

Village of Shorewood Hills
Joint Meeting of the Board of Trustees and Plan Commission
Draft Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 28, 2014 7:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** Village President Mark Sundquist called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Roll Call**
 - A. **Board of Trustees** Members of the Board present were Mr. Sundquist and Trustees Bob Hurley, Dave Benforado, Felice Borisy-Rudin and John Imes. Tim Ridders and Barbara Center were excused.
 - B. **Plan Commission** Members of the Plan Commission present were Board/Plan Commission members Mr. Sundquist and Mr. Benforado and Plan Commission members Debby Remington, Brauna Hartzell, Karl Wellensiek, Earl Munson and Jim Etmanczyk. Also in attendance were Village Administrator Karl Frantz and Village Clerk Cokie Albrecht. Approximately 100 visitors were in the audience.
3. **Statement of Public Notice** Karl Frantz confirmed the meeting had been properly posted and noticed.
4. **Procedures Orientation** There was none tonight.
5. **Appearances**
 - A. **Representatives from the University of Wisconsin Madison (UW) will present the Recreation (Rec) Sports Master Plan with focus on the University Bay (U Bay) Fields component of the plan**

Representatives from UW's Facilities Planning and Management attending the meeting were Associate Vice Chancellor Bill Elvey and Gary Brown, Director of Campus Planning and Landscape Architecture.

Attendees from UW's Rec Sports were John Horn, Director, Mike Warren, Senior Associate Director, and Aaron Hobson, Assistant Director of Competitive Sports.

A copy of the power point presentation provided by the UW staff is attached as Addendum A.

Mr. Elvey provided an overview of the proposed Rec Sports Master Plan. He said that the UW's policy is to create master plans for the development of its facilities; it is time to address recreational sports. The Rec Sports Master Plan is a draft, nearing final completion. No formal design has been done.

Mr. Horn outlined the components of the Rec Sports Master Plan. It includes the reconstruction and expansion of the SERF and Natatorium and improvements to the Near East and Near West playing fields (located adjacent to the Natatorium on the UW campus). The changes would be funded in part by an increase in the UW students' segregated fees. If approved through a student referendum to be held March 3-5, 2014, the portion of segregated fees funding UW's recreational sports would increase from \$36.78 to \$145.06/semester. The plan also calls for the expansion of the Nielsen Tennis Stadium and the development of the U Bay Fields into a sports complex. Neither of those projects is included in the student referendum. Funding for them has not yet been identified, although "Rec Sports is

actively pursuing donor opportunities...” The facilities envisioned for the U Bay Fields include: the installation of overhead lights to provide illumination of the playing fields in the spring and fall from dusk to 9:00 p.m. Monday-Thursday; nine fields dedicated to specific sports; synthetic turf on the four fields on the southwest corner of the property; two picnic shelter/concession stand/bathroom structures; a par course; chain link fencing with gates around the synthetic turf fields; construction of a new parking lot to the north of the Waisman Center and expansion of the parking lot at the intersection of University Bay Drive and Oxford Road.

Mr. Brown discussed the process for the review of the proposed Master Plan and the expected timing of the development stages.

B. Public invited to speak about the Master Plan with focus on the U Bay Fields (Please complete the form at the registration table if you wish to speak and place it in the box at the table. When it is time to speak your name will be called. You may also/instead provide written comment. Place your comment in the box on the registration table)

Andy Mendyk, 1115 Wellesley Road, said he was concerned about the traffic the U Bay sports complex would generate. He anticipated overflow parking on adjacent streets since he did not believe the proposed parking would be adequate to handle the increased demand. He was concerned about the impact of the development on police resources. He also envisioned negative impacts from the lights and anticipated trash after events.

Fred Wade, 1121 Wellesley Road, suggested that limiting the fields to specific sports will actually reduce their availability since currently the same fields are used for multiple sports. Mr. Horn said that the Master Plan reflects the present uses plus it will provide space for baseball and softball games.

Ann Gordon-Walker, 1230 University Bay Drive, asked about the fencing. Mr. Horn said the baseball and softball diamonds will have backstops and fences marking foul lines. The four synthetic turf fields will be fenced, similarly to the soccer field on the southeast corner of the U Bay Fields presently used by the Athletic Department.

Bob Hurley, 3448 Crestwood, asked for clarification of the funding for the \$10 million U Bay Fields development. Mr. Elvey said it is not included in the referendum. If the referendum fails, the U Bay Fields project could proceed since it will be financed by donations.

David Armstrong, 1114 University Bay Drive, said the development of the U Bay Fields as proposed will have significant negative impacts on the quality of life of nearby residents. Presently the use of the fields is open and flexible; the planned sports complex, however, will make the uses more structured and intense. The traffic, lights, noise, parking, and concession stands will result in a much different environment than what is there now. Mr. Armstrong said he was also concerned about the environmental impacts: the fields were once a natural marsh and wetland. They serve as an infiltration area for stormwater, providing some protection from the movement of silt, sediment, and pollutants into Lake Mendota and a source to recharge ground water. The fields now provide refuge for wildlife.

Mr. Sundquist asked if the artificial turf will be permeable. Mr. Elvey replied that the synthetic turf will be water compliant.

Tom Martin, 1111 Wellesley Road, said he has nine concerns about the development of U Bay Fields, some of which have been addressed this evening. His comments will focus on his concerns about the impact of the sports complex on wildlife and the ecology. He does not know where migrating water fowl will go when the grass they visit semiannually is covered with artificial turf. He has done research on artificial turf and wondered why it was being introduced to this ecologically sensitive area. He would like to see toxicological and safety testing of the turf done. Once the artificial turf is installed, it will be permanent: the fields cannot be returned to grass. He said synthetic turf is expensive to maintain: the temperature on the turf will be high on warm days—it will have to be wetted to make it useable; it also will need to be washed periodically. Mr. Martin was concerned about the timing of the environmental impact assessment. He felt it should be done now, before the planning progresses. He fears the environmental impact statement will have little actual impact on the development since it will be completed after the plans are finalized.

