
From: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 9:44 AM
To: bobd@meardonlaw.com; Bonnie J. Campbell; Rose Vasquez; Jack Evans; craiglangbor@ifbf.org; Greta Johnson; ruth.harkin@cox.net; Dave Miles; Gartner, Michael 'geoffroy@iastate.edu'; Madden, Warren R [VPBUS]; Donley, Robert [BOARD]; Racki, Joan [BOARD]; Michel, Tammy J [PRES]; Smith, Dianne [BOARD]
Cc:
Subject: RE: Comments relative to ISU Cyclone Sports Complex

Attached is an updated pdf file containing an additional comment from Doug Johnston concerning the ISU Cyclone Sports Complex.

Marcia



Comments ISU
Cyclone Sports Co...

Marcia R. Brunson
Policy and Operations Officer
Board of Regents, State of Iowa
11260 Aurora Avenue
Urbandale, IA 50322
(515)281-6418 (phone)
(515)281-6420 (fax)
mbruns@iastate.edu
<http://www.regents.iowa.gov>

From: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 4:16 PM
To: 'bobd@meardonlaw.com'; 'Bonnie J. Campbell'; Rose Vasquez; 'Jack Evans'; 'craiglangbor@ifbf.org'; 'Greta Johnson'; 'ruth.harkin@cox.net'; 'Dave Miles'; 'Gartner, Michael'
Cc: 'geoffroy@iastate.edu'; Madden, Warren R [VPBUS]; Donley, Robert [BOARD]; Racki, Joan [BOARD]; Michel, Tammy J [PRES]
Subject: Comments relative to ISU Cyclone Sports Complex

Board Members:

Attached in a pdf file are the comments received concerning the proposed ISU Cyclone Sports Complex (Agenda Item #10). I will bring copies of these to the meeting on Wednesday.

Marcia

<< File: Comments ISU Cyclone Sports Complex.pdf >>

Marcia R. Brunson
Policy and Operations Officer
Board of Regents, State of Iowa
11260 Aurora Avenue
Urbandale, IA 50322
(515)281-6418 (phone)
(515)281-6420 (fax)
mbruns@iastate.edu
<http://www.regents.iowa.gov>

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 4:50 PM
To: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Subject: FW: Maintenance of Proposed ISU Sports Complex

From: Mannatkins@aol.com [mailto:Mannatkins@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 3:09 PM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu
Subject: Maintenance of Proposed ISU Sports Complex

TO: Board of Regents, State of Iowa, for March 23, 2011 Meeting in Ames, Iowa

RE: Maintenance of Proposed ISU Sports Complex

I am very concerned about the ability of ISU to guarantee maintenance and upkeep of the proposed sports complex. ISU has a long history of deferring the interior and exterior maintenance on many existing buildings on campus, C. Y. Stephens interior, Fisher Theatre interior, and all exterior sidewalks and stairs around the C. Y. Stephens and Hilton Coliseum Complex.

ISU has not performed maintenance on its existing sports complex and it is now an eyesore in the neighborhood. How can we be assured that the next sports complex will not become a similar eyesore?

The funds donated to build the sports complex do not provide for upkeep on the grounds for the next 20 years, electricity for the excessive lighting, maintenance of the seating areas, and janitorial services for the toilets, concession areas and grounds. The funds for all of these activities must come from the continuing university budget.

This is not a free sports complex. The proposed complex will be expensive to operate and maintain for the next 20 years. If ISU fails to maintain these facilities as they have so many others, it will be the surrounding neighborhood that will be the biggest loser. The neighborhood will suffer both in quality of life and property values.

In this time of limited resources, can ISU really afford this complex that the university management has publicly stated will have only **limited use**?

ISU should not be allowed to construct a Sports Complex that it cannot afford to maintain.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Martha Ann Atkins, ISU Associate Professor, Retired
419 Pearson Avenue
Ames, Iowa 50014
515-292-5490

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 4:55 PM
To: Burkart, Michael R [GE AT]
Cc: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Subject: RE: ISU Sports Complex Proposal

Dear Mr. Burkart:

Thank you for allowing me to attend the meeting and for the additional information you have provided to the Regents. We will make the appropriate changes as you note on page 5.

All the best,

Bob Donley

-----Original Message-----

From: Burkart, Michael R [GE AT] [<mailto:mburkart@iastate.edu>]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 11:18 AM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu
Subject: ISU Sports Complex Proposal

Dear Mr. Donley:

Thank you for participating in the March 14 meeting among representatives of ISU, City of Ames, and the south campus neighborhood. I sincerely appreciate your interest, on behalf of the Board of Regents, in our concerns about the hasty plans for constructing a sports complex in our neighborhood.

Please include the following comment in the written materials offered members of the Board of Regents when considering Agenda Item 10, the "Cyclone Sports Complex" authorization scheduled for the March 23, 2011 meeting.

Please note that the last item on page 5, Appendix A of the materials presented to you on the Sports Complex (External Forces: None.) is inaccurate. Indeed this proposed project WILL affect people and properties external to Iowa State University, namely the City of Ames and adjacent private property owners.

If the proposed Cyclone Sports Complex is to be approved, I urge the Board of Regents to define a date no earlier than the summer of 2012 to initiate construction of the complex. Draft detailed designs (not included in the information before you) presented at a recent meeting of University, City of Ames and neighborhood representatives show elevation and surface drainage components inconsistent with existing storm sewer systems managed by the City of Ames. Ames has budgeted the restructuring of Storm Street, immediately north of the proposed site, during the summer of 2011 and Ash Avenue, immediately east of the proposed site, during 2012. City plans include, among other construction, new stormwater infrastructure under Storm and restructuring of stormwater infrastructure under Ash Ave. A start date no sooner than 2012 will allow coordination of infrastructure planning and construction, particularly stormwater drainage, with the City of Ames. The proximal timing of these two projects affords a rare opportunity to correct some serious home and street flooding problems that have existed for decades in the neighborhood of the proposed complex. It may

be possible for ISU to consider more effective and less costly options to discharge the additional water runoff from the planned impervious surfaces if their planning and construction are timed to meet the 2012 final stage of adjacent street reconstruction. Timing construction of the sports complex with City street reconstruction on Ash will likely save both ISU and the City of Ames the costs of correcting unintended problems with proposed designs. Please consider this reasonable request to help mitigate some long-standing water problems in the south campus neighborhood.

Michael Burkart
816 Ash Avenue
Ames, Iowa

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 6:27 PM
To: Sandra McJimsey
Cc: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Subject: RE: Iowa State Sports Complex

Sandra:

Thank you for the additional information provided – your input has been very helpful. I will add your comments to the information we will provide to the Regents regarding the ISU Sports Complex proposal.

All the best,

Bob Donley

From: Sandra McJimsey [mailto:skmcjimsey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 5:26 PM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu
Subject: Iowa State Sports Complex

Dear Mr. Donley:

Thank you for attending the March 14 work-group meeting about the proposed Iowa State sports complex and for informing us about plans and protocols for the March 23 Board of Regents meeting. Please forward these comments for the Board's consideration:

Recommended Actions:

1) Postpone final approval to correlate with a 2013 construction schedule. Construction in summer 2011 is premature because: a) Water-management standards that will guide the project design are currently under review for revision; therefore, designing to current standards is imprudent; and b) City infrastructure projects on streets adjacent to the proposed site will be under way in 2011 and 2012. Completion of these improvements can positively impact the design and engineering plans for the sports complex. Also, staging the city and university projects is safer and more manageable in terms of impacts on the area, particularly if the weather is rainy.

