new lot and doubted the law would apply anyway, Joe Lusson said that he liked the 40% reduction of surface area because there would be less salt, runoff, etc. - it could possibly be altered, but we do need a parking lot.
9. Paul (unknown last name) asked if Tom M. had talked with traffic engineering about the lot layout. He suggested that they can do real measurements of usage and asked again if larger vehicles and boaters should use the other lots. Tom M. said yes, they should. He stated that Parks staff rarely sees the lot full.
10. David Waugh asked if Sherman street parking could be added to reduce the lot size. Patty P. said that when that stretch of Sherman was rebuilt it was narrowed, so parking might not work. Street parking starts west of Marston. Joe L. said it would be good to have more spots on the street. Tom M. stated that the vista from Sherman Ave is also important.
11. David Panofsky said that less asphalt is good, but please don't use tire

	<p>chips on the playground. Tom M. said that there will be meetings starting next year on the playground renovation.</p> <p>12. Tim Olsen asked what is the more sacred land - park along lake or the street-space? This project chooses parking and cars, including choosing drive-by viewing rather than having street parking. He prefers removing the parking lot. We don't provide parking at Giddings or James Madison.</p> <p>13. Jeff (last name unknown) agrees that we should have no parking lot at all. There is parking by the tennis courts and along the river, so get rid of the lot and the proposed collecting pool.</p> <p>14. <b>James Tye moved that TLNA work with Parks to explore options and to ask the City to table the parking lot refurbishment.</b></p> <p>15. Tom M. reiterated that the project is in this year's budget and that if it isn't done, we might not get the funds again for as long as 10 years. He states that the project will be out for bid in May for fall construction.</p> <p>16. Richard L. asks if the city cares about TLNA's opinion on this project. He said he wants to second James' motion, but thinks the lot refurbishment is a better solution.</p> <p>17. <b>David Waugh seconded James' motion.</b> Discussion ensued. David P. said that what could come out of any modified project could be even worse. He will vote no. Kevin Luecke agrees that Parks will do the project regardless of TLNA's opinion. Patty Prime says she is probably not in favor of the motion, because the lot is used – the refurbishment and area reduction are a good compromise. David W. said he seconded the motion because from a Parks perspective, the project is maintenance, but there are bigger implications. There should have been a different process.</p> <p>18. Keith Wessler submitted a friendly amendment that Parks let TLNA know sooner for future projects. James T. accepted. Joe L. stated that he likes the project as presented - the area reduction is great, he wants the beaches and lakes to continue to be used. Emily Reynolds said that getting rid of some lot area is great and that physical activity promoted by removing the lot is needed, but she thinks it's a done deal.</p> <p>19. <b>The motion failed on a voice vote.</b></p> <p>20. <b>Kevin Luecke moved that the friendly amendment from Keith W. be separated and voted upon. Emily R. seconded and the motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. Joe L. will communicate this to Parks.</b></p>
<p><b>6. Report of Elected Officials.</b></p>	<p>District 2 Alder Ledell Zellers reported.</p> <p>1. The City continues to try to reduce the impact of the East Johnson reconstruction project. Changes in parking restrictions on nearby streets have already started. These will allow for greater turnover near Johnson, thereby helping the businesses and nearby neighbors.</p> <p>2. Central Park across E. Washington is starting to schedule events, including 3 concerts and a 7 Sept. chefs event.</p> <p>3. The zoning and neighborhood plan changes requested for the Reynolds lot development passed Plan Commission and Council.</p> <p>4. The Lamp House ad hoc committee report was approved at Council.</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. The Landmarks Commission’s rejection of the Gilman Street development was upheld by the Council, 12-6.</li> <li>6. The Yahara River Parkway continues to move ahead.</li> <li>7. David Waugh asked about the inability of residents to save trees under power lines. He asked if she thought was impossible to save them. Ledell said that the EAB plan passed a couple of years ago and doubts that the will exists to change it, but she will follow up.</li> <li>8. David Panofsky said that Forestry needed to present better numbers. Ledell said that if the questions are articulated, she will facilitate a discussion with Parks and the City. Joe Lusson suggested that we could have a sub-committee to deal with the tree/EAB issue and that TLNA could encourage T-L residents to adopt park trees. David P. said that there first needs to be broader discussion about the City's plan. Ledell agreed. She will further research the issue and report back to Joe and others.