



City of Madison

City of Madison
Madison, WI 53703
www.cityofmadison.com

Meeting Minutes GARVER FEED MILL CRITERIA AND SELECTION COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 18, 2015

6:30 PM

Goodman Community Center
149 Waubesa Street

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present – Clausius, Sheppard, Wallner, Rummel, Ahrens, Allgood

Absent –

Staff – Rolfs, Sladky, Scanlon, Knepp, Crawley, Viste, Erdman, Monks

Wallner called the meeting to order at 6:42 PM.

Present: 6 - Marsha A. Rummel; David Ahrens; Joseph R. Clausius; Alnisa T. Allgood;
David L. Wallner and Maurice C. Sheppard

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Allgood, second by Rummel to approve. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Greg McManners (City of Madison) – McManners said he was the Exec Director of the Monona Terrace. He spoke against the Alexander proposal, as it would compete directly with the Monona Terrace's convention center space. He said that the proposal from the Alexander would compete directly with the Monona Terrace. He noted that the proposal would require multiple events on a single day to generate the revenue that was proposed, which would create additional traffic counts for the area. He said without the support of a hotel, it would only compete for local business that otherwise would go to Monona Terrace. He said the projected loss that they were projecting based upon this project would be around \$400,000 - \$500,000. He asked whether the City should provide land and funds to compete with a publicly owned facility. Ahrens asked for McManners estimate for the required parking based upon the Alexander proposal. McManners said in his opinion, the parking as proposed was inadequate. Ahrens asked what the City subsidy was for Monona Terrace. McManners said that the City provided approximately \$2.8 million.

Dr. Amy Owens (Madison, WI) – She spoke in opposition to the Alexander proposal. She spoke against the participants, the traffic, the noise, and indicated that this would require her to move from her current home.

John Steines (Madison, WI) – Steines spoke against the Alexander proposal. He reviewed the SASY neighborhood's long term plans for the area and some of the history of Garver and the North Plat.

Stacy Fritz (Madison, WI) – Fritz indicated that she was one of the joint owners of Calliope Ice Cream. She said as a business owner looking to move into a production facility, this space would meet their needs. She said a production facility with shared space and production spaces would meet their needs. She felt that the project would be a huge bonus for their business.

Diego Calderon (Madison, WI) – Calderon said that he did not like any of the proposals, but if one had to be selected, he preferred the Baum proposal. He noted that the Latino and African American communities were not represented in any of these proposals.

Carl Landsness (Madison, WI) – Landsness said that he grew up in the neighborhood. He said that the Garver area provides him with sanity, serenity, and serendipity. He urged the Committee to balance the proposal with people, place, and planet. Landsness spoke in favor of the Baum proposal, indicating that this project would fit in best with the neighborhood.

Nathan Greenwalt (Old Sugar Distillery) – Greenwalt indicated that the Old Sugar Distillery was named after the Garver Feed Mill, as it was originally a sugar beet factory. He said it was never his intention to have a large tasting room in his current space, but it has been very successful. He said they recently developed a project to bring together local breweries to create a whiskey from each brewery. He said the Baum proposal was a chance to bring this project further along. He appreciated the collaboration opportunity in this property. He noted that Old Sugar Distillery was not looking to move, but was contemplating expansion.

Mark Lydon (Marshall, WI) – Lydon spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. He felt it would help to drive small business development. He felt that it would help to drive local food production and economy in the City of Madison.

John Martens (Madison, WI) – Martens spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. He provided an overview of the City of Madison's historical development.

Mike Moon (Just Coffee Coop) – He provided a brief overview of Just Coffee Coop, indicating that they grew up in the Common Wealth Development Incubator Space. He spoke in favor of the Baum proposal and the synergies that would be provided by the project. He indicated that they worked very hard to focus on their impact on their employees and the community.

Miriam Grunes (Madison, WI) – Grunes spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. She said she was the Executive Director of the REAP Food Group in her professional life. She noted that Madison was well known throughout the country for the local food movement that was developed and thriving here. She said this could be one more step for those growing out of the REAP Feed Kitchen.