2) Include for the record, and endorse, the commitments that Mr. Madden and Mr. Pollard have made verbally on behalf of Iowa State to help mitigate excessive noise and nuisance behaviors, particularly when the sports complex is used for purposes other than competitive events.

3) Endorse continued regular dialog and interactive processes as needed between Iowa State and the South Campus Area Neighborhood association.

Background and Rationale:

The interactive process that Mr. Madden has led in response to area residents' outcry upon first learning about the proposal from news reports has been enlightening and will lead to an improved outcome for the sports complex.

It is now clear that the most significant challenge lies in solving the multifaceted drainage issues. When Iowa State took the project to the Board of Regents in October, neither the university, nor the City of Ames, nor the neighborhoods understood the extent of these problems. Mr. Madden believed the proposed site drained south into a creek. The city knew the infrastructure in the area was aging but it had insufficient data about the condition of pipelines and was unaware that residential basements flood repeatedly, that runoff frequently runs curb high, and that these problems are exacerbated by runoff from the intramural fields on the site proposed for the complex. Residents had been dealing individually with the impacts of inadequate rainwater management, without informing the city or saying much to one another.

Today we know, among other things, that 1) the proposed site is historically a wetlands area that naturally stores water; 2) the site as currently developed drains not into the creek but directly into neighborhoods surrounding the site and most detrimentally to the northeast corner where it empties into streets and basements that are downhill toward the Iowa State Center; 3) neighbors on three sides of the site routinely have water issues, ranging from wet basements during periods of heavy rain, not just during the recent floods, to raw sewage that backs up into basements when storm sewers are overloaded, to pine trees dying due to waterlogged roots; 3) the city plans to inspect and improve some storm and sanitary sewer lines as part of two street projects, however, this area of town is not included in the city's flood mitigation planning nor is there any comprehensive infrastructure project in the 5-year Capital Improvements Plan for this area; 4) the city is currently drafting new ordinances to address the reality of increased rainfall.

As most neighbors are, I am grateful for Mr. Madden's assurances that Iowa State will meet the Department of Natural Resources water-management standards.

Nevertheless, for the following reasons, the Board's approval of this project is premature:

- The wetlands character of the site and inherent groundwater issues of water table and subsurface drainage—as well as the surface water runoff problems that have been the focus of attention—remain to be fully understood by Iowa State and the engineering firm that will be preparing specifications for the site. The conditions that cause the field in its current state to have standing water for extended periods of time need to be understood and factored into plans for development.
- The DNR and city standards “on the books” that the engineering firm will be using are insufficient. The fact is that the city (and perhaps the DNR) is in the process of drafting changes to its water-management ordinances. This makes area residents skeptical that Iowa State’s vow to comply with current standards will alleviate the current problems, let alone the increased risks when irrigation and impervious surfaces are added to the site.
- The water-runoff models used by engineers rely heavily on historic rainfall data. In January 2011 the Des Moines Register reported that researchers forecast a 21% increase in annual rainfall over the next thirty years. The upward trend began several decades ago. Even at this point in time, both the city and the university institutionally struggle to plan for and cope with the impacts of too much water, as do residents personally. Failing to adjust—at least to some degree—for the anticipated increase in the models engineers will use for the complex simply increases the probability that designing the project to meet current standards leaves the area, and perhaps the sports complex venue itself, vulnerable.
- Equally significant are the health concerns related to the drainage issues. To date we know that residents’ health is at risk when sanitary sewers back up into basements but we do not know the extent of this particular problem nor whether engineering to current standards will be a remedy. The water-retention ponds that are a logical part of the solution to containing and mitigating the surge of water runoff unfortunately pose a health risk to students, spectators, and the general public when the ponds become a breeding ground for mosquitoes.

Postponing the project until 2013 to allow for completion of city infrastructure projects also gains time for some clarity on the above factors. This serves Iowa State’s interests as well as those of area residents.

The two items unrelated to the water-management need the Board’s attention and commitment for these reasons:

- First developed in 1920s–1940s, the south campus residential area has been a good neighbor to Iowa State for many decades and throughout much change.

Since the 1970s the impacts of Iowa State's decisions have brought into the south campus neighborhoods increased car and pedestrian traffic, greater concentrations of short-term student residents, activities that create noise levels typically incompatible with residential norms, and unfortunate degradation to the housing stock in some parts of the area.

Nevertheless, many residents have not only endured these impacts but also supported change because we have an appreciation for Iowa State's mission and its desires for competitive extracurricular programs. We understand what Iowa State's presence means to the larger community, and we ourselves benefit from Iowa State in many ways, including our proximity to campus.

That said, with the sports complex being the newcomer to a location that has established residential neighborhoods on three sides and little opportunity for sufficient buffering and screening to offset the less desirable aspects (e.g., noise, light, occasional nuisance behaviors) of this juxtaposition, we hope Iowa State will support us when we encounter problems more subjective than issues such as drainage. To their credit, Mr. Madden and Mr. Pollard were responsive and took good faith actions in regard to concerns about loud music (with crude lyrics) that residents adjacent to the SW sports field expressed at December's meeting. That type of ethical commitment and neighborliness needs to continue over time.

- As noted in the first paragraph of the Background & Rationale section, the interactions between Iowa State and the neighborhood have been an efficient, effective, and productive part of Iowa State's due diligence work to date on the sports complex. It exemplifies that the neighborhood has a beneficial role to play when south campus developments occur. If Iowa State and/or the city had involved the residents last summer when the project was, we now know, under informal discussion between them, the process could have been more positive from the outset. Now that the communications are open, I encourage Iowa State to stay in touch with the South Campus Area Neighborhood association as plans for the sports complex and other projects in the area unfold. I hope, too, that SCAN will invite Mr. Madden to its meetings periodically for updates and dialog on topics of mutual interest.

I appreciate your inviting these comments for the Board's consideration. And, please let the Board know that I very much appreciate Iowa State's willingness to revise their original concept for the sports complex. Plan B incorporates many improvements.

Sincerely,

Sandra McJimsey

2236 Storm Street

Ames, Iowa 50014

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 11:22 AM
To: Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]
Subject: FW: Proposed ISU Athletics Complex
Attachments: Sports complex BoR.doc

From: Bryce Abel [mailto:babel@mbsgenetics.com]
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2011 11:18 AM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu
Subject: Proposed ISU Athletics Complex

Mr. Donley,

Here are some comments and concerns about the proposed ISU Athletics Complex that the Board of Regents will be considering at its meeting March 23. I have also included them in an attachment. I do have some issues with the location of the proposed complex.

Regards,
Bryce Abel

To the Iowa Board of Regents:

March 20, 2011

I wish to express my concern for the proposal of ISU's newly proposed Sports Complex east of the Tower's dormitories in Ames, IA.

There are two primary concerns that I have. One is selection of the proposed site and the other is that if the proposed site is selected then that measures be taken to mitigate impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed Sports Complex site as currently selected will insert a Sports Complex consisting of softball, track and soccer into a well established neighborhood. I know of few if any other such athletic projects that are inserted into a location that is surrounded on three sides by family homes. From my observation most athletic facilities of this type are on the edge of a city or neighborhood where there is the least impact on family dwellings. Concerns in the neighborhood around the proposed site are for water drainage, traffic, noise, lighting and overall aesthetics, all impacting the quality of life and property values in the area.