Rick Gourse, 1118 University Bay Drive, said he lives across the street from the U Bay Fields. This area is a floodplain. In the 25 years he has lived there, he has seen large portions of the grass covered with rainwater and stormwater runoff. He is concerned about the impact of the sports complex, particularly the synthetic turf, on drainage. He wonders about the growth of molds and infectious agents if water infiltration is limited. Mr. Gourse said these health threats need to be considered in addition to the plan's negative impacts on esthetics. Mr. Brown replied they are aware a floodplain is located on the east side of the U Bay Fields. That is why the synthetic turf is planned for the fields closest to Shorewood Hills—out of the floodplain. The synthetic turf is included in the plan because presently the wet conditions leave the natural grass unusable a good deal of the time. Games have to be cancelled. Artificial turf, however, can be played on in wet conditions. Mr. Brown said the proposed turf will be placed over a gravel, not asphalt, base. The gravel will improve infiltration and the turf will not heat up; it therefore will not need to be watered down. Mr. Brown said the UW will examine the negative aspects of the turf, including its toxicology, in the environmental impact analysis.

Liberty Boucher, 1132 University Bay Drive, said she also lives across from the U Bay Fields and has seen them underwater frequently. She is concerned about the impact of the artificial turf on infiltration—will it exacerbate flooding? Will the turf be damaged by being underwater often?

Mr. Benforado asked if there were any plans to raise the playing fields out of the floodplain. Mr. Brown said there were not.

Alain Peyrot, 918 University Bay Drive, suggested that the UW use innovative thinking to deal with the saturated grass rather than cover it with artificial turf. He suggested that the UW staff look into pumping “muck” from University Bay and depositing it on the U Bay Fields. The goal would be to improve the quality of the lake and raise the level of the U Bay Fields by a couple of feet.

Karla Knobel, 1006 University Bay Drive, said she lives on University Bay Drive and works at the Waisman Center. She is aware of what is happening on the U Bay Fields every day. She asked the UW staff to recognize that they are planning to cover with artificial turf and fence a large grass area that, according to own their projections, won't be used for several months of the year—from November to March. Is this worth introducing the poisons, toxins, drainage issues, etc., associated with the synthetic turf

and limiting the use of the fields with the fencing, for facilities that will be used so few months of the year? In reality the UW club teams use the fields primarily April to May and September to October. The rest of the time—including several hours each day—the fields sit largely empty.

Peter Monkmeyer, 1128 University Bay Drive, said he is concerned about lighting. Will the proposed overhead lights comply with the Village of Shorewood Hills' lighting ordinance? Addressing the UW staff, Mr. Monkmeyer asked: Is the installation of lights an essential part of what you want to do? Shouldn't UW students be back in their dorms studying after dark? He asked the staff to reconsider the proposed lighting for several reasons, including its impact on children trying to sleep in bedrooms that face the fields. He is also concerned about a possible public address system and wonders if one were not installed initially, would it be later? Further, he understood that one significant purpose of the U Bay sports complex is to make money; Rec Sports plans to rent the use of the fields to outside groups—is that correct? Mr. Horn replied that the fields are currently rented out. Mr. Monkmeyer replied that if this project were to go forward as planned, they will be rented far more, including at night. He said he would prefer that the fields remain unlit. However, if the sports complex has to include lighted fields, he suggested that the staff move the UW soccer practice field to the west, leave it unlit, and move the Rec Sports illuminated fields east to its location. Mr. Monkmeyer asked for a show of hands of how many in the audience were opposed to the installation of the overhead lights. All ~100 attendees' hands, excluding the UW staff's, went up.

Mr. Sundquist said the direction the lights are pointed will have a significant impact on the neighborhood.

Kennedy Gilcrest, 30 South Franklin Avenue, said that he lives in the Hoyt Park neighborhood, several blocks away from the proposed development of the U Bay Fields. He can see the lights from the UW's McClimon Track and Soccer Complex/Near East and West Rec Fields from his home. He said that he anticipates his neighborhood will be impacted by the new overhead lights envisioned for the U Bay Fields.

Mr. Elvey said that they get the message that lighting is a concern. There will be a detailed study of it as part of the environmental impact analysis.

Karen Strier, 1111 Wellesley Road, wondered why the environmental impact assessment could not be done earlier in the planning process. Mr. Elvey replied that there is no reason to spend money to study a project if there is none—they don't have the \$10 million yet.

Tom Martin, 1111 Wellesley Road, said that despite assurances to the contrary from the UW, the lights from the UW Children's Hospital are very visible in adjacent neighborhoods.

David DeVito, 939 University Bay Drive, asked the UW staff to clarify how open the fenced areas would be. Mr. Brown said the fences will surround the four synthetic turf fields. They will be similar to the one presently around the Athletic Department's soccer practice field in the southeast corner of the U Bay Fields—black chain link, approximately five feet tall. The fences will have gates which will be locked at some times. Mr. DeVito said his family moved to University Bay Drive in 2006. Since then he has seen six or seven major building projects on the West Campus. He hoped that the Master Plan review process, including the Joint West Campus Committee's, will conclude that leaving the U Bay Fields an open, grassed area would be a counter balance

to the concrete recently erected in the area. If this project proceeds, Mr. DeVito said he will “feel cheated” that he did not put up more of a protest when the hospital/health sciences buildings—several of them in the Shorewood Hills’ corporate boundaries—were recently constructed or expanded adjacent to his home. He would like to see the U Bay Fields left in their present state.