Matt Feifarek (Madison, WI) – Feifarek spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. He also said he was part of the Slow Food Movement in the City of Madison. He said the project spoke to him both from a business perspective and as a neighbor. He indicated that the tiny houses were something that could and would be supported by the community.

Rick Brooks (Madison, WI) – Brooks said he was a co-founder of Dane Buy Local, although he was not speaking on its behalf tonight. Brooks spoke in support of the Baum proposal.

Lou Host-Jablonski (Madison, WI) – Host-Jablonski spoke in appreciation for the community.

Scott Frank (ACC) – He noted that their proposal included a day care that would be open to the public, not just to their employees.

Grant Foster (Madison, WI) – He spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. He noted that in his work they often used the scoring rubric similar to the one the Committee generated in the RFP. He discussed the Committee's scoring numbers and potential biases in the scores. He felt that the scoring tool did not have any part for input from the community. He urged the Committee to respect the neighborhood's wishes.

Brad Hinkfuss (Madison, WI) – Hinkfuss spoke as the Chair of the SASY Neighborhood Association (SASYNA). He said he was concerned about the rejection of the public feedback in support of the Baum proposal, that he saw in the Alexander proposal. He noted that the capacity of the building as proposed was more than 5,000 people, that would adversely impact the neighborhood.

Betty Chewning (Madison, WI) – Chewning spoke in favor of the Baum proposal and against the Alexander proposal. She said that the proposal was not sensitive to the North Plat or the neighborhood. She felt that the proposed facility would require many more parking spaces than proposed, which would damage the North Plat. She felt that the parking and transportation plan was a concern for the neighborhood. She spoke against the Alexander proposal and its potential to impact the Monona Terrace Convention Center. Chewning indicated that she looked forward to the tiny houses so she could stay in them. Ahrens asked Chewning where in the proposal it showed 5,000 potential guests. Chewning clarified this item.

Steve Gaffield (Madison, WI) – He noted that he was a former chair of the Friends of Starkweather Creek. Gaffield said he supported the Baum proposal. He said it was at the confluence of two branches of the Starkweather Creek, and was a sensitive area. He felt that this proposal would be most respectful of this fact.

Twink Jan-McMahon (Wisconsin Urban Wood / Sustainable Atwood) – Jan-McMahon spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. She hoped that many of the tiny houses could be built with local wood by local builders, which would increase the sustainability of the City. She felt that the Baum proposal would be sensitive to the triple bottom line and enhance sustainability.

Lance Green (Friends of Starkweather Creek) – Green spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. He read a list of animals that had been spotted on the North Plat and the Garver area and in Starkweather Creek. He noted that the Friends of Starkweather Creek felt that the only proposal that would preserve this area was from Baum. He noted that there was a move to create a green corridor from Lake Monona through the Garver property up to the Voit property

to the Interstate highway.

Armistead Feland (Madison, WI) – He noted that they moved to the area about 5 years ago. He spoke in favor of the Baum proposal and against the Alexander proposal. He felt that the proposal would have too much impact on the surrounding neighborhood. He asked for some perspective from each Committee member on how they scored their responses.

Jennifer Voichick (Madison, WI) – Voichick spoke in favor of the Baum proposal. She noted that the Baum proposal had a great deal of support from the local community. She was happy to see movement on the property.

Robert McGraw (Madison, WI) – McGraw spoke in support of the Baum proposal. He said that the other proposals felt flat and from the previous century.

Jacob Shea (Madison, WI) – Shea noted that the scores from the Committee did not line up with the input from the community and the neighborhood. He referred back to the original intent identified in the RFP. He felt that the small food businesses in the Baum proposal would be an asset to the local food business economy. He asked the Committee to not get caught up with the tiny house concept.

Michael Gay (Madison, WI) – Gay spoke in support of the Baum proposal as a place where entrepreneurs would have physical space to grow and thrive. He felt that this space would create a resource for food entrepreneurs. He urged the Committee to be bold with the tiny houses. He spoke in favor of the Baum proposal as an outside development team that listened to the community. Rummel asked Gay how the Baum proposal would relate to the public market. Gay said that he felt that the Baum proposal would complement and fuel the public market.