There are other options. The existing site is an option. Although Warren Madden and the ISU Athletics department say it will cost more to improve the existing site, we have not seen the numbers to substantiate this

claim. The existing site already has an established softball field. Access to the existing site according to a preliminary plan for that site would be convenient from two locations. The existing site has residential homes only on one side with no plans for long term development on the other three sides. It is right next to the ISU Cross Country field creating possible synergies for athletic events. It has excellent drainage away from this location.

Madden estimated it would cost about \$2-3 million more to build at the existing site. I believe this is only estimating the cost of a parking lot at the existing site when it is all said and done as the proposed site across from the Towers will still require substantial fill dirt and drainage systems. The softball field will have to be reestablished on the newly proposed site whereas the one at the existing site can be utilized. The existing site could benefit from some major clean up anyway as it is an eyesore in the community. The area surrounding the existing site is currently used for outside storage by ISU and looks like a dumping ground for old and unused ISU equipment and tree and building refuse. There are plans to take care of some of this anyway as the site will be used for ISU intramural activities if the proposed new site is established so I find it difficult to see the difference in cost between the existing site and the proposed site. As mentioned before, a fair amount of fill dirt will be needed at the proposed site which will have to be trucked in from somewhere and the drainage system will have to be more substantial at the proposed site to mitigate impact in the surrounding neighborhood.

If a new site is absolutely necessary, then there are potentially other ISU/state properties to the south and west along Mortensen Road that are on the edge of the city and neighborhoods, which are not in the middle of an established neighborhood and which would have better drainage and accessibility, better traffic control, and less impact of noise and lighting.

What fundamentally seems to be at issue here is that I believe someone drove past the proposed site east of the Towers, which is considerably used for ISU's club sports and intramural activities and the Iowa games, and they probably thought, that looks like a nice big open level area with an adjacent parking lot, let's move in there with our new Sports Complex. The problem is that is not the case. For those of us like me who have lived next to this area for 30 years, it is a poorly drained site, that has caused flooding and ground water issues in the neighborhood and where turf establishment has been difficult. Perhaps this is why nothing has been done on this site for decades.

Which leads to my second concern, that if the proposed Sports Complex is built at the Towers site, that every possible means be taken to address surface and subsurface/ground water issues and that every option to mitigate neighborhood impact for lighting, noise, traffic concerns and aesthetics be taken, including landscaping to screen the complex and beautify the area.

It should be noted that I, like many of my neighbors, are not anti-ISU and the athletics department. Many of us support ISU sporting events, both major and minor. Many of us are working at or have worked at or studied at ISU. Personally I have a degree from an Iowa community college plus three degrees, BS, MS and PhD, from ISU and now live in the area. I worked at ISU for ten years. My children and wife have degrees from ISU. So we have been major supporters.

Our concern in the neighborhood is the insertion of this proposed Sports Complex in the middle of our neighborhood and the potential issues that would result, some specific to this particular site.

I hope you will decide not against the proposed Sports Complex at ISU, but rather its location. And if it has to be at the proposed location, that every possible measure be taken to decrease the impact on the neighborhood, not only on the property values but also the quality of life. This neighborhood south of the ISU campus with its campus town, fraternities and sororities, churches, and other properties of value, is and has been likely the most important neighborhood in support of ISU in Ames. We'd like to keep it that way.

Bryce C. Abel, Ph.D. (ISU '89)

714 Lynn Ave.

Ames, IA 50014-7324

To the Iowa Board of Regents:

March 20, 2011

I wish to express my concern for the proposal of ISU's newly proposed Sports Complex east of the Tower's dormitories in Ames, IA.

There are two primary concerns that I have. One is selection of the proposed site and the other is that if the proposed site is selected then that measures be taken to mitigate impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

The proposed Sports Complex site as currently selected will insert a Sports Complex consisting of softball, track and soccer into a well established neighborhood. I know of few if any other such athletic projects that are inserted into a location that is surrounded on three sides by family homes. From my observation most athletic facilities of this type are on the edge of a city or neighborhood where there is the least impact on family dwellings. Concerns in the neighborhood around the proposed site are for water drainage, traffic, noise, lighting and overall aesthetics, all impacting the quality of life and property values in the area.

There are other options. The existing site is an option. Although Warren Madden and the ISU Athletics department say it will cost more to improve the existing site, we have not seen the numbers to substantiate this claim. The existing site already has an established softball field. Access to the existing site according to a preliminary plan for that site would be convenient from two locations. The existing site has residential homes only on one side with no plans for long term development on the other three sides. It is right next to the ISU Cross Country field creating possible synergies for athletic events. It has excellent drainage away from this location.

Madden estimated it would cost about \$2-3 million more to build at the existing site. I believe this is only estimating the cost of a parking lot at the existing site when it is all said and done as the proposed site across from the Towers will still require substantial fill dirt and drainage systems. The softball field will have to be reestablished on the newly proposed site whereas the one at the existing site can be utilized. The existing site could benefit from some major clean up anyway as it is an eyesore in the community. The area surrounding the existing site is currently used for outside storage by ISU and looks like a dumping ground for old and unused ISU equipment and tree and building refuse. There are plans to take care of some of this anyway as the site will be used for ISU intramural activities if the proposed new site is established so I find it difficult to see the difference in cost between the existing site and the proposed site. As mentioned before, a fair amount of fill dirt will be needed at the proposed site which will have to be trucked in from somewhere and the drainage system will have to be more substantial at the proposed site to mitigate impact in the surrounding neighborhood.

If a new site is absolutely necessary, then there are potentially other ISU/state properties to the south and west along Mortensen Road that are on the edge of the city and neighborhoods, which are not in the middle of an established neighborhood and which

would have better drainage and accessibility, better traffic control, and less impact of noise and lighting.

What fundamentally seems to be at issue here is that I believe someone drove past the proposed site east of the Towers, which is considerably used for ISU's club sports and intramural activities and the Iowa games, and they probably thought, that looks like a nice big open level area with an adjacent parking lot, let's move in there with our new Sports Complex. The problem is that is not the case. For those of us like me who have lived next to this area for 30 years, it is a poorly drained site, that has caused flooding and ground water issues in the neighborhood and where turf establishment has been difficult. Perhaps this is why nothing has been done on this site for decades.

Which leads to my second concern, that if the proposed Sports Complex is built at the Towers site, that every possible means be taken to address surface and subsurface/ground water issues and that every option to mitigate neighborhood impact for lighting, noise, traffic concerns and aesthetics be taken, including landscaping to screen the complex and beautify the area.

It should be noted that I, like many of my neighbors, are not anti-ISU and the athletics department. Many of us support ISU sporting events, both major and minor. Many of us are working at or have worked at or studied at ISU. Personally I have a degree from an Iowa community college plus three degrees, BS, MS and PhD, from ISU and now live in the area. I worked at ISU for ten years. My children and wife have degrees from ISU. So we have been major supporters.

Our concern in the neighborhood is the insertion of this proposed Sports Complex in the middle of our neighborhood and the potential issues that would result, some specific to this particular site.