Terry Andrews, 921 University Bay Drive, said he agrees with the issues already raised tonight but as the father of young children, will emphasize his concern about traffic, including the increase in its volume and speed, if the project as planned goes forward. Given the anticipated demographic of the population using the sports complex, many will be younger drivers. Mr. Andrews anticipates they will tend to drive fast. How will the UW mitigate the impact of this on the neighborhood? Mr. Brown replied the plans include the construction of a parking lot that will contain approximately 100 new parking spaces north of the Waisman Center. That lot would be accessed from Highland Avenue, not University Bay Drive. The existing parking lot at Oxford Road would be expanded to 75 spaces. It’s possible the parking spaces along University Bay Drive could be eliminated. Mr. Andrews said number of parking spaces does not address his concerns about the dangers of increased traffic volume and speed. He also wondered about a willow tree to the northwest of the 1918 Marsh—will it be removed for the construction of the baseball/softball diamonds? Mr. Brown said as far as he knows the tree is staying. Mr. Andrews said that the UW presently has a unique “jewel” in the U Bay Fields. He does not understand why some UW staff would consider paving over portions of it to construct parking lots and synthetic turf fields, limiting its use to the wider community. Mr. Brown said their goal is to provide needed facilities for students.

Santhia Brandt, 933 Cornell Court, wondered why the plans include the construction of a parking lot/more parking spaces since the majority of the anticipated uses of the sports complex will be after work hours. With the games starting at 4:30, couldn’t the participants park in the present Lot 60 or Waisman lot, both of which would be largely empty at the time? Mr. Elvey said that parking is subject to potential compromise. The need for the increased number of parking spaces remains to be determined. The plans are not intended to provide parking for students—the spaces would be for other users of the sports complex. The neighborhoods’ concerns will be considered at the Joint West Committee level. The plans show a new parking lot but nothing has been designed yet.

Ms. Borisy-Rudin wondered how the students will get to/from the U Bay Fields. Mr. Brown said that the campus bus travels near there; students would also walk and bike to the area.

David Boutwell, 2935 Harvard Drive, asked the UW to look into the signage of the bike path on the south side of the U Bay Fields. Presently there is no way to travel east by bike legally.

Jenny Armstrong, 1114 University Bay Drive, said she shared many of the concerns voiced this evening. She would like the UW staff to think creatively about the use of the U Bay Fields. Instead of a sports complex, make the space an unstructured conservancy open space where well being, sports, and health uses by all are provided. She would like the area made into a well being for life area with grass turf, walking and biking paths, no parking on University Bay Drive. Leave the space unfenced, without artificial turf or lights. Keep the area open and flexible and usable by many.

Liberty Boucher, 1132 University Bay Drive, asked if wet playing fields are an issue, why is the Athletic Department's soccer practice field grass rather than synthetic turf? Mr. Brown said the soccer field was recently rebuilt with underground drainage. On wet days, however, the team tries to stay off of it.

Mr. Frantz, wondered if the UW staff had considered improving the grass playing fields through installing better drainage, implementing better maintenance practices, etc., rather than covering them with artificial turf.

Denise Runde, 1202 Shorewood Boulevard, asked if there were not ways to improve the drainage on the U Bay Fields rather than install artificial turf.

Mr. Sundquist summed the audience's comments to the UW staff: there is significant concern about the artificial turf. Instead of covering four fields with it, explore modern methods to improve the grass fields.

Andy Alexander, 1006 University Bay Drive said he lives near the U Bay Fields and works at the Waisman Center. As a result, he is very familiar with the activities on the playing fields. He questioned the premise that they are not available in wet conditions—he sees them often used in the rain. He disagrees that there is a need to dramatically change the fields with lights and synthetic turf; the present grass provides an acceptable playing surface.

Liberty Boucher, 1132 University Bay Drive, asked if there will be a public address system installed at the sports complex. Mr. Horn said that a public address system is not a priority. In response to the audience's reaction to that reply, Mr. Horn said the sports complex does not need a public address system. Ms. Boucher asked if a PA system were not needed, why construct concession buildings? Mr. Horn said that presently, concessions are sold on portable tables; an actual concession building would be more convenient. Ms. Boucher wondered if the UW staff would consider using food carts instead of constructing permanent concession structures. Mr. Horn said they could consider them. Ms. Boucher asked when the overhead lights would be turned on and how. Mr. Horn replied the lighting of the fields would be determined by game schedules. The lights would be controlled by computers.

Carol Barford, 1212 Wellesley Road, said she is the Director of the Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment at the UW's Nelson Institute. She agreed with the concerns expressed by her neighbors. She said we love the U Bay Fields the way they are now. The proposed synthetic turf would be permanent: if installed, in our lifetimes we will never see the grass fields again. She said the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts, also at the Nelson Institute, has studied the change in Wisconsin's climate over the last 50 years. In that period, precipitation has markedly increased in the southern portion of the state. Also the frequency of intense rainfall events is increasing. She said it is not true that we know where the 500 year floodplain on the U Bay Fields is located—it is moving west. As plans for the development of the fields are reviewed, she asked the UW Rec staff to take advantage of the expertise on the UW campus, carefully consider the comments shared this evening, and recognize they do not know everything about the area.

Mark Trewartha, 1205 Shorewood Boulevard, said that the neighbors of the U Bay Fields are pleading with the UW staff: do not do this. Is this another of the University's fait accompli in the West Campus area? What clout does the surrounding community have to change the Master Plan? Can the Village do its own environmental impact assessment in

terms of light, noise, traffic, quality of life, property values? Mr. Trewartha is afraid the concerns of the community are falling on deaf ears.

John Kutzbach, 1138 Shorewood Boulevard, is Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences and Environmental Studies at the Nelson Institute and a member of the Science Advisory Board of the Wisconsin Initiative on Climate Change Impacts. He concurred with Ms Barford's comments about the likelihood of increasing rain in the future. This will make it more difficult to control water quality. Historical data about the natural conditions on the U Bay Fields are not relevant because the environment is changing. Mr. Brown replied the UW is working on extensive stormwater control projects near the U Bay Fields (on the north side of Lot 60 and along northern portions of University Bay Drive). They are aware of stormwater issues and are consulting with experts regarding them.