In Support, Not Wishing to Speak

In Opposition, Not Wishing to Speak
Lissa McLaughlin (Madison, WI)

In Support, Available to Answer Questions
Diane Grypp (Madison, WI) – In support of Baum
Wendy Hutton (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Mitchell Brey (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Efrat Livny (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Kenneth Baun (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Jason Tish (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Paul Kosmerl (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Emily Kosmerl (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Garrett Hughes (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Jim Lorman (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Al Bachmann (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Anne Forbes (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Ed Engler (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum

Chris Quandt (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Susan Mills (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Dana Boucher (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Matthew Miller (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Phyllis Hasbrouck (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
David Simmons (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Naomi Kroth (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Brian Kroth (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Karen Brown (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Michael Johns (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum and opposing Alexander
Julie Melton (Madison, WI) In support of Alternative Continuum of Care and
opposing Alexander, Baum, and Ogden
Leslie Schroeder (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Ellen Carlson (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Larry Jensen (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Fritz Hastreiter (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Michael Schill (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Erin McWalter (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Emily Steinwehe (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Tom Rogers (Baum Development)
Meghan Blake-Horst (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Stephanie Steigerwaldt (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Nelle Burke (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
John May (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Deiter Dettling (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Phyllis Treige (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Leah Evans (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Mrill Ingram (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Emily Locke (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Andy Swartz (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Tom Solheim (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Sue DeBuhr (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Tomothy Bauer (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Steve Drake (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Deborah Bachmann (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
David Rossing (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Michael Vickerman (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Kathleen Behrens (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Linda Kietzer (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Linda Haglund-Lynch (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Angie Gaster (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Jennifer McGraw (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Nikki Drilias (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Max Burke-Scoll (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Franklin Berkowitz (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Andy Olson (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Marcelo Pineyro (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Kerry Martin (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Ellen Zweibel (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Robert Fontella (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum
Nicholas PrahI (Madison, WI) - In support of Baum

Motion by Rummel, second by Allgood for a seven minute break. Motion
carried at 8:17 PM.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

OLD BUSINESS

DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL ON GARVER DEVELOPER

34500

Garver Feed Mill Criteria and Selection Committee (2014) Request for Proposals

Attachments: [Revised UPDATE 14 August Revised Criteria Proposal from Sue Thering.pdf](#)
[8279 GarverRFP2014 WorkingDraft 08-25.pdf](#)
[SASY response to RFP for Garver Committee.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver - DRAFT Criteria Scoring 08-28.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver DRAFT Timeline 08-27.pdf](#)
[Sheppard - Revised Criteria Points - Garver RFP Draft.pdf](#)
[OBS ltr to garver comm 8.1.14.pdf](#)
[GarverRFP2014 WorkingDraft 07-30.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver - RFP Sustainability Language.pdf](#)
[Revised Criteria Proposal for discussion Sue Thering 31 July.pdf](#)
[8279 GarverRFP2014 WorkingDraft 07-15.pdf](#)
[8279 GarverRFP2014 WorkingDraft 06-18.pdf](#)
[Garver Feed Mill Project Website](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver - Referendum Scenarios.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver Background RPT.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver - Public Input Process.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver Com - Intro Presentation.pdf](#)
[Thering Presentation July 7, 2014 - Garver Building and the North Platte 200](#)
[Thering Presentation - Garver & North Plat Participatory Analysis, Planning, &](#)
[Steines email - 2014 08-04 -and-Harvard Medicinal Greenspace.pdf](#)

Meeting re-commenced at 8:27 PM.

Rolfs provided an overview of the process that would take place after the selection of the Committee. He noted that City Staff and the development team would need all the time before them to ensure that the project was successfully completed and eligible for the State of WI Historic Tax Credits under the existing program.