I hope you will decide not against the proposed Sports Complex at ISU, but rather its location. And if it has to be at the proposed location, that every possible measure be taken to decrease the impact on the neighborhood, not only on the property values but also the quality of life. This neighborhood south of the ISU campus with its campus town, fraternities and sororities, churches, and other properties of value, is and has been likely the most important neighborhood in support of ISU in Ames. We'd like to keep it that way.

Bryce C. Abel, Ph.D. (ISU '89)
714 Lynn Ave.
Ames, IA 50014-7324

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD] [bdonley@iastate.edu]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 1:55 PM
To: 'arvido@iastate.edu'
Cc: 'mbruns@iastate.edu'
Subject: Re: Sports Complex Concerns for meeting 3-23

Thank you for sending this information. Regards,
Bob

From: Osterberg, Arvid E [ARCH] [<mailto:arvido@iastate.edu>]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 01:19 PM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu <bdonley@iastate.edu>
Subject: Sports Complex Concerns for meeting 3-23

Bob Donley
Executive Director, Board of Regents
Iowa State University

Dear Mr. Donley,

Attached is a pdf of the March 13th Ames Tribune article that the Board the Regents should read in preparation for your meeting on March 23rd. It reflects concerns neighbors have about the proposed Sports Complex.

Sincerely,

Arvid and Gayle Osterberg
930 Ash Avenue
Ames, Iowa 50014
515-292-9129

'This is a neighborhood'

Campus-area residents: Sports complex a mismatch with neighborhood

By Laura Millsaps
Staff Writer

Published: Sunday, March 13, 2011 12:22 AM CST

Residents in the neighborhood around Towers intramural field look every day across a green space that by this summer may well be under construction for a \$13 million Iowa State University sports complex, planned to include a softball stadium, track and soccer fields.

University officials have held multiple meetings and changed the layout of the site at least once since the project was approved in October by the Board of Regents. Still, residents aren't pleased with the prospect of having such a large facility butting right up against their neighborhood.

"This is still a neighborhood, and they're not respecting a residential area, where people live," Gayle Osterberg, who lives on Ash Avenue, said.

Not anti-ISU, just pro-neighborhood

A dozen area neighbors, including those living along Ash and Storm avenues, front-row-center to the proposed complex, met with The Tribune recently. Over coffee and pastry in the St. Andrews Lutheran Church hall, longtime campus neighbors expressed their frustrations over the plan, including concerns about a perception that they are hostile to the university, students and athletes.

"I love the students. That is why I live in my house," Ash Avenue resident Lori Grant said. "I love hearing laughter, clapping, cheering, whistles. There's activity passing my house and on that field almost every day of the year. I love that. I just don't think I need stadium lights and PA speakers."

Ash Avenue resident Al Jergens said, "We do support ISU athletics. We're proud of the kids and their accomplishments. It's not about being against athletics. It's about ending up living right across the street from a facility that has not been planned with any of our interests or our properties in mind."

Osterberg pushed a piece of paper across the table. She's taken an informal survey of 11 homes on Ash Avenue. Collectively, the residents have lived in their homes a total of 247 years, with an average per household of 22.5 years. In her numbers, she also lists four professors, one professor emeritus and one staff person with a total of 153 years of service to ISU.

"We've been here for a long time," Osterberg said as the others nodded. "We're committed to our neighborhood. We're committed to the university."

More pavement means more run-off

Like everyone else in town, residents in this neighborhood had a soggy summer 2010 and dealt with the flooding. But the problems with stormwater drainage and standing water were not just a one-time disaster for them.

While those sitting around the table had minor water problems on their property, all of them could name neighbors, next door or just a few houses away, who have had standing water, flooded basements or raw sewage backups, not just this summer, but as an ongoing problem. And they believe it will get worse with the additional development on the intramural field site.

Bryce Abel, a Lynn Avenue resident with a background in horticulture, said he's observed the field for close to 30 years.

"To an untrained, eye it looks like a level field," he said, "but there's all kinds of wet spots that I don't think they realize are there. If



[Click here for larger image](#)
[Purchase Photos Here](#)

Zoe Sirofiak, 14, and her sister Arie, 11, jog at the ISU Tower Intramural field Friday evening in Ames. The neighborhood's residents said they want to see more support from the university, as it moves forward with its plans to build a \$13 million sports complex on the Towers intramural fields south and west of their homes. Photo by Nirmalendu Majumdar

they are going to put in top quality athletic surfaces, they need proper subsurface drainage. I think they are going to run into trouble."

Residents think the city's systems are already aged or maxed out. So while university officials have promised that they will manage stormwater drainage on the site and not overtax the city's infrastructure the water feeds into, the people who live up and down these streets aren't buying it.

"I'm one house away from all of the water," Grant said.

Bob Harvey, a 43-year resident of the neighborhood, wants to know who's footing the bill if the project exceeds the city's systems.

"Who pays for all the offsite infrastructure to deal with the additional stormwater?" Harvey said. "Is it the taxpayers of the city of Ames, or is it the Board of Regents?"

Neighbors question design

The university's first draft of the conceptual plan put the facilities directly across from Storm Street, with little setback. In an attempt to soothe upset residents, a redesign pushed the track and soccer field farther south, but closer to Ash Avenue.

"The new version pulls things much closer to the Ash neighbors," Arvid Osterberg, Gayle's husband, said. "If they'd just turn it 90 degrees and push it over a bit west, to get more of a buffer between the complex and the residents."

Everyone around the table agreed the university's intention to use the existing parking lots was making the design of the site clumsy, and they should be discarded.

"The fundamental problem with the existing site plan is the silly parking lot they insist on keeping," Jergens said. "That's really what's fueling much of this site development."

Gayle Osterberg said, "We have designers in our neighborhood, and design is something the university teaches, but it isn't apparent that they're using any creative design approaches to this project."

Concerns about traffic, noise and more

Gloria Betcher, president of the South Campus Area Neighborhood Association, said drainage and design concerns were only part of a whole host of possible negative effects the sports complex could have on the neighborhood's integrity.

"We are very concerned about traffic, parking, the aesthetics, the lights, the noise and the reduction of property values," Betcher said. "If this is going to be built, we want it to have the least impact possible on the neighborhood, and that means looking at the issues being raised by the residents."

Carol Pearson, an Ash Avenue resident, works as a massage therapist in her home.

"I'm feeling semi-hysterical, because my business is in my home," she said. "I'm gravely concerned about noise and light pollution during practice times."

Wendy Livy, an Ash Avenue resident, said, "They tell us this facility isn't going to be used all that much. Then why are they pouring so much money into something that isn't going to be used all that much? I wonder how heavily this facility will be used five years down the road, 10 years down the road."

Too many unknowns

Right now, the plans for the sports complex are only conceptual. And without a formal site plan, without engineering, traffic, stormwater and sewage system studies, it's impossible for the residents, the city or the university to know for sure how the project will affect the neighborhood in the long run, the people around the table said.

Add in the construction of an agricultural pavilion planned for the southwest corner of Mortensen Road and Gateway Hills Drive, the transportation hub and other Campustown redevelopment, residents said, and the pressures of development on their homes is untold.

The group said they were happy to meet with university and city officials as many times as needed to resolve some of the issues, and many were determined to plead their case at the next Board of Regents meeting, March 23 in Ames. They felt the sports complex was being rushed ahead of wise planning.