Joan Shands, 1117 Wellesley Road, said many of her concerns have been expressed this evening. She wanted to emphasize sound. The neighbors have all heard noise from the playing fields but knew it was limited and temporary. It will be very different if enhanced sound systems are used at the sports complex for several more hours a day. If installed, she asked the staff to keep the community in mind and direct megaphones and public address systems away from apartments/houses nearby.

Caryl Askins, 1234 University Bay Drive, said she has lived across from the U Bay Fields for 25 years. She is bothered by the idea of fencing and locked gates. She sees no need for them, nor the synthetic turf. She is concerned about the artificial turf's impact on flooding and wildlife.

Susan Porter, 1110 University Bay Drive, said that the U Bay Fields are wonderful as they are—for years, neighbors have used and enjoyed the fields without fences while respecting the rights of the teams to play there. There has never been a conflict; the fences are unnecessary. She too would like to see the environmental impact studies completed earlier, before the plans are finalized and it is too late. Ms. Porter is concerned about the sports complex's impact on an already bad traffic situation on University Bay Drive—she can't imagine adding more traffic to the already congested street. She wonders how emergency vehicles will be able to navigate through the area. She is worried about the negative impacts of the lighting on the area's neighbors. And she is concerned about the sports complex's impact on the many water fowl that rest in the fields—where will they go/how will they feed on artificial turf?

Carl Grant, 2700 Colgate Road, is also worried about the impact the development of the U Bay Fields will have on traffic since he feels it is bad now. He asked the UW staff where the idea to increase segregated fees to pay for these recreation facilities originated: was it a plan constructed in some UW office and brought to the students? Mr. Horn said the ASM president David Gardner could answer that question. The preparation of the Rec Master Plan was suggested by the Student Services Finance Committee—the action is documented in their meeting minutes.

Susan Porter, 1110 University Bay Drive, said that she questioned the need for additional outdoor playing facilities: in her experience, students are more interested in indoor sports activities.

Charlie Palit, 933 University Bay Drive, wondered who will speak for the birds that presently flock on the U Bay Fields. Or those that previously congregated on the many recently green areas in the West Campus that are now under concrete. He said we heard

this evening the plans to build the concession stands are to make the UW staff's lives more convenient and will generate revenue, without consideration of their negative impacts. Mr. Palit anticipates the buildings constructed on the U Bay Fields will lead to bigger structures in the future in pursuit of more convenience, more revenue. He fears the creation of the U Bay sports complex will ruin the natural resource that the fields now are.

Karin Ringler, 1240 Dartmouth Road, said she is concerned about the artificial turf and fences. The use of the U Bay Fields is unstructured now and that is the way it should be left.

Mr. Sundquist concurred that the fences will close off one of the few remaining vast open spaces in the area. An example is the impact of the fences on the use of the fields for cross country skiing. Mr. Brown replied cross country trails are available; the open U Bay Fields are not a cross country course.

Craig Weinhold, 1235 Dartmouth Road, said he grew up near the U Bay Fields and although he has never participated in a structured rec program there, has used/enjoyed the fields for years, including for kite flying and rocket launching. He said he feels he owns the fields, as does the surrounding community. The development of the sports complex, however, will close the use of the fields to most, including residents of University Houses and Eagle Heights. Mr. Weinhold is opposed to the proposed lighting, as others have mentioned. He wonders why baseball and softball diamonds are part of the plan. Mr. Horn replied they discussed the plan with Eagle Heights residents and they requested the basketball and volleyball courts. The ball diamonds will be used by two club baseball teams, a women's softball club team and intramural sports softball league.

Plan Commission member Earl Munson, asked the UW staff to quantify the usage of the U Bay Fields' facilities. How will use now compare to use as a sports complex? What would be the impact on the hours of use if the overhead lights, synthetic turf, PA system were eliminated from the plans? If Rec Sports were unable to rent the space to outside groups, what would be the impact on your revenues? Mr. Horn said, considering all Rec Sports' outdoor facilities, on average they lose 25 to 40% of scheduled games due to weather/field conditions. The lost games are not rescheduled. Over 14,000 students participate in intramural sports; there are 41 active club sports, half are outdoor based, and each has several teams associated with them. Increasing the number of useable outdoor facilities, as proposed in the Master Plan, will impact several thousand students per semester. For example, they now have to turn away 50 – 70 flag football teams each year for lack of space on the Near East and Near West Fields. Mr. Horn anticipates many of those could be accommodated if those fields were expanded. He expects the 14,000 students participating in Rec Sports activities would grow by 3,000 - 4,000. Mr. Munson asked if Rec Sports has done a study of the use of the U Bay Fields specifically. Mr. Horn said women's softball and men's baseball clubs presently have to play off campus. The diamonds at the U Bay Fields would give those four teams a campus space.

Mark Lederer, 3447 Edgehill Parkway, asked if there is so much need for the U Bay Fields sports complex, why was it not included in the student referendum? Mr. Horn replied there was a limit to the amount the students were willing to increase segregated fees. Their priorities were the SERF, Nat, and Near East and West Fields. Mr. Lederer said that indicates to him that the students do not want the U Bay Fields sports complex badly enough to pay for it. He said the results of the referendum would have provided

valuable information: perhaps they would have revealed that there were many students who did not support the U Bay Fields concept for a variety of reasons, including the expense and anticipated environmental impacts.

