

*play*  
**MADISON  
PARKS**

Eric Knepp  
Madison Parks Superintendent

**Madison Parks Division**  
www.cityofmadison.com/parks

**Administrative Office  
Planning and Development  
Community & Recreation Services**  
210 ML King, Jr. Blvd., Rm. 104  
P.O. Box 2987  
Madison, WI 53701-2987  
Phone: 608.266.4711  
Fax: 608.267.1162

**Parks Operations Offices**  
Goodman Maintenance Facility  
1402 Wingra Creek Pkwy.  
**West Forestry**, 608.266.4816  
**Construction**, 608.266.6289  
**Conservation**, 608.267.4918  
**Central Parks**, 608.266.4728

**State Street Mall Concourse  
Maintenance**  
120 S. Fairchild St., 608.266.6031

**Summit Maintenance Facility**  
1902 Freeport Rd.  
**West Parks**, 608.288.6164

**Sycamore Maintenance Facility**  
4602 Sycamore Ave.  
**East Parks**, 608.246.4508  
**East Forestry**, 608.266.4816

**Olbrich Botanical Gardens**  
3330 Atwood Ave., 608.246.4550

**Warner Park Community  
Recreation Center**  
1625 Northport Dr., 608.245.3690

**Irwin A. & Robert D. Goodman Pool**  
325 W. Olin Ave., 608.264.9292

**Golf Madison Parks  
Glenway Golf Course**  
3747 Speedway Rd., 608.266.4737  
**Monona Golf Course**  
111 East Dean Ave., 608.266.4736  
**Odana Hills Golf Course**  
4635 Odana Rd., 608.266.4724  
**Yahara Hills Golf Course**  
6701 E. Broadway, 608.838.3126

**Forest Hill Cemetery**  
1 Speedway Rd., 608.266.4720



A Proud Division of  
the City of Madison

**TO:** Garver Feed Mill Committee  
**FROM:** Eric Knepp, Parks Superintendent  
**DATE:** March 12, 2015  
**SUBJECT:** Proposals for Garver

First, I want to thank each of you for your role on the Committee. I appreciate all of the time and effort the Committee has invested in creating the criteria to evaluate the four proposals before you today. The level of effort each of you has invested in reviewing the proposals and talking with each of the teams has been significant. While each proposal has its merits, Parks is not supporting one proposal over another. I am writing this memo to share with the Committee some pertinent information prior to final scoring and evaluation of the proposals. This information relates to the land requirements for each development; the future of the remaining land on the North Plat; the financial impact on the City of Madison; and the process moving forward from selection to a successful project on the site.

One key difference between the proposals is the footprint of land required. Three of the four proposals have indicated they will stay almost entirely within the 5-acre footprint around the Garver building. The concept shown in the fourth proposal (Baum) extends significantly into the North Plat. While Baum has indicated they will need slightly more than two additional acres (for a total of slightly more than 7 acres), the amount of additional parkland that will need to be leased to Baum to incorporate all of the elements shown in the Baum proposal is unclear. Any leased land would require an equal amount of new parkland dedicated or acquired for City Parks to release WDNR restrictions. The cost of land required to release the WDNR restrictions on the leased areas is an important consideration in calculating the overall cost of the project. For any project selected, this kind of cost should be a consideration in the negotiation process and will ultimately be a decision for City policy makers.

Another key fact with each of the proposals is the lack of clarity in regard to expectations of the City of Madison in relationship to the balance of the North Plat property. In some of the proposals there is no vision or concept proposed, while in others there is. This is not to say that having a vision or concept is inherently better or worse, but it is critical for the Committee to note that the current Parks Division Capital Improvement Program (the plan for future capital investments) does not include any funding for development of the North Plat prior to 2020. It is also important to note that the Board of Park Commissioners must approve the selected proposal and will also approve any plans for development (including master plan revisions) for the balance of the North Plat. Additionally, the Board of Park Commissioners will review and offer input on the final ground lease, development agreement, and terms of sale of the building itself. Each proposal may include expectations of the City in regard to the North Plat, but I want to make clear that at this point there is no funding budgeted for development or maintenance of this land.

A third point is that it is important to conceptualize the total financial cost to the City for each proposal. I know that Dan has provided the Committee with significant amounts of information and expertise in regard to the proposals and their individual financial strength. I would state, however, that beyond the ability of each proposal to make their project work financially, the requirement of the \$1.825M in City funding to the project, and the outlay for the procurement of additional land there are additional financial considerations to take into account. There will undoubtedly be additional operational costs for Parks from the North Plat for any development. The current resource allocation to this area is very low and adding a more intensive use will lead to higher costs per acre as the land moves at minimum from a completely passive/natural area to a more highly visible and utilized natural area. Some of the proposals also indicate further and more extensive development on the North Plat. Unless this will be funded by the developer, there is a significant cost exposure to the City in developing/rehabilitating the North Plat. Shoreline, paths, trees, a bridge, and prairie plantings are all things that could be a very good fit on the land, but each comes with a cost that is currently unbudgeted or planned. Given the current budgetary constraints for Parks, I do not foresee being able to request funding for Operational or Capital costs for any development on the North Plat as a part of the base requested budget for Parks for the next few years. Any funding for this type of development would need to be a supplemental, as otherwise quality projects would need to be delayed and/or deleted from our plan.

My final consideration for the Committee is that the Committee consider providing an explicit statement that staff from various agencies should work to negotiate the best possible agreement that is in the best interest of the City of Madison and its residents. In watching this process unfold, it is clear to me that this statement being made expressly clear would help encourage what I know the Committee already understands: A successful project for Garver will require a negotiation between staff and the selected developer to ensure the most positive outcome for the building, the City, the neighborhood, the developer and the numerous other stakeholders in this process.

I am excited for the final selection of a proposal for the rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Garver building. This landmark building is an important part of the Parks inventory and we are excited to see multiple visions of what the building can be in the future. I am confident the Committee will select the overall best project for the future of the building, park, neighborhood, Olbrich Gardens, and the City. Thank you again for all of your work on this matter.