"We'd like to have traffic studies before this is constructed," Betcher said. "The sewer studies should be done before the project breaks ground."

"We are a concerned neighborhood. We are not saying ISU cannot build this in our back yard, we are saying they have other choices. If they are going ahead with the plan to build this, there are better choices to be made and worse choices to be made. We would like to see them make the better choices in the interest of people who have to live next to it."

On Sunday, March 20, the city of Ames weighs in on the sports complex and its effects on infrastructure.

Laura Millsaps can be reached at (515) 663-6922 or lmillsaps@amestrib.com.

[← Previous Article](#)

City of Huxley looks for buyer in wake of grocery store closing

[Next Article →](#)

Food inspection forum, utility workshop on tap

Article Rating

Current Rating: 1.8 of 5 votes!

Rate File: **Reader Comments**

The following are comments from readers. They do not necessarily represent the views of The Tribune or Amestrib.com.

why wrote on Mar 13, 2011 7:34 AM:

" If not many people are expected to use it, then why build it? That neighborhood is visually appealing and the open space enhances the appeal. ISU has basically abandoned the old baseball field and that area. Refurbish and develop that existing area instead of causing harm to this neighborhood. If this complex is built, people like me who don't live there but drive by will be angry by what it looks like. ISU needs to be a good neighbor and think about how they are affecting others. Further, the City of Ames needs to get involved. This type of building will hurt property values and make the area less appealing. Ames needs to attract people. ISU is expanding State Gym and has a new complex in West Ames. Just because there is an open area doesn't mean you have to build something.

I applaud the neighbors for speaking up and doing so constructively. I also applaud the Tribune reporter for the article. It's too bad these citizens of Ames feel that they have to justify the concern for their neighborhood and quality of life.

To those speaking up-kudos and if anyone accuses you of being anti-ISU just remember that's how some operate. Ignore them and move on. Attempting to marginalize those that disagree is a game played by those who have no case and an attempt to intimidate. "

logan wrote on Mar 13, 2011 9:33 AM:

" Not anti-ISU, just pro-neighborhood "

Of course they are. You love having a major university in your town because otherwise, Ames wouldn't even be half of what it is. However, the second they want to do something with their land in your neighborhood, suddenly you aren't so happy anymore. What a joke.

You want them to cater to your needs, fix the city's problems, and ensure your property values will stay the same. Have you ever stopped to think that they aren't entitled to change anything in their plans to accommodate your needs?

The university expands over time to take on new challenges. If you don't want something like this being built near your home, don't live so close to the university or university-owned property.

There are plenty of neighborhoods in Ames where you can have a house and not have something built next to it. Do your homework. I can't believe this is being dragged out as far as it has been, just like any other change that comes up in this town. "

Great idea wrote on Mar 13, 2011 9:35 AM:

" I live in this neighborhood too - and I think this project is a wonderful idea. With every project all the NIMBY (not in my backyard) people come out of the woodwork. Get over it! It's not like you didn't know this was ISU property when you purchased your home. "

LindsayH wrote on Mar 13, 2011 12:23 PM:

" How many people in this "neighborhood" have lived there longer than ISU has owned that land? "

Drake Stadium... wrote on Mar 13, 2011 1:01 PM:

" ...seems to do just fine in a "neighborhood" of very similar character in Des Moines. These are the risks you knowingly took moving into the university impacted area. Get over it. "

Nothing new wrote on Mar 14, 2011 1:02 AM:

" Nothing new presented here. Just a rehash of the same opinions that were presented by the same people at previous meetings.

You want existing parking destroyed, but at the same time don't want patron traffic/parking on residential streets? Can't have it both ways.

You want answers/guarantees now for questions that can't even be addressed until about a few more bureaucratic steps are completed.

Even City of Ames folks who attended the last meeting said that was the first they had heard about sewer concerns. Why is that? "

Bill wrote on Mar 14, 2011 9:06 AM:

" Let's see, they live next to university land and are now shocked that the university wants to do something with the land. If we want to keep the university more compact and reduce sprawl this is the right location. Where are the so called "smart growth" people. They should be supporting this development. "

Ames Resident wrote on Mar 14, 2011 9:21 AM:

" Another group against anything new being built. "

Gvet wrote on Mar 14, 2011 10:43 AM:

" How about not spending money on a "playground" and then use it to not raise the tuition! This solves the problems with the property owners too! "

Amy wrote on Mar 14, 2011 11:32 AM:

" They are anti-everything out there.

I say ISU should build the facility. It was a big dorm facility before that, and the Towers were known as the "party dorms".

OR this would be a GREAT SPOT for a new mall...just saying.

I'm sick of residents buying beside something and then being against it...much like buying beside the airport and being against airplane noise. "

Dani wrote on Mar 14, 2011 12:12 PM:

" ISU owned that property long before the houses were built. It's kind of like building by the RR tracks and then complaining about the trains. Get over it people, it's not your property. "

Russ wrote on Mar 14, 2011 12:22 PM:

" Posters-of course you have a right to express your opinion but do you have to marginalize those who express a concern? "Ames Resident"-I know of no groups who are opposed to "anything being built" so please stop the mean spirited barbs and state why you think it should be built. "

ISU is extremely important to Ames and the concerned residents know this. That doesn't mean that ISU should do whatever it wants with no thought to the

effect.

Has ISU made a case for needing this? I know they don't have to, but they should. It seems to me that ISU stated that there wouldn't be heavy usage, so is ISU building just because it can?

To Amy-"they are anti-everything out there" you post. Who are "they" and what are "they" against. Are you against anything Amy? Amy, have you ever had your property values and quality of life threatened?

It may be that this complex is needed and if so I would support it. ISU hasn't made a case yet and the public input opportunities came late and didn't include much information or give and take.

My guess is that neighbors there would be okay with some type of compromise or at least acknowledgement of that there will be some negative effects.

Here is an opportunity for some discussion. "

DaveM wrote on Mar 14, 2011 12:55 PM:

" Russ - ISU has already MADE a compromise. Now they are supposed to make more? And what will speaking out at the Board of Regents meeting prove? They need that OK to do engineering studies on the drainage. Without that data, there are no grounds for objections other than "not in my back yard".

To me, it's just another example of people trying to stop any type of progress or construction in Ames. That and people who have gotten used to using ISU's ground as their own personal park and now are upset that they won't be able to. If you don't like basement flooding, maybe you should go talk to the city, not the university. "

Jaylah wrote on Mar 14, 2011 2:30 PM:

" why wrote:

"ISU has basically abandoned the old baseball field and that area. Refurbish and develop that existing area instead of causing harm to this neighborhood."

According to Madden and Poffard, it would cost more to refurbish the existing complex than it would to build at the new site. And they only have enough donor money to build new.

Pretty much the same story with the parking lot situation. According to Madden, there is not enough donor money for the project as proposed "plus" a new parking lot. (There is room on the site for both, but the parking lot would need to be reconfigured a bit.)

What ISU has avoided responding to, is that the existing parking lot is already in dismal shape and will need to be at least resurfaced within a few years anyway. Perhaps even sooner, depending on how much additional use it gets from the new facility. "

Steve wrote on Mar 15, 2011 9:09 AM:

" The existing baseball field/ SW complex deteriorated under the athletes department's watch. It is their neglect that led to the now large cost to fix it up. So, they abandon it (leaving an eyesore behind) and go for building a new facility in a different part of town?