Ms. Borisy-Rudin said she is trying to get a sense of the increased traffic/use to be caused by the sports complex. She said the picture she is getting is the U Bay Fields will be used by students, but also Rec Sports wants to increase the fields' use by outside groups by making them "fancier" and extending the hours they are available for rental by putting in lighting until 9:00 at night. Because the synthetic turf will be playable on rainy days, there will be increased traffic on wet days. This may include periods when nearby roads could be flooded and impassable. The flooding may be exacerbated by the synthetic turf. The fields will be in use longer each day and with greater frequency. Even though there is such a large demand for rec fields that students groups are turned away, this will be a money maker for UW because the fields will be available for rent by outside groups. The plan provides for the rental of the U Bay Fields Monday through Thursday until 9:00. Ms. Borisy-Rudin asked if this summary were correct? Mr. Horn replied Rec Sports would like to make the fields more usable to students. He doesn't anticipate the use will change significantly. Mr. Horn said he thought there are approximately 70,000 uses/year of the U Bay Fields currently.

Mr. Sundquist said that Rec Sports mentioned they have a loss of usage of ~ 25% due to wet conditions. One could extrapolate that the sports complex will see 100,000 uses with the installation of the synthetic turf and even more with the availability of lights. Perhaps the changes could result in a 50% increase in use.

Gisela Kutzbach, 1138 Shorewood Boulevard, asked the UW staff to clarify that they are going to encourage the use/rental of the UW's rec facilities, including the U Bay Fields, by outside groups. Mr. Horn confirmed they plan to do so.

Ms. Borisy-Rudin asked the UW staff to clarify the number of increased uses and the resultant impact on traffic and parking since the participants will be both students and outside teams and will arrive through a variety of transportation modes. Mr. Brown said that will be addressed in the environmental impact statement process.

Susan Porter, 1110 University Bay Drive asked if the environmental impact statement includes an analysis of the project's affect on nearby property values. Mr. Brown said it would as part of the economic impact review.

Karla Knobel, 1006 University Bay Drive said the U Bay Fields are ecologically sensitive and UW staff states they are at capacity. Rather than change the natural environment, would the UW staff consider leaving the fields as they are and instead use the \$10 million to be raised for the sports complex to change the use of the fields? There is very little activity on the playing fields prior to 4:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday. Would the Rec Sports staff consider a change in programming so the fields are used for more of the daylight hours, more days of the week?

Santhia Brandt, 933 Cornell Court, thanked the UW staff for attending the meeting this evening and listening to the neighbors' comments. Is information about the Master Plan available on online? Mr. Brown said it is on the Rec Sports website and that this presentation will be posted there as well.

John Imes asked of the ~ 70,000 annual users of the U Bay Fields, are all associated with the University? Mr. Horn said they are; miscellaneous users of the fields are not included in those data. Mr. Imes wondered what impact the Master Plan facilities will have on the

rent revenues collected. Mr. Horn said they estimated a 30% increase. Mr. Imes asked when in the review process the environmental impact statement would be completed. Mr. Brown said the environmental analysis has to be done prior to the presentation of the plan to the Board of Regents. This will occur before they approach the City of Madison for approvals.

Colleen Albrecht, 1231 Wellesley Road, asked what the UW staff will do with the comments heard this evening; would they consider revising the plans based on the concerns expressed? Mr. Elvey replied that this project may never happen but the comments will be kept and if the plans for the U Bay Fields move ahead, all the things heard this evening will be considered. Mr. Brown had outlined the review process; an environmental impact analysis will be done. Mr. Elvey said they took notes of the concerns expressed this evening. UW Staff had anticipated most of the issues raised including lights, intensity of use, noise, traffic. The one they had not expected was the opposition to the fencing. The comments are valid and if and when the project moves to the design stage, the concerns will be studied further. The project may not happen unless someone wants to write a \$10 million check.

Written comments are included in Addendum B.

6. **Board and Plan Commission Matters**
 - A. **New Business Resolutions and Motions**
 - i) **Board and Plan Commission discussion and possible actions concerning UW's proposed Recreation Sports Master Plan** No action was taken by either the Board of Plan Commission.
7. **Adjourn** Meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Colleen Boyle Albrecht
Village Clerk

Addendum A



University of Wisconsin-Madison Rec Sports Facilities Master Plan

- Bill Elvey, Associate Vice Chancellor, UW Facilities Planning & Management
- John Horn, Director, UW Recreational Sports
- Gary Brown, Director, UW FP&M Campus Planning & Landscape Architecture

Key Points

- DRAFT division master plan for a unit on campus
- Focus is on providing improved facilities for all users
- Need to meet the needs of our students, faculty and staff
- University Bay Drive Fields are unfunded and unapproved at this time



**IMPROVING THE UW-MADISON
EXPERIENCE IS OUR MISSION.**

The mission of the Division of Recreational Sports is to enrich the UW-Madison experience by providing **high quality programs, services, and facilities** that promote the social, mental, and physical well-being of the campus community.

REC SPORTS: BY THE NUMBERS.

83%

Percentage of UW-Madison students who have participated in Rec Sports programs/facilities last year.



18%

Percentage of UW-Madison faculty/staff who have participated in Rec Sports programs/facilities last year.

CURRENT CHALLENGES.

- Outdated, overcrowded facilities
- Extensive repairs needed to maintain existing facilities



- Lack of space for informal recreation participants
- Inability to accommodate reservation requests
- Well below the national standard for quality and amount of recreational space

In Spring 2013, the Student Services Financial Committee charged the Division of Recreational Sports with reexamining a Facilities Master Plan. The SSFC approved \$100,000 towards updating the plan.

GOALS OF THE PROJECT.

- Increase recreational space to meet campus demand
- Expand programming to better serve participants
 - Adaptive programs
 - Community outreach
 - Student Organizations and Sport Club Space
- Determine students' tolerance and priorities for expansion
 - Satisfy students' willingness to pay increased segregated fees
 - Demonstrate responsible stewardship of students' money
- Demonstrate Rec Sports' commitment to sustainable practices

The Division of Recreational Sports has been working with architects Kahler Slater out of Milwaukee on developing a proposal for new recreational facilities on campus.

Kahler Slater
experience design

FACILITIES IN THE MASTER PLAN.

SERF, Natatorium, Nielsen Tennis Stadium, & outdoor fields

SERF.



NATATORIUM.