</li> <li>9. Richard L. said that TLNA should demand the city revisit the EAB plan. He suggested that civil disobedience could be in order. Richard added that he was very happy with the Council’s backup up of the Landmarks Commission on the Gilman project. He asked Ledell why the vote was so lopsided. Ledell said that right prevailed, but that there was good communication with alders about the real issues/concern. Two info sources were crucial – the steering committee for the project and from Ledell, both well before Landmarks turned down the proposal. She said that council members are bombarded with info, but most were well informed on this issue. She said most alders saw the hardship associated with the rejection as self-created. Joe L. mentioned that David W. testified about heritage tourism and historic buildings, which was valuable. Ledell said all testimony was dynamite and diverse. The adjacent neighborhood associations all spoke against the project, including those with historic districts and structures.</li> <li>10. Keith Wessel revisited the tree issue – if we would allow taller trees, energy usage will go down, but instead the City is demanding short trees to protect the wires. How about some large, but slow growth trees? Maybe we can bury the lines or technology will change in the long run. Ledell agreed. James T. asked if the TLNA neighborhood plan contains quality of life issues. Do we need a longer planning process to address sustainability? David P. said that some sustainability and related matters are in the plan, but it was written in 2008, prior to the possibility of having a biodigester. EAB and such. Joe L. suggested that we might be able to eliminate the overhead phone lines as landlines are becoming obsolete. Keith W. said he paid ~\$400 to have bury his lines. Ledell said they did the same. Joe suggested an email conversation on the issue.</li> </ol>
<b>7. President’s comments</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Due to late hour, Joe Lusson postponed his comments until next month.</li> </ol>
<b>8. Report of Officers</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emily Reynolds, Treasurer, reported that TLNA has \$11,773.38 in cash</li> </ol>



<b>and Committees</b>	assets.
<b>a. Johnson Street Business grant award</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Patty Prime reported.</li> <li>2. There was a meeting of volunteer meeting held this week and a meeting for businesses with City staff scheduled for Tuesday at 10:30 at Johnson Public House. The TLNA grant proposal is not yet a done deal because the City Council needs to vote on it, but signs are good. Ledell Z. said she would include the pertinent Council meeting when sending out her weekly reminders. Patty P. reminded the TLNA Council that the grant is structured for reimbursement rather than direct payment. It is a negotiated contract that is reimbursed as we go. The project will be asking for \$1,000 from TLNA to supplement the city's expected \$5,000 and the \$500 donation by MG&amp;E. She is hoping that there will be enough for a stipend for communications and marketing likely including coordinating with businesses, recruitment and developing an events calendar. Patty P. moved that TLNA donate \$1,000 to the project, Richard L. seconded and it passed unanimously.</li> <li>3. Joe Lusson said that the project should ask for more from TLNA if it becomes necessary.</li> <li>4. Ledell Z. encouraged all to sign up for the reconstruction project's weekly email updates. Info available at <a href="http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/EJohnson/">http://www.cityofmadison.com/engineering/EJohnson/</a> Use the "Stay Informed" links on that page to sign up for project updates.</li> </ol>
<b>b. Newsletter Distribution</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jessi Mulhall – discussion postponed to next meeting due to late hour.</li> </ol>
<b>c. Social/Membership</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Richard Linster – no report</li> </ol>
<b>d. Parks</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. James Tye – no report</li> </ol>
<b>e. Business</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dirk Entenmann - no report</li> </ol>
<b>f. Development</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. David Waugh – no report</li> </ol>
<b>g. Housing</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Keith Wessell - no report</li> </ol>
<b>h. Transportation/Safety</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kevin Luecke - no report</li> </ol>
<b>i. Publicity/Newletter</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jessi Mulhall – no report</li> </ol>
<b>9. Adjournment</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. James motioned to adjourn the meeting.</li> <li>2. Motion passed unanimously.</li> <li>3. Meeting adjourned at 9:31pm.</li> </ol>