That kind of (mis)management doesn't give me much confidence in the new plans. "

DaveM wrote on Mar 15, 2011 9:30 AM:

" Steve - maybe you should do a little research on the plans re: SW Athletic Complex before tossing out your opinion. "

Russ wrote on Mar 15, 2011 7:58 PM:

" To DaveM-Allowing an investment to go into a state of disrepair should cause people to doubt ISU's plans for new building, regardless of the purpose of the new development. Thank you Steve.

As an ice-rink employee in Minneapolis in the 80's I was extremely disgusted by the deterioration of the first ice-rink due in large part to a build up of ice that could have been prevented with daily ice-removal. It built up to the point that the structure of the rink was compromised and a new one had to be built for 2 or 3 million dollars. This is irresponsibility, poor management and waste at it worst. This was the responsibility of ISU and the City of Ames.

Ice rink problems like this are TOTALLY preventable. The rink where I worked is going strong after 30 years due to simple daily and periodic maintenance.

This and the allowed deterioration of the baseball complex give me very little confidence. This is disrespectful of donors and Ames residents. ISU needs to set clear priorities on what it needs funded by donors and the state.

Lack of maintenance is absolute disrespect for donors. "

Steve wrote on Mar 15, 2011 11:39 PM:

" to DaveM- the last Varsity baseball game was played there over 10 years ago. The tennis courts at SW have never been usable (20+ years). Same for the outdoor track there. Great plans..." "

logan wrote on Mar 16, 2011 9:01 AM:

" Russ, Steve,

1.) This project was funded by private donors, if you were a donor, then maybe you should reconsider future donations. If you weren't, then why does it matter to you?

2.) Again, it's their property. It's not for you to decide what they can and cannot do with it. As long as they are following regulations and guidelines, they are free to build whatever they want on the property. "

Steve wrote on Mar 16, 2011 10:52 PM:

" Logan - I see the point you are trying to make. But try to see it from this angle: the 'neighbor' (in this case ISU) is behaving badly, making the neighborhood an eyesore, and negatively affecting property values of others nearby. While maybe they do have the right to do 'whatever they want' one would have hoped for more responsible behavior from such an esteemed institution. "

logan wrote on Mar 17, 2011 9:50 AM:

" Steve,

How are they behaving "badly"? They haven't done anything illegal, they are most likely going to follow guidelines, and the sports complex isn't going to create any new problems that weren't already in place.

Trust me, there could be much worse things built next to your homes, other than a sports complex.

And again, I love when people move/invest in a house that is next to a piece of property that isn't residential, then complain down the road when the owners of that property want to build something on it other than a park or homes. It's no different than people moving into a subdivision next to a cornfield, then

complaining down the road when a commercial developer wants to put a big box retail store there. If I were going to buy a home, I wouldn't live right next to the university for these very reasons. Same reason I wouldn't buy a house right next to an open cornfield. You don't know what may be built there down the road. Whether it be 5 years down, or 25 years down the road. "

ISU alum and Ames taxpayer wrote on Mar 17, 2011 3:56 PM:

" ISU should have a higher standard than legally. Just because it's legal doesn't mean it's good. We understand that the decision is for ISU to make, we're just giving our opinions. Are we allowed to criticize ISU or is it exempt? "

Steve wrote on Mar 17, 2011 10:50 PM:

" Logan, I think you are missing the point. ISU has been a reasonably good neighbor (if you don't live near the crumbling SW athletic complex, that is).

But the analogy here is that you live next to someone who is okay for some time, then they build in their backyard, which overlooks yours, something that is technically up to code but is objectionable (a bright light that shines 24 hours, a trampoline, a smelly compost heap, whatever. Without letting you know (a courtesy, of course, not a requirement).

And when you ask if they might make a few changes for the good of the neighborhood, they say, don't worry.

All legal, yes, but not neighborly of them.

And then everyone in town, unsolicited, says that you shouldn't object to the bright light, compost bin, or whatever. And that you should never have bought a house next to someone who composts... "

Ames Resident wrote on Mar 18, 2011 10:26 AM:

" Steve, I think the analogy here is if you have a park outside your back door that you use for your own benefit for free, then the owner decides to use that park land for another purpose, you have no basis to say that the owner has no right to be such a "bad neighbor."

It sounds like ISU has already made some concessions to the original plans and has historically been a good neighbor in this area. "

the23 wrote on Mar 18, 2011 12:36 PM:

" This situation is a good example of why Ames should be requiring progressive, state-of-the-art stormwater management in all future development. It's easier and less expensive to build good stormwater management into development when it's designed and built than to try to find solutions to serious drainage problems later. And that's especially true since many drainage "solutions" end up making flooding problems worse for other people. "

Jaylah wrote on Mar 18, 2011 9:51 PM:

" Well said, Steve. However there are some here that will never understand (until it happens to them, at which time they'll be screaming bloody murder).

And then they'll explain to you that "it's different" when it happens to them. "

Submit a Comment

We encourage feedback, questions and discussion. All comments are reviewed by editorial staff before posting. Submission of a comment indicates that you have read and agree to follow our comment policy.

Name:

Email:
(optional)

Comments:

Current Word Count: 0

Image Verification: (Case sensitive)



[Return to: News](#) | [Home](#) | [Top of Page](#) ^

Stephens Media LLC. The Tribune
P.O. Box 380
317 Fifth St.
Ames, Iowa 50010

Primary Telephone/Fax Numbers
(800) 234-TR18
(515) 663-6900
Fax: (515) 232-2364
Other Telephone/Fax Numbers
Automated Switchboard: (515) 232-2161
Business Office Fax: (515) 232-7935

Copyright © 2011 Iowa Newspapers, Inc. All rights reserved. :: [Terms of Service](#) | [Copyright](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | Powered by [TownNews.com](#)

Brunson, Marcia R [BOARD]

From: Donley, Robert [BOARD] [bdonley@iastate.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 5:52 AM
To: 'dmjohnst@iastate.edu'
Cc: 'mbruns@iastate.edu'
Subject: Re: Minutes of the March 14 Sports Complex Mtg--SCAN/ISU/City of Ames

Dr. Johnston:

Thank you for the communication. Although we sent all communications to Regents by close of business yesterday, we will make sure they get a copy of your email.

Regards,
Bob

----- Original Message -----

From: Johnston, Douglas [C R P] [<mailto:dmjohnst@iastate.edu>]
Sent: Monday, March 21, 2011 08:47 PM
To: bdonley@iastate.edu <bdonley@iastate.edu>
Subject: FW: Minutes of the March 14 Sports Complex Mtg--SCAN/ISU/City of Ames

Mr Donley, and the Board of Regents,

As a resident of the area affected by the proposed sports complex and as a land use planning and design professional I wish to respectfully register my opposition to the plan to use the preferred site for an intercollegiate athletics facility. My concern is not with the stormwater runoff, or sewage, or traffic (or loss of free open space-- there is plenty in the area). Rather it is with the general concept of building a major sports complex on a site bounded on three sides by private residences. The rationale for moving the Southwest Sports Complex is supposedly based on cost effectiveness. If that is so, it is because the difference in cost is being expected to be borne by the neighborhood through risk of lower property values (well documented in the literature with regards to proximity to sports parks), and nuisance factors. It has only be indirectly stated by the AD that potential donors want their contributions to be more visible (which the proposed site would make it), but not nearly as visible as other potential sites. I realize many athletic fans do not believe the Regents should have oversight over athletic capital programs (witness the Cyclone fan blogs on the subject). When the plan was presented to the Regents at their last meeting, it was claimed that there was no timeline for implementation, according to the minutes from the meeting. Immediately after approval, a plan and implementation schedule was released, only subsequently only modestly modified in response to public opposition. Since Warren and the AD have made it abundantly clear that the Sports Complex WILL be built on this site, perhaps it should be suggested that the Athletic Association compensate the neighborhood property owners for lost value. At least that way, the full cost of the proposed Cyclone Sports Complex would be considered.