OUTDOOR FIELDS: BY THE NUMBERS.

1
additional lighted outdoor
activity space

3
synthetic turf areas

5
flag football fields
at Near West

5
soccer fields at Near East
(including one
championship field)

3
softball + baseball fields

2
lacrosse and rugby fields

2
soccer and ultimate
Frisbee fields at U-Bay

2
picnic shelters with
concession windows and
restrooms

1.5
miles of parcours fitness track
open to community

NEAR WEST FIELDS.



NEAR EAST FIELDS.



UNIVERSITY BAY FIELDS.



SUSTAINABILITY COMMITMENT.

- **Environmental impact studies on all projects**
 - Minimize noise and light impact of outdoor fields
- **LEED certification across all facilities**
- **Solar panels and green roofs**
- **Ecofill material in outdoor turf**
 - No pesticides



DRAFT LIGHTING SCHEDULE.

- April – May
 - Monday-Thursday
 - dusk – 9 pm
- June-mid August – no lighting used
- Mid-August – November
 - Monday-Thursday
 - dusk – 9 pm
- November – March
 - limited play; fields closed – no lighting used
- Lights only used 24% of the time annually for 3.5 hrs. day
- Potential Saturday games played during the day – no lighting used

SEG FEES: BY THE NUMBERS.

\$36⁷⁸

Amount UW-Madison students pay to Rec Sports each semester via segregated fees.



\$145⁰⁶

Average Big Ten segregated fee paid to campus recreation programs per semester.

REFERENDUM: CURRENT FORECAST.

- Included in the referendum:
 - SERF
 - Natatorium
 - Near West Fields
 - Near East Fields
- Student voting will take place March 3-5
- Rec Sports is actively pursuing donor opportunities for the Nielsen Tennis Stadium and University Bay Fields

REC SPORTS MASTER PLAN: PROJECT TIMELINE

NEAR WEST

**DESIGN &
CONSTRUCTION**
(5/15 - 6/16)

OPENS
Summer 2016

SERF

DESIGN
(6/15 - 6/17)

CONSTRUCTION
(7/17 - 7/19)

OPENS
Summer 2019

NATATORIUM

DESIGN
(6/17 - 6/19)

CONSTRUCTION
(7/19 - 7/21)

OPENS
Summer 2021

NEAR EAST

DESIGN
(6/19 - 6/21)

CONSTRUCTION
(7/21 - 7/22)

OPENS
Summer 2022

2015

2016

2017

2018

2019

2020

2021

2022



Project Review Process – Next Steps

- Divisional master plans are typically not “approved” by any group or agency. They are reviewed by the Campus Planning Committee and on a campus master plan level with all those impacted. A new campus master plan will be starting in 2014-15.
- All projects are within the City of Madison.
- The University Bay Drive site is currently zoned “conservancy”.
- Outdoor recreation fields are considered a “conditional use” within a conservancy district.
- All proposed projects will need to be enumerated in an upcoming State capital budget when funding is identified. As such, each goes back through the CPC, the chancellor, UW System, the Board of Regents, and the State legislature for review and approval. The University Bay Drive Field improvements are not currently approved and are unfunded.
- If approved through the capital budget, each project would need review by the Joint West Campus Area Committee with a recommendation to the City of Madison Plan Commission.
- Joint West will be kept apprised of the projects, if and when they move forward.
- Environmental Impact studies will be completed once the projects move forward with funding approval. That will include a full lighting impact analysis, socio/economic impact analysis, and an environmental impact analysis.

RecSports

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

PLAY HARD. GET FIT. LIVE WELL.

Addendum B

January 28, 2014
University of Wisconsin Madison
Division of Recreational Sports

When I look over UBay fields in any season, I am struck with wonder. I often take the long way to work from Hoyt Park to North Hall around that bucolic and gentle curve. The stunning view over the soccer fields, marshes, and into the distance to Picnic Point is unique in the whole of Madison's Westside and I often find myself going out of my way to drink it in. I was greatly disturbed to hear that Rec Sports has proposed to radically change the whole environment of UBay fields. If their most ambitious plans were to play out, I believe that the fields would turn from being a visual and sporting wonder, in harmony with the surrounding nature, into a blight on the landscape. The parking lots, astro-turf, and particularly the fencing proposed will destroy the balance between nature and use that is so fantastically observed today. I suspect that the changes constitute 'an investment' that is geared to generating revenue. I strongly question the wisdom of monetizing UBay fields, and strongly question that any 'return on investment' will ever be realized. With so little to gain, and so much to lose it is my hope that a more long-term, level-headed planning will prevail and that the 'artist's conception' will be compared to the natural layout, to which it pales in comparison.

Cordially,

Ricardo Court
Kristin Phillips-Court

122 Sheperd Terrace
Madison, WI 53705

District 5
Alder Shiva Bidar-Sielaff

Stephen Laubach '00 (M.A.) and '13 (Ph.d.)
Carina Santos Laubach '99 (M.S.)
406 Eagle Heights, Apt A
Madison, WI 53705

UW Madison Division of Recreational Sports
715 W. Dayton Street
Madison, WI 53715

January 26, 2014

To Whom It May Concern,

We are writing as alumni of the University, current residents of the Eagle Heights Community, and future permanent residents of the City of Madison. It has been brought to our attention that the UW Madison has a master plan that includes changing the existing University Bay drive fields by 2019 to include sports fields and facilities.

The existing fields are one of the very few open, mostly natural, spaces on or near campus. The master plan shows the installation of structured fields, shelters, lighting, paved walkways, and a track. The impact on traffic and light and noise pollution from these facilities, not to mention the environmental impact of fields that are so close to the neighboring marsh and lakeshore, will be detrimental to the current natural state of the fields and nearby Lakeshore Preserve. The area around this space is already very crowded due to the hospital facilities, as evidenced by heavy end-of-shift traffic patterns.

