

Public testimony from 10/28/08 NMPIOC public input meeting.

Chris James, Parks Division, Dane County Land & Water Resources Department

- Proposed Natural Resource Area Boundary includes a large geographic area. Only about 10% of this area is currently in dispute.
- County Parks and Open Space Plan is not a land use plan and does not control what private landowners may do with their property.
- Private lands within a Natural Resource Area Boundary may still sell for development.
- County Parks Division proposed a wider Natural Resource Area Boundary boundary near Pheasant Branch to address surface water drainage into springs.

Larry Burcalow, Yahara Materials

- Assessment of impacts on alternate routes
- There has been inadequate public notice of new routes under consideration

Buck Sweeney, Attorney for Yahara Materials

- Committee should address potential impacts to sources of dolomite limestone.
- Consider including quarry areas as part of natural resource protection area.

Will Henson, 5122 Pheasant Branch, Waunakee

- Some of the proposed routes would go through an existing pond
- Farmland should be considered a natural resource worthy of protection. Farmland produces food.
- Make sure to address alignment impacts on existing businesses.
- Why can't roadway cross through narrow area of wetland, or go south of Oncken Road to avoid S-curves?

Don Hoffman, Town of Springfield

- Agree with Will Henson's comments
- Natural resource area should include non-water-related natural resources. Should include land resources.
- Don't limit options for roadway by making Natural Resource Area Boundary too extensive.

Randy Meffert, 5964 Highway K , Waunakee

- Possible impacts on archaeological mounds for some of the routes. (Tom Lynch responded that this would be considered at the design stage).

Harry Read, 2545 Van Hise Ave., Madison

- Madison Audubon Society supports the wider Natural Resource Area Boundary proposed by Dane County Land and Water Resources Department.
- Development, with or without the proposed road, is occurring.
- Lots of habitat and water resources in the area.
- Costs of acquisition of resource areas continue to rise.

- Natural buffers are an effective means of protecting and improving water quality in Lake Mendota.
- The Natural Resource Area will be as much of a recreational benefit to residents as the Nine Springs E-Way is to residents on the south side of the metro area.
- The sooner the NRA becomes established, the better.

Don Hammes, 3567 Velby Ridge Road, Middleton

- Designation as a natural resource area does not limit development potential.
- Why define an area? Environmental sensitivity of area
- Roadway will act as a catalyst for additional development.
- This area is at the top of the watershed for the Yahara chain of lakes. Impacts will affect downstream areas.
- 80% build-out of this area would be an environmental disaster.
- How much build-out do we want?
- Committee should err on the side of preserving as much land as possible.

Jeff Wong, 5413 Larkspur Road, Middleton

- In favor of Dane County Land and Water Resources Department proposal for the Natural Resource Area Boundary
- Enjoys use of Nine Springs E-Way corridor; a wide swath of land.
- City of Middleton proposal is short-sighted.

Gary Werner, 2302 Lakeland Avenue, Madison

- Population changes over last 60 years have changed landscape.
- Thanks foresight of early planners that much has been preserved.
- Supports a Natural Resource Area Boundary that is at least as wide as that proposed by Dane County Land and Water Resources Department.
- Potential for a resource area that is anchored by Frederick Springs at one end, and by Governor Nelson State Park at the other.
- Could include drumlins, oak savanna and effigy mounds in county park.
- Need wide connection northward.
- Natural Resource Area Boundary should be expanded to include 220 acres of restored prairie west of Governor Nelson, 90 acres near CTH M, and St. Benedict's prairie restoration on the west side of CTH M.
- Opportunity to protect a fully-functioning prairie ecosystem.

Carson Mottle, 4316 Hilltop Circle, Middleton

- Supports County Land and Water Resources Department proposal for Natural Resource Area Boundary
- Would allow willing landowners additional opportunities for their land
- Wider corridor provides a different recreational experience than a narrow corridor

Trevor Smith, 1818 Reetz Road, Madison

- Engineering /civil engineering background
- Wetlands should be part of design considerations
- Do it right: look at the functionality of the beltline, and why it works.
- Lives on south side of the metro area, near Arboretum.
- What is the cost of having natural areas instead of development?
- North beltline will be an economic tool.
- Not realistic to have every natural area protected.
- Restoring of water levels may affect property values.

Janet Kane, 1225 Murfield Ct., Middleton

- Spent afternoon in Pheasant Branch Conservancy with 3rd-grade teachers and students.
- Focus on water and watersheds, water towers, water quality.
- There was a 1960s plan to build a housing development and a marina where the Pheasant Branch Conservancy is now.
- Are you going to be officials who protect the resource?
- Natural resource decisions are about short-term vs. long-term interests. Think about the next 20 years.

Connie Threinen, League of Women Voters

- Endorses previous comments about natural resources
- Difficult to see and interpret multiple maps.

Mike Davis, City of Middleton

- City plans for a narrow corridor linked to collector road
- Private development needed to finance road – inclusion in Natural Resource Area Boundary may deter planned development.
- No significant water resources in area in question, only farmland.
- Is farmland protection appropriate for an area planned for urban development?