



Lakeshore Nature Preserve
FACILITIES PLANNING & MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Lakeshore Nature Preserve Committee
Friday May 20, 2022
10:30 – 12:00pm
Remote WebEx meeting
Approved Minutes

Present

Janet Batzli, Rob Beattie, Gary Brown, Kathy Cramer, Kelly Ignatoski, Rhonda James, Cole Koffron, Anna Pidgeon, Karen Oberhauser

Also Present

J Blue (SmithGroup), Ann Burgess (Friends), Adam Gundlach (Preserve), Sara Hotchkiss (Botany), David Liebl (Emeritus Professor Engineering), John Magnuson (Emeritus Professor Limnology), Bryn Scriver (Preserve), Will Vuyk (Friends), Laura Wyatt (Preserve)

Minutes

The minutes from April 22, 2022 were approved by consent.

Staff Updates

1) Director (Gary Brown)

See Preserve Staff Reports – May 20, 2022

2) Assistant Director (Laura Wyatt)

See Preserve Staff Reports – May 20, 2022

In April the visitor counter recorded 13,268 people entering Picnic Point. The counter tracks by date and by hour. We have had as many as 400 people in the Preserve after hours, usually on a Saturday night. The date with the highest number of visitors was Saturday April 23 (70 degrees F, partly sunny) – 1,799 people entered the Preserve. The heaviest visitation time is generally 1-4pm.

3) Capital Projects (Rhonda James)

See Preserve Staff Reports – May 20, 2022

4) Field Activities (Adam Gundlach)

See Preserve Staff Reports – May 20, 2022

Batzli noted the crown vetch in the old orchard and weeds in the Eagle Heights Community Gardens fruit tree border. Wyatt said invasive plant issues in and around the gardens was on the next Garden Oversight Committee meeting agenda.

5) Volunteer and Outreach (Bryn Scriver)

See Preserve Staff Reports – May 20, 2022

Friends of the Lakeshore Nature Preserve report (Will Vuyk)

No written report this month. Vuyk forgot to report that Tom Zinnen, UW-Madison Science Outreach Extension Specialist, is one of the new Friends Board members. New Board member Josh Sulman, an ecologist at Stantec, wants to spearhead a Friends effort to further long-term monitoring projects in the

Preserve. He and Vuyk would also like to see language in the Preserve Master Plan about implementing long-term monitoring. They are drafting a statement.

Preserve Master Plan Update (Rhonda James)

Information collection (online survey and emails) from the last review period is wrapping up. The master planning team will review and consider all responses and make further investigations as necessary. All recommendations will be evaluated with respect to core values and guiding principles. Later this summer the team will assemble a group of professionals with land management experience—from campus as well as local practitioners—and get their reactions. The team will present a refined plan to the Preserve Committee and start preparing for public input in the fall.

Master Plan Priorities Discussion (Rhonda James)

The master planning team is looking for help setting priorities. There are lots of ideas about what should happen in the Preserve but not everything can happen at once and not everything gets the same attention.

What criteria should be used to determine if a project is high, medium, or low priority?

- 1) Facilities or improvements (new project or a big repair—trails, benches, signs, structures, lighting, etc.):
 - a. Some tasks are automatically a high priority, and they are addressed ASAP:
 - i. Safety issues
 - ii. Environmental resource protection (severe erosion, Threatened and endangered species protection)
 - iii. Invasive plant removal (especially NR40 state prohibited species)
 - iv. Cultural resource protection
 - b. Sample criteria:
 - i. Supports educational function
 - ii. Supports passive recreation or wellbeing opportunity
 - iii. Imminent danger of safety or environmental degradation if we don't do this?
- There was support for sample criteria.
- The other side of protecting from degradation is improving ecological health and integrity
- Keep in mind both formal and informal educational functions.
- Include long-term priorities/goals, which tend to be undermined by short-term priorities.
- Consider frequency of use? High intensity use areas vs areas not used as frequently.
- Balance management and public use
- Prioritize projects that facilitate ongoing management (e.g., a shed for storing equipment).
- 2) Land/vegetation management efforts (vegetation, soil, etc.):
 - a. Focus should be on vegetation management and NOT:
 - i. daily health and safety tasks (pit toilets, trash control, firewood stocking)
 - ii. Targeted invasive species control
 - iii. Staff time spent on managing volunteers, part-time employees and contractors (all require administrative work and take staff time)
 - b. Sample criteria:
 - i. Level of use/people an area receives
 - ii. Amount of resources, time (of limited staff) and funding, required to move toward a target vegetative community
 - iii. Past work effort in/to the area – did we start a project that needs continued attention

- iv. Level of threat to an area – is a critical resource being threatened if we don't do management
- v. Level of impact-value-result for input (low hanging fruit idea)
 - Areas targeted for restoration value or ecological value given higher priority over other areas?
 - Biocore or other areas with explicit educational use given higher priority?
 - Can we use data from permit requests to see where heavier use for teaching and research is?
 - Connect Preserve efforts into regional conservation efforts and activities
 - Highest use areas not the highest priority (i.e., Picnic Point)?
 - Or should Picnic Point be managed at a higher level—there is a lot of diversity there if we're willing to put in the resources, but we need to accept that things might get trampled.
 - Showing really intact functioning native ecosystems is perhaps more important to do where people are seeing or experiencing the Preserve (i.e., Picnic Point)
 - Management of cultural resources i.e., vegetation management around mounds goes into safety.
 - Concerns about crime prevention and vegetation management? Discussed with lighting at recent campus meetings regarding the Temin Lakeshore Path. Preserve works closely with UWPD liaison.
 - Vegetative corridors for wildlife (e.g., turtles and cranes crossing University Bay Drive)

Class of 1918 Marsh Request (John Magnuson and David Liebl)

Emeritus professors John Magnuson and David Liebl sent a letter to committee chair Rob Beattie. The letter. Magnuson and Liebl described the points they made in the letter.

- Long-term management of the Class of 1918 Marsh should be considered with Master Planning process particularly in terms of a new Preserve Visitor Center.
- Need to look for more expertise on specific aspects of the marsh and marsh restoration.
- We want to prevent unintended consequences.
- If you're anticipating doing any major civil engineering projects (construction, road rerouting, etc.) there are opportunities that could benefit the marsh (scraping, dredging, hydrological cycle manipulation).

Discussion followed:

- The Master Plan sets a vision; it is not a plan for management or construction.
- Where does the Class of 1918 Marsh fall in terms of priorities?
- Campus is going to undertake a West Campus Innovation District Master Plan which will make stormwater even more important and may provide funding for improvements to the marsh.
- Before anything happens, we would develop a full management plan and bring the necessary experts to the table.

Adjourn

Submitted by Bryn Scriver, Preserve Volunteer and Outreach Coordinator