

# Comments on the Hammes Final Report for the AEC Strategic Design Committee

Compiled by Ron Shutvet on January 20, 2016

## [AEC Strategic Feasibility Study Summary Report Presentation 10-28-2015](#)

### SWOT Analysis

- No detail of Opportunities + Threats as there was for Strengths + Weaknesses
- No analysis of neighborhood input comments for incorporation of into SWOT analysis  
see pages 21-27

### Real Estate Analysis

- No discussion of Willow Island and surrounding greenspace
- No discussion of Quann Park as real estate rented and controlled by AEC
- No discussion of conflicts associated with concept of a residential component in Willow Island area

## [AEC Strategic Feasibility Study Report 10-28-2015](#)

### 1.0 Introduction

- Page 10-11 No mention of Willow Island and surrounding greenspace as part of AEC campus
- Page 15 statement that comments received by neighborhood residents are included in Appendix 9. However, CSL neighborhood comment notes from a July 25, 2015 meeting with representatives from three nearby neighborhoods are missing in that appendix.

### 2.0 SWOT Analysis

- page 22 Threats listed but there is no details or explanation of "Community Opposition"
- page 22-27 No detail of many SWOT items listed. No mention of Willow Island in SWOT analysis

### 2.5 SWOT Analysis - Summary of Findings and Conclusions

- page 81 One paragraph on public input sessions. No detailed discussion or analysis of public comments. No mention of meeting with representatives from Bay Creek Neighborhood, Bram's Addition Neighborhood , or Capital View Neighborhood.

### 3.0 Real Estate Analysis

- No discussion of public input regarding overall AEC facilities except for one comment on page 91 stating "Noise, flooding and other concerns expressed by surrounding neighbors".

### 3.1 Real Estate Analysis - Highest and Best Use

- page 103 - statement suggesting that Olin-Turville Parks could be utilized to support the World Dairy Expo and Midwest Horse Fair at AEC. How could this happen? - Give an example please.

### 3.1 Real Estate Analysis - Types of Uses

- page 105 residential units near Willow Island mentioned as a potential highest and best use yet it is noted that loud and frequent outdoor events at AEC could pose a challenge to residential development near AEC facilities. Why is there no elaboration on this statement?

### 3. Real Estate Analysis - Key committee questions and responses

- page 110 - totally inadequate response to questions 2 and 3
- page 111 - question 4 and 5 are the same - proof reading would help here
- page 159 - Answer to question 1 lacks detail of positive or negative effects
- page 161 - answer to Question 3 lacks detail especially on negative impacts.

## [AEC Strategic Feasibility Study Report Appendices 10-28-2015](#)

### 4.0 Capital Improvement Needs November 5, 2014

- page 24 statement - "Noise, flooding and other concerns expressed by surrounding neighbors" yet no attempt to elaborate on this statement. What are the "other concerns"?

### Real Estate Potential November 5, 2014

- pages 36-55 No discussion of possible options for Willow Island or surrounding greenspace. Only one image that shows potential of residential units along the southern portion of this area.

#### 7.0 Stakeholder Comments

- CSL meeting notes for the July 25, 2014 meeting with representatives of the Bay Creek Neighborhood, Bram's Addition Neighborhood, and Capitol View Heights Neighborhood are completely missing in this document. Please review the following document at this link:

<https://dane.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=3233269&GUID=6E31D413-B48D-4641-9C77-80D73DED941B>

Pages 7 and 8 of this document are the missing meeting notes.

These stakeholder meeting notes are also missing on the AEC Strategic Design committee website. Why?

#### 9.0 Neighborhood Meeting Feedback Indian Springs & South Metropolitan Council

- The AEC Strategic Feasibility Study AEC Community Outreach Plan should be at the start of this part of the appendices. There were two versions of this document. One dated DRAFT 9/9/2014 and an updated version dated 12-17-2014. Both documents list many more neighborhood groups in the vicinity of AEC that were going to be included in the community outreach efforts. Why are there only meeting notes for just Indian Springs and the South Metropolitan Planning Council meetings? The DRAFT Community Outreach Plan dated 9-9-2014 listed the following target audience and stated that "The audience/area will include, but is not limited to:

Area businesses

Bay Creek

Bram's Addition

Capital View Heights

Friends of Olin-Turville Park

Indian Springs

South Madison Planning Council

Wenonah Way

Town of Madison

The Alliant Energy Center (AEC) Strategic Feasibility Study South Madison Community Outreach Plan updated 12.17.14 is on the AEC SD Committee website and can be found at this link -

[https://aecstudy.countyofdane.com/documents/community/Community\\_Outreach\\_Plan\\_updated\\_12172014.pdf](https://aecstudy.countyofdane.com/documents/community/Community_Outreach_Plan_updated_12172014.pdf)

This document gives an expanded target audience as follows:

Target Audience Community members including area residents, businesses, neighborhood associations, local elected officials, and South Madison. The audience/area will include, but is not limited to:

Arbor Hills Arboretum Bay Creek – adjacent to AEC

Bram's Addition – adjacent to AEC

Bridge/Lakepoint

Burr Oaks

Capital View– adjacent to AEC

Greenbush

Highland Manor Mobile Home Community

Indian Springs

Leopold

Monona Bay

Rimrock/Moorland

Southdale

Southdale/Clausen

Waunona Way

South Metropolitan Planning Council

Area businesses

Friends of Olin-Turville Park

Town of Madison

There is a **BIG** discrepancy between the actual recorded meeting notes from only two of all of the above neighborhood groups in the Hammes Final Report Appendices and the implied intent of the Alliant Energy Center (AEC) Strategic Feasibility Study South Madison Community Outreach Plan updated 12.17.14.

### **Why is this?**

**I feel that the Hammes Final Report and its Appendices are incomplete and lack the public input component that was promised when the AEC Strategic Design Committee started this process.**

**The Hammes Final Report should be rejected as incomplete by the committee. Hammes should not be paid for their work on this study until the final report is revised to truly include the public input process that was promised.**

Sincerely,

Ron Shutvet

Madison WI