Motion by Rummel to allow the Chair of the committee to participate in the discussions to the Committee, second by Clausius. She noted that without this motion, the Chair would not be allowed to participate in the Committee. Viste said that the Chair could vote, if there were three votes for a proposal, as his vote would affect the outcome. Motion by Ahrens to amend the motion to allow the Chair to vote at his own discretion, regardless of the totals, second by Allgood. Motion on the amendment carried unanimously. Amended motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Rummel to accept the Baum proposal, second by Allgood.

Rummel said that there were four proposals that were sound and reasonable. She felt that under the totality of criteria, the Baum proposal rose to the top of the four. She was glad that the neighborhood had worked very hard to ensure that the Garver building was saved.

Sheppard said that he viewed the scores as a way to organize his thoughts and a starting point for making a recommendation. He said he had had two issues with the Baum proposal, as it would have a full time, 24/7 impact on the area. He still had some questions regarding the tiny houses concept in the Baum proposal.

Clausius was pleased with the turnout from the neighborhood, noting that his major issue was protecting the financial interest of the City. He noted that the Baum proposal and the Alexander proposal were scored nearly similarly, but he gave the Alexander group more points due to their payback of the \$1.8 million in funds.

Rolfs reiterated that any proposal that was accepted would change throughout the negotiations with the City, and as a result of the City processes.

Allgood said that she used a two pass voting process to assign her scores. She liked the Baum proposal. She also felt that the ACC was very underappreciated given that Madison is facing a growing elderly community. She said that while this did not put the ACC proposal over Baum, it is a currently unmet need.

Ahrens said the testimony that showed the dissonance between the scores relative to the unanimity of the neighborhood input in favor of Baum. He said that the importance of the proposal and the importance of the project made this something beyond a facility for the immediate community. He said that this was the reason that he did not support the Baum proposal. He felt that their tiny houses were a concern. He noted that some part of the City funds would go toward the creation of a private hotel type of space. He noted that the creation of these tiny houses as hotel rooms was a leap into the unknown, with no knowledge of their viability. He said his first task of protecting the fiscal wellbeing of the City gave him pause on the Baum proposal. He said that there was no demand for hotel rooms in this area, so there were hotel rooms in this area. Ahrens said that he was struck by the lack of any discussion of social benefit in the scoring sheet. He felt that the issue of social benefit and social purpose was integral to his selection for ACC.

Allgood said that she felt calling the micro-lodges tiny hotels did them a disservice. She saw them as small cabins in the wilderness of the North Plat.

Rummel acknowledged the research that Ahrens had done, but challenged his research. She felt that this was monetizing the park land on a temporary basis, but that this was not a permanent fixture. She referenced the changes that are taking place in the travel market, with people seeking experiential places to stay during their travels. She noted that in the previous RFP process both proposals had a hotel component, so there was precedent for this kind of proposal.

Wallner said that his focus was on the use of the building, as the North Plat would be developed in due time by the City. He said that he came down on several issues. One was the public use of the building, and as such he liked the Alexander plan given that it would be more open. He said that he felt that the Alexander plan had more chance for synergy with Olbrich, and the Baum proposal would also cost more for replacement of parkland. He also referenced the payback of the funds from the Alexander proposal. He said he was still concerned with the tiny houses and the financial ability of this portion of the project to succeed. He felt that traffic would be an issue with the Alexander proposal. He said he was not wedded to any proposal, but he felt that the Baum, Alexander, and ACC proposal would all serve the City well.

Ahrens said McManners testimony provided some main points regarding the Alexander. He had concerns regarding the large number of cars that would be generated by this project. He felt that there were a finite number of conventions, and that Alexander would potentially take away some of the business from the City funded Monona Terrace and other surrounding venues such as the Goodman Center. He also raised the concern about the lack of a hotel within 2 miles of the Garver property. He expressed appreciation for Alexander's work in the City.

Rummel said that she felt that the Alexander proposal could encourage people to use Sugar Ave through Olbrich as an entrance for the project.

Allgood said she felt that the Alexander project used a lot of parking, and whether or not there was a need for more event space in the City. She felt that there was a need for more community event space, versus the large spaces provided for in the Alexander proposal. Allgood felt that the Alexander proposal did not provide a large social benefit, versus the Baum and ACC proposals. She said that the potential impact on the local food market in the area with the Baum proposal would provide societal benefit to the City.