Regards,

Doug Johnston
(925 Gaskill Dr, Ames)

Douglas M. Johnston, PhD

Professor, Department of Landscape Architecture Professor and Interim Director, Department of Community and Regional Planning Interim Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Programs College of Design Iowa State University 515.294.5490 www.design.iastate.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: Betcher, Gloria J [ENGL] [<mailto:gbetcher@iastate.edu>]

Sent: Thursday, March 17, 2011 11:07 PM

To: gbetcher@iastate.edu

Subject: Minutes of the March 14 Sports Complex Mtg--SCAN/ISU/City of Ames

If you are receiving this email, you have expressed interest in the construction of the proposed ISU Sports Complex. On Monday, March 14, representatives from the South Campus Area Neighborhood Association, ISU, the City of Ames, and the Board of Regents met to discuss the plans that will be presented to the Board of Regents (BoR) on Tuesday, March 23. Attached are the minutes for that meeting and the concept for the sports complex showing the location of three water retention ponds (in blue).

Note that if you wish to have input on the BoR discussion, you will need to submit comments in writing (email is fine) by Monday, March 21, directly to BoR Executive Director Bob Donley <bdonley@iastate.edu>. You may attend the meeting, but the BoR will hear no oral comments at the meeting. Written comments will be distributed to the BoR for reading before the meeting. The meeting will be held in the Sun Room at the Memorial Union, beginning at 8:30, on the 23rd. The Sports Complex discussion is item 10 on the agenda, so it will most likely be up for discussion between 10 and 11:30 a.m. The documents for the agenda item are available for download at <http://www.regents.iowa.gov/Meetings/DocketMemos/11Memos/March2011/0311_ITEM10.pdf>.

Thanks to everyone who has been active in this discussion. SCAN appreciates your willingness to assist in this process.

Gloria

Gloria J. Betcher, Ph.D.
Co-President, SCAN

515-292-5177

SCAN/ISU/City of Ames Joint Meeting, 5:30 p.m. March 14, 2011
Room 235, Ames City Hall
Minutes

Attending: ISU VP for Business Warren Madden; Board of Regents Executive Director Bob Donley; Board of Regents Policy and Operations Officer Joan Racki; City of Ames Municipal Engineer Tracy Warner; SCAN Representatives Gloria Betcher, Mike Burkart, Sandra McJimsey, Jonathan Sturm, and Bryce Abel; ISU Athletics Dept. Budget Analyst Chris Jorgensen; ISU Facilities Planning & Management Project Manager Jon Harvey; ISU Executive Director of University Relations John McCarroll; 3rd Ward City Councilman Jeremy Davis; and Engineer from Schneider Corp Rich Volker (sp?)

VP Madden opened the meeting by announcing the BoR meeting on March 23 and passed around the report that will go to the BoR along with the final conceptual drawings of the proposed Sports Complex. At the Mar. 23 meeting, ISU will request BoR approval of the schematic drawings and approval of funding to proceed with the project. Madden noted that ISU is open to continued conversations with the neighborhood but is happy with the current plan. He confirmed that ISU will continue to work with the City engineers as plans develop to ensure that there will be no additional run-off from the Towers site. ISU does not believe that building on this site will prove problematic for the neighborhood. Madden also explained that the playing fields east of Lied Rec Center will be used by Recreation Services in the future.

Ex. Dir. Donley explained that the BoR meeting on Mar. 23 was originally supposed to be a telephonic meeting but it was changed to a face-to-face meeting, half of which is to be devoted to the evaluation of the various system heads (including Pres. Geoffroy). Because this meeting has a very full agenda, the BoR will hear no oral comments from the neighborhood at the meeting. **Residents who wish to submit comments in writing (email is fine) must submit them by Monday, March 21, directly to Donley <bdonley@iastate.edu>. These comments will be distributed to the BoR for reading before the meeting. The meeting will be held in the Sun Room at the Memorial Union, beginning at 8:30, on the 23rd. The Sports Complex discussion is item 10 on the agenda, so it will most likely be up for discussion between 10 and 11:30 a.m. if anyone is interested in attending the meeting.** Donley affirmed that he will pass on the information that he gathered at the joint meeting (March 14). [The documents for the agenda item are available for download at http://www.regents.iowa.gov/Meetings/DocketMemos/11Memos/March2011/0311_ITEM10.pdf].

Donley believes that ISU has done a good job exercising due diligence in this situation. He is, however, concerned about the drainage situation and wanted to hear more about it from the SCAN reps at the meeting.

In response to Burkart's question re: what is different about the authorization granted by the BoR at this meeting, Madden explained that gaining BoR approval for actual site development will allow the Athletics Dept. to bid the project this summer. The plan is to work out the engineering issues before June if possible so that the project can move ahead and the softball complex outfield can be seeded by August.

McJimsey expressed concern that the project was moving ahead at a pace that seemed in conflict with the pace of City of Ames infrastructure projects in the neighborhood.

Warner explained what the various projects and their timelines are. These include a flood study that will analyze the water issues associated with 2010 flooding much as the 1993 flood was studied. Citizens should give the city their input on any water problems they experienced during the floods

to help complete this study, which could take several years (the 1993 study took three years). Since the CoA was not aware of any water problems in SCAN, the FEMA and Homeland Security monies that have been granted will not be going to projects in the neighborhood. Some sanitary sewers in the neighborhood, for example, on Lynn and Beach, were already under contract to be repaired and some of those repairs have already begun. Warner recounted the minimal number of complaints from the neighborhood, including one sanitary sewer backup report since 1998 (not including the 2010 problems) and reporting of storm sewer flooding on Country Club due to the 2010 flood. That report resulted in repairs to a pipe, but FY2011-12 monies have been allotted to replace the pipe.

Warner will review the Sports Complex plans to ensure that no additional run-off comes from the site. The CoA plans to reconstruct storm sewers on Storm Street in 2011 and Ash Avenue in 2012. At that point, larger mains may need to be installed. Over the years, water main size has increased from 4 inches to 6 inches and now to 8 inches. An evaluation of the sanitary sewer system was started this fiscal year and will be expedited in FY2011-12 so that the (originally) 6-year project can be completed more quickly. This \$3mill project will look at inflow and infiltration and what upgrades might be needed. Councilman Davis noted that many ward residents with whom he had spoken were against accelerating this 6-year study to a 3-year study because the CoA would be spending too much money too soon. (The Council has approved the funding.)

Warner explained that storm sewers are designed for a 5-10-year rain event and were simply overwhelmed in 2010. She is not sure how the CoA can handle extra flow in a built-out neighborhood like ours, where there is no room to add detention ponds, other than trying to address main size and make repairs and replacements as needed.

