



**University of Wisconsin-Madison
Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee
Friday October 8, 2021
Noon – 1:30 pm
Remote WebEx meeting
APPROVED Minutes**

Present

David Bart, Janet Batzli, Rob Beattie, Tom Bryan, Gary Brown, Kathy Cramer, Kelly Ignatoski, Rhonda James, Karen Oberhauser, Ryan Zavodnik

Also Present

J Blue (SmithGroup), Ann Burgess (Friends), Glenda Denniston (Friends), Maura Donnelly (UW System), Adam Gundlach (Preserve), Sara Hotchkiss (former Preserve Committee chair), Gisela Kutzbach (Friends), Roma Lenahan (Friends), Seth McGee (Friends and Biocore), Bryn Scriver (Preserve), Will Vuyk (Friends), Laura Wyatt (Preserve)

Minutes

The minutes from the September 17, 2021 meeting were approved by consent.

Staff Updates

- 1) Director (Gary Brown)
See Preserve Staff Reports – October 8, 2021
- 2) Program Manager (Laura Wyatt)
See Preserve Staff Reports – October 8, 2021
- 3) Capital Projects (Rhonda James)
See Preserve Staff Reports – October 8, 2021
- 4) Field Activities (Adam Gundlach)
See Preserve Staff Reports – October 8, 2021
- 5) Volunteer and Outreach (Bryn Scriver)
See Preserve Staff Reports – October 8, 2021

Friends of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve report (Tom Bryan)

The Friends ceded their report to allow more time for the Master Plan discussion.

Education Subcommittee Report (Janet Batzli)

Batzli has been asked by undergraduate students why faculty and staff are allowed to apply for this award. They were comparing this award with Soph Research and Hilldale awards where applicants are restricted to undergraduates. Given the broader purpose of the grant— to facilitate the use of the Preserve as a resource for education among UW undergraduates, it may be important to emphasize the focus on undergraduate students with a guide to faculty/staff applicants on the degree to which students must be engaged in the project. Currently any student, faculty or staff member at UW-Madison may apply. Batzli says the proposal needs to be clearer that the grant needs to benefit undergraduates.

Beattie said last year while reviewing grant proposals he and others on the Education Subcommittee wanted the projects to have an outreach or publicity component, since this is in the spirit of student engagement. The review criteria don't list this requirement. Beattie added that there seems to be two kinds of engagement—deep engagement by one or a few students and broad engagement with a project that brings lots of students into the Preserve—both are worthy. Scriver will clarify selection criteria to ask how students are benefitting and the degree of engagement and ask for a component of outreach.

Work Plan 6-month status update after stakeholders meeting (Laura Wyatt)

Six individuals joined staff for the virtual stakeholder meeting on September 28. Staff reviewed highlights of what has been accomplished in the last six months. If you have any questions about the workplan contact Laura Wyatt.

Master Plan - (J Blue, SmithGroup)

A Master Plan is a blueprint for the future. Benefits and purposes of a Master Plan include:

1. Establishing a reference for consistent decision-making
2. Identify opportunities
3. Catalog areas of concern
4. Align needs with capacity
5. Recommend actions for executing a vision
6. Identify future projects

A Master Plan is not a specific vegetative plan nor is it a set of billable drawings for construction or implementation. A master plan should be a living document that gets used a lot. It is not a set of commandments; it's a set of guidelines to say what we're trying to accomplish and here are our priorities.

Over the last couple weeks, the SmithGroup team of ecologists and engineers has been in the field collecting information and has identified four types of areas:

1. Areas of good ecological condition (i.e., few invasive species with healthy canopies typically with higher management or maintenance)
2. Transitional areas (i.e., where the habitat character is going through a change, typically becoming more mesic)
3. Areas that lack any kind of ecological identity (i.e., typically found where there was the most agricultural impact)
4. Areas of poor ecological condition (i.e., high invasive species cover, no regeneration of native species)

The team also noted areas of shoreline erosion due to wave action, non-shoreline erosion as a result of user's not staying on trails, and trail access/amenities in poor condition. They also noted areas of conflict, like the traffic coming out of the Grounds storage area. The consultants also noted some areas that receive a lot of use relative to their size. Blue observed, "you have some portions of the Preserve that are probably being loved to death in terms of the use they are getting."

Blue shared a slide presentation and walked the Committee through what the team found.

Next Blue shared an example of an online input or mapping portal. There will be two portals:

1. A public facing input portal where the community can add thoughts and ideas and add their own photos
2. An input portal that's meant as a working tool for the Preserve staff—add notes, photos, and create polygons

Blue will have the coders set up a Beta version for the Preserve.

The Preserve Strategic Plan says that the guiding principles from the 2006 Master Plan would be revisited with this Master Plan. Blue asked the Committee to consider the following:

- Are the guiding principles still appropriate (18 years later)? If not, why?
- Have changes to the Preserve or the campus impacted the guiding principles? If so, how? What has changed?
- Are there guiding principles that should be removed or edited? Are there new principles that should be added?

James will set up and facilitate a meeting to review the guiding principles.

Adjournment (1:35pm)

Submitted by Bryn Sriver, Preserve Volunteer and Outreach Coordinator