Ahrens said there was major growth in the area of the number of people who are 85 years old and above. He said that the ACC proposal would create nearly 100 new jobs, relative to the Baum proposal that would be creating jobs very incrementally. He also spoke in favor of the ACC proposal's childcare center that would be a benefit to the neighborhood. Ahrens said in the Eastmorland area, there were a high number of people who were 75 years of age and above, and the ACC proposal would help these residents.

Roll call vote on the motion:

Ahrens – No

Allgood – Yes

Wallner – Yes

Rummel – Yes

Clausius – Yes

Sheppard – Yes

Motion by Allgood, second by Ahrens to recommend ACC as the second choice. Discussion took place on whether or not to set conditions that would cut off negotiations. Staff was asked to report back to Council on how negotiations were proceeding with Baum.

Ahrens – Yes
Allgood – Yes
Wallner – Yes
Rummel – Yes
Clausius – No
Sheppard – No

36628

Garver Feed Mill RFP Responses

Attachments:

[8279 - Garver Feed Mill - 2015 02-26 Financial Review.pdf](#)
[8279 - Garver Feed Mill Proposal - Staff Analysis.pdf](#)
[2014 Garver Feed Mill Proposal Review Process.pdf](#)
[8279 - 2014 Garver Feed Mill UPDATED Review Process v3.pdf](#)
[8279 - Garver 2014 - Proposal Review.pdf](#)
[Alexander Company - Response to Garver RFP.pdf](#)
[Alexander Garver Event Center Site Plan Colored Rendering Revised.pdf](#)
[Alexander - 2015 01-16 Submittal.pdf](#)
[Alexander Company - NMTC Transactions - Dane County.pdf](#)
[2015 02-10 - Alexander Garver Loan Amortization Schedule.pdf](#)
[Ogden Garver Feed Mill RFP Submittal.pdf](#)
[Ogden 2. Conceptual Plan and Design.pdf](#)
[Ogden - 2015 01-16 Submittal.pdf](#)
[Ogden - 2015 01-16 email.pdf](#)
[Alternative Continuum of Care - Garver Feed Mill RFP\(compressed\).pdf](#)
[Alternative Continuum of Care - Banking References and disclosures.pdf](#)
[Alternative Continuum of Care - Final Financials.pdf](#)
[ACC Garver 2015 01-16 Submittal.pdf](#)
[ACC email - Tax Credits - 2015 02-11.pdf](#)
[ACC email - Tax Credits Replacement Sources 2015 02-26.pdf](#)
[Baum Garver SmithGroupJJR \(compressed\).pdf](#)
[Site Plan 11x17 Baum Revision 1.15.15.pdf](#)
[Baum Responses 1 16 15.pdf](#)
[Baum Revision 1.15.15 - Site Plan Revision.pdf](#)
[Baum Banking References.pdf](#)
[2015 02-02 Baum Financials - Garver - 10 Years.pdf](#)
[Baum 2015 02-11 State Historic Tax Credit.pdf](#)
[Financial Summary Update - Baum 2.25.15.pdf](#)
[Garver Feed Mill Approved RFP](#)
[Garver Feed Mill RFP - Creation Process](#)
[2015 01-22 Alexander Garver Feed Mill Event Center Presentation Final.pdf](#)
[2015 01-22 ACC Garver Presentation.pdf](#)
[2015 01-22 Baum Garver Feed Mill Presentation .pdf](#)
[2015 01-22 Garver Feed Mill Ogden Engberg Anderson Presentation.pdf](#)
[Garver Public Comment through 2015 03-09.pdf](#)
[Knepp Memo 2015 03-12.pdf](#)
[8279 - Garver Scores Memo Ahrens Narrative.pdf](#)
[Garver Public Comment through 2015 03-19.pdf](#)

This Miscellaneous was Approve

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Rummel, second by Allgood to adjourn. Motion carried at 9:31 PM.