There will be a public meeting the last week of March (possibly March 29) to discuss the storm sewer project on Storm Street.

Much discussion of drainage issues followed. Burkart, Abel, and McJimsey all spoke about the current drainage problems experienced by neighbors and on the site itself. Abel expressed additional concerns about raising the water table by detaining water on the site and pointed out that engineers need to take into consideration the sub-surface drainage that is already causing water problems in neighbors' basements. McJimsey also pointed out that trees are already being lost at the south end of Ash because of water-logged soil.

Harvey, Volker, and Warner spoke about the options that ISU has investigated, which include attempting to shift drainage off the site to the south, somewhere off Mortensen Rd. Unfortunately, such drainage would not route water to Worle Creek as had been assumed. It would, instead, route water back through mains to the area around Moore Park (which also acts as a secondary retention basin for storm water). This could pass drainage problems to other neighborhoods. (The proposed Ag Pavilion will drain to this area.)

ISU is working with Schneider Corp to run the numbers on likely amounts of run-off from the site, but no entity is required to retain water beyond the 100-year flood level. The City will not approve a plan that leads to additional run-off but will need more than the current concept drawings to determine what might happen. If, when plans are drawn up, the City engineers determine that there will be additional run-off, Warner would send a letter to ISU saying the project doesn't meet required standards and ISU would need to modify the site plan. Both the CoA and ISU are operating under the assumption that run-off will not increase. Madden affirmed multiple times that ISU does not want to do a project that does not meet the required standards. In fact, ISU is committed to meeting the requirements, and the goal is to make the water management on the site better than it currently is.

Harvey explained that the numbers run by Schneider suggest that the current concept, with three retention ponds (see attached diagram), could retain water from a 100-year event so that the discharge from the site would be no more than that of a 5-year event. This water would be retained on site for no more than 24 hours and not raise the water table. ISU is also exploring other means of dealing with water, for example, native plants, grading of the site to channel water flow effectively, a new irrigation system that will keep softball field watering to a minimum, and removal of old tile systems that exist on the field. The soccer field will be covered with an artificial turf system that is designed to allow water to drain through the turf and then be channeled outward to the track.

Warner believes that ISU is taking the concerns of the neighborhood into consideration in the design process and is trying to determine an effective means of water control. Throughout this discussion of drainage, especially when Burkart raised concerns about street flooding, Warner reiterated that the CoA needs updated information on water problems faced by citizens. If citizens will not report problems, the CoA can't work to fix them. Davis confirmed that, in knocking on doors after the flood, many residents were hesitant to say that their properties had experienced flooding problems. Many did not want to go on record and would speak only of "hypothetical" problems. Warner said that reports to the CoA do become part of public record. Discussion of what sort of information the city needs to know in order to take action followed. The area at the south end of Ash and into Little Blue Stem, where water-logged soil has led to loss of trees, is scheduled for work in FY2014-15 because of low-point drainage issues. Warner requested the results of the SCAN survey so that the CoA would have some record of problems. These survey results will be provided but results will be generalized to block numbers (for example, 5 houses in the 800 block of Ash) so that specific addresses will not be on record.

Sturm asked if the retention ponds could be moved to other locations, but Harvey explained that would not be possible given the lack of drainage options to the south. Sturm also suggested perhaps installing an irrigation system into the ponds that would recycle the retained water to irrigate the softball outfield. Harvey said this is a possible option that is being considered.

McJimsey expressed appreciation for ISU's efforts to mitigate drainage problems but expressed concerns that the engineering models might not be able to address the reality of the situation. What recourse would neighbors have if the water management efforts failed? Madden assured her that ISU would return to the issue and work on improving water management. This did not reassure McJimsey, who reminded us of the poor stewardship shown for the SW Athletics Complex. She wondered if we would end up with a second languishing ISU property in the neighborhood. Madden reiterated ISU's commitment to maintaining the complex.

McJimsey asked how operating costs would be funded. Jorgensen told her that Athletics funds would cover operations. These funds would not come from tax dollars.

Madden noted that many neighbors had been concerned about other issues, such as parking, fences, lighting, noise, and traffic. He dealt with these summarily. The parking lot will remain at the size it currently is because spaces are needed for Towers residents and other students; adding more green space by eliminating some parking is not in the cards. ISU doesn't want to reduce either the parking or the playing area. The fence around the complex should help to channel cars away from the neighborhood streets; ISU does not believe traffic will increase. Noise and lighting issues should also be minimal since the site will not be used often. Jorgensen reported that there might be lights used for 6 or 7 night soccer games each year, but that the softball complex would remain unlighted since there are no night games played. He also noted that, at present, Athletics believes the track would be open to public use and there is a plan to maintain green space for neighborhood use. Harvey also addressed previous concerns regarding stress on the sanitary sewer system; the new

water service and sanitary sewer lines for the restrooms will tie into Mortensen Rd. mains instead of mains to the north in order to put less strain on overburdened neighborhood mains.

Betcher asked whether or not a traffic study would be done. Harvey reported that the CoA traffic engineer did not believe the number of people coming to the site would merit a traffic study. The CoA doesn't do traffic studies to account for individual events that might increase traffic volume.

Burkart and Betcher asked about the current plans for the fence around the complex. The revised site plan shows the fence inside the berm to the east of the site. Harvey confirmed that the fence had been moved to the west side of the berm and would, likely, follow the contours of the site. This would allow resident to walk on the berm and would enable the planting of trees and shrubs on top of the berm as screening for the fence. The location of the fence to the north of the site is still under discussion. Betcher and Abel expressed concern that keeping the fence too close to property lines might make it difficult for ISU to maintain the area. Currently, the homeowners to the north do the property-line upkeep, not ISU, which owns the property. Jorgensen affirmed that the Athletic Dept. would be willing to work with neighbors on the location of the fence, though one would be needed for liability reasons. Harvey pointed out that the height of the fence could be lower, perhaps 6 ft rather than 8 ft. Jorgensen concurred with this. The fence is still under discussion.

McJimsey and Betcher raised public health issues that have concerned neighbors; sewage in basements and possible mosquito breeding grounds in retention ponds have been mentioned by a number of residents.

McJimsey reminded ISU of how late we came into this process, but thanked Madden for ensuring that SCAN is now being heard. We appreciate the involvement in the process and are glad to be neighbors of the university.

Davis expressed the desire to have access to the SCAN survey results.

Betcher seconded McJimsey's thanks to ISU for involving SCAN in the process, albeit somewhat late. She explained for the BoR reps' benefit that SCAN has felt caught in the middle of a number of ISU projects--Sports Complex, Intermodal Facility, Campustown Revitalization, Ag Pavilion--that seem to have been rather haphazardly planned with no overarching plan for the entire neighborhood. Madden said that beyond these current projects, ISU has little planned; the Towers will stay for the indefinite future, and there will be increasing equine activities on the old dairy farm but no other major construction. McJimsey asked that ISU keep SCAN in the loop as plans for the Ag Pavilion emerge. She suggested that SCAN invite Madden to speak at an upcoming neighborhood meeting to enable further dialogue. Madden agreed that would be a good idea. Betcher also asked Madden to confirm that the sub-committee would be reconvened once the engineering plans have been completed, assuming the BoR approves the project. Madden agreed.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