Having open, natural space is important to us as parents, and we are strong advocates of maintaining accessible outdoor environments for children and others in our neighborhood. Maintaining open fields is about having a space to fly kites, host impromptu neighborhood soccer games, and amble along one of the few wide-open vistas on the UW campus. Upon returning to Madison for Stephen's Ph.D. in 2007, the sight of this field with a view to the Class of 1918 Marsh and Lake Mendota reminded us what we missed about Madison. To us, this was evidence of a University that understood—we thought—the value of open space that is not overscheduled and overdeveloped. Furthermore, these open fields provide a buffer for wildlife and people between the hospital and surrounding neighborhoods and the Preserve. The quality of life of the neighboring community, and for all users of the fields and lakeshore area, must be taken into consideration.

Your master plan states that the objective is "to expand the amount of fitness/activity space at UW-Madison in order to better meet the needs and demands of the campus community." We are active members in both our neighborhood and the campus community – please know that a University Bay conceptual plan that includes lights, concession stands, artificial turf, more pavement, and daily scheduled events *does not* meet our family's needs or demands for recreational activity. We encourage you to publicly share the research that was done to socially and environmentally justify the moves towards changing the existing University Bay fields.

Sincerely,



Stephen Laubach
Carina Santos Laubach

608-238-3157

Comments on Proposed UW-Madison Plan for University Bay Fields

by David E. Armstrong

I have two major areas of concern regarding the proposed plan:

First, as a resident of the Village of Shorewood Hills, living on University Bay Drive, I am concerned about the disruptions that would occur as a result of this development. The proposed changes would convert an open, flexible use area into fixed use areas, including fenced, lighted recreational fields, park shelters with concessions, and a parking lot. These changes can be expected to result in disruptions, including increased traffic, congestion, noise extending into evening hours (encouraged by lighting), and diminished access (due to fencing). The resulting disruption and congestion would impact the quality of life in Shorewood Hills and likely result in decreased property values. The current open, flexible use design is preferred to avoid these negative impacts.

Secondly, I am concerned about the environmental impact. The proposed development would further decrease the size and quality of this marsh-wetland area. Wetlands are important zones for wildlife and for infiltration and “filtering” of silt and other pollutants from stormwater runoff, decreasing the loading of these substances to Lake Mendota. Furthermore, zones of infiltration are important for recharging the groundwater that serves as the water supply for the Madison area. The groundwater aquifer is “mined” by pumping groundwater to households and business and then discharging the resulting wastewater into the lower Rock River, outside of the zone for recharge of the Madison aquifer. Infiltration zones should be increased and enhanced, rather than further diminished as the proposed plan would cause. It would be better to maintain and improve current open area rather than to further diminish the size and quality of this valuable resource, as proposed in the current plan.

Finally, I am not sure that the University has demonstrated the need for this development of the University Bay Fields. There seems to be an assumption that “if we build it, they will come”.

David E. Armstrong
40-year Village Resident
1114 University Bay Drive
Professor Emeritus, Environmental Chemistry Area
UW-Madison

Concerns regarding the Impact of proposed Recreational Sports development plan of the University Bay Playing fields.

- 1. Increased runoff to the Lakeshore Preserve, marsh and lake. Effect on flood plain**
The proposed new playing surfaces, buildings, parking and hard surface paths will lead to increased run-off. The proposed plans do not show any buffer area or other methods to alleviate the impact of the development.

Goal: Environmentally responsible use of the land not only to prevent increases in runoff but also to reduce runoff below current levels (affected by previous "improvements" of the playing fields).

- 2. Increased light, noise, traffic pollution and visual distraction.**

Increased noise, light, traffic, and the planned amenities (concession buildings, parking lots, lamp posts, fences)

- Affect residents of Shorewood and Eagle Heights, people at the UW Hospitals
- Reduce the area of habitat value for the Lakeshore Preserve including the marsh. Wildlife is impacted by conditions beyond the mapped boundaries of the Preserve. Currently, the soccer fields serve as a buffer between developed areas and the Preserve.

Goal: Eliminate evening flood lights and sound systems from the plan. No lights and noise or music during evening hours; no renting of facilities to non-university groups.

Goal: Create effective buffer zones, by reducing the space designated for recreational fields, to protect the natural habitats of the Lakeshore Preserve.

Goal: Eliminate parking surfaces on playing fields. Students to be served by this proposed expansion are discouraged by university policy to use cars.

Development of the playing fields must not negatively affect the experience of the residents of Shorewood and Eagle Heights, the overall experience of visitors to the Preserve, such as the audio trail around the 1918 Marsh, and the habitat requirements of fauna and flora of the Preserve. Students value organized recreational sports, but students also value recreational activities in the Lakeshore Nature Preserve and will be sensitive to the needs of other stakeholders in this sensitive area.

Karl Frantz

From: Nancy Volk [uwvolk@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2014 3:56 PM
To: Karl Frantz
Subject: UW playing fields proposal

Dear Mr. Franz,

I am unable to attend tonight's meeting on the UW Rec Sports plan but I wish to express my concerns about the plan. As usual, the university has not considered the impact on neighboring communities when making their changes. The impact on Shorewood Hills would include increased demand for parking (I see little in the way of added parking except the one which involves cars crossing Marsh Lane which could be dangerous), night light pollution, increased through traffic and noise (from public address systems - we already hear the band).

In addition, I am concerned about the environmental impact of this new synthetic turf and general disturbance of the floodplain. I am particularly opposed to having concession stands there which implies an expansion to installing bleachers and other more permanent structures.

I am unsure where the fencing will be installed but it implies restricted access to the fields which are used for casual recreation and spontaneous sports. It implies restriction of field use rather than their claimed expansion. It also seems to me that setting up the whole space to dedicated sports (esp. all the space for baseball) restricts the areas use rather than making it more useful.

I find it surprising that that University claims they have to

cancel so many activities when I rarely see much activity on those fields during weekdays. Students are not in class all day until 5:00pm like office workers. Most activity occurs on weekends when visiting teams would want to play during the day rather than at night which would require an overnight stay or driving home in the dark.

I would support a more limited implementation of the plan with some dedicated fields, no night lighting and no concession stands. The University has repeatedly said they take neighborhood concerns into consideration and then go forward with whatever **they** want to do. They have repeatedly reneged on promises (such as removing the parking lot along the border of the fields when lot 70 was completed) so I do not feel we can trust them to consider their neighbors. I would also wonder whether an **adequate** environmental impact study has been done. That is reclaimed, tiled fields which require constant pumping.

I hope some report will come out summarizing the results of tonight's meeting. I would like to hear how other village residents feel about it.

Regards,
Nancy Volk
1240 Sweetbriar Rd.

**UNIVERSITY BAY PLAN –
WRITTEN COMMENTARY IN RESPONSE TO THE UNIVERSITY OF
WISCONSIN’S PROPOSED PLAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY BAY FIELDS
PROVIDED BY: JENNY R. ARMSTRONG, 1114 UNIVERSITY BAY DRIVE,
MADISON, WI 53705, RESIDENT OF SHOREWOOD HILLS; E-MAIL:
JRGJRA60@YAHOO.COM
DATED: JANUARY 28, 2014**

1. **ELIMINATES ACCESS.** Currently, the open playing fields and marsh gardens and paths are totally accessible, open and usable by all university students, staff, and faculty and the children and families of the surrounding neighborhoods which currently regularly use the University Bay Open Playing Fields and Marsh Park and Paths. These users include at minimum the residents of the following surrounding neighborhoods: Shorewood Hills, Eagle Heights, University Houses, Regent Street Neighborhood, University Heights, Monroe Street, Hoyt Park, and Westmoreland.

2. **ENVIRONMENTALLY UNFRIENDLY.** Currently, the open playing fields, marsh gardens, paths and open grassy area provide environmentally friendly features. Leaving this area as it is will preserve the remaining portion of the University Bay Marsh and grassy area and help preserve the quality of Lake Mendota. This area provides space for people to observe nature, walk, run, rest, and enjoy still a small piece of unobstructed view of Lake Mendota and the Capital Sky Line.

3. **ELIMINATES QUIET ENJOYMENT.** This open piece of land abuts the residential neighborhoods of Shorewood Hills, Eagle Heights and University Houses. The open field currently provides unobstructed views to Lake Mendota, the Marsh Gardens, Plantings and Wild Life. Already, the University Medical Complex, including the Pharmacy Building and the Goodman Softball Stadium has eliminated many of the unobstructed views of the Capital Skyline, the Marsh, the Marsh gardens and plantings and Lake Mendota for these residents. Parking lots which were promised to be only temporary have become permanent along University Bay Drive. Residents are disturbed by honking horns, early and late, not to mention the added exhaust fumes that many cars in close proximity to homes and the danger to children residing in those houses. This plan adds more surface parking, more lights, more fences, more non-natural surfaces. This affects all of these residents’ quiet enjoyment of their homes and property.

4. **DESTROYS UNOBSTRUCTED VIEWS OF THE LAKE AND MARSH PLANTINGS AND PATHS.** This plan destroys some of the remaining unobstructed views of Lake Mendota, the Marsh and the Marsh Plantings for residents of the Village of Shorewood, University Heights and Eagle Heights with residents along University Bay Drive. Views are important to property values, mental well-being, and quality of life. This Plan clutters the existing views with fences, lights, light poles, AstroTurf, Concession Stands and Public Bath Houses.

5. **ELIMINATES, FAILS TO ENHANCE, AND OBSTRUCTS EXISTING BIKE WAYS AND WALKING PATHS.** The bike path and walking path along Marsh Lane is heavily used

Re: Proposed Changes to University Bay Fields

Although the proposed plan for the changes to the University Bay Fields has some reasonable features, such as the running/walking path, there are also some huge negatives including those listed below.

The metal fencing proposed would severely impinge on the use of the fields by the public and would destroy the aesthetics of the fields, as would the synthetic turf.

The lighting, PA systems, electronic score boards and expanded parking at Oxford road should be researched for minimization of impact on the neighborhood. Perhaps some type of low-impact lighting and PA system could be used. Also an ending time for their use could be imposed.

Another possibility would be to disallow the use of lights and PA during times when the fields are leased by outside groups that are unrelated to UW club sports. Written requests for exceptions could be permitted.

Ann Gordon-Walker
1230 University Bay Drive, Madison, WI 53705
(gordonwalker@wisc.edu)
January 28, 2014

WRITTEN COMMENTS

NAME Karen Strier

ADDRESS 1111 Wellesley Rd

EMAIL kbstrier@wisc.edu

The Village needs to do an Environmental Impact Study independent of the University's & before the fund raising is initiated. We also need to publicize the impact, especially on habitat & water & wildlife ~~we~~ we can buy ads on the city buses, etc. Most people in Madison don't & won't know about this until it is too late.

Fundraising for the study & PR could be from Village volunteers - Do a call for the cost, ask for a % of property taxes as a donation.

Finally, no one discussed broader issues of safety, police, etc. as more people are ^{moving} into the area.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

NAME

Jim Hoppers

ADDRESS

Shorewood Hills

EMAIL

JimHoppers11@gmail.com

UW-Madison Recreational Sports can really benefit from major facilities improvements.

Highly encourage Village Board to create a written agreement of expectations ^{with UW-Madison} covering items such as

- Types of lighting ^{when} and how lights are visible from ^{residents}
- How parking works (where, how many spots, etc.)
- How traffic flows
- ^{Permanently} Protection of the current amount of green space ^{square footage}
- Where fences can go
- If the village/community has access to fields
- If and where, astroturf can go.
- What sound systems are allowed
- How conflicts are resolved and the agreement modified - ^{Both parties sign.}

Thank you for the presentation