



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes GARVER FEED MILL CRITERIA AND SELECTION COMMITTEE

Monday, August 4, 2014

6:30 PM

Goodman Atwood Community Center
149 Waubesa St

NOTICE: Committee member Susan Thering will be participating in the above noticed meeting via Skype. This method of participation will allow Ms. Thering to both provide input and to hear public testimony and input from other Committee members.

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Present – Clausius, Allgood, Shepherd, Wallner, Rummel, Ahrens, Thering
(participating via Skype)

Absent –

Staff – Rolfs, Sladky, Wendt, Crawley, Rutledge, Monks, Scarborough

Meeting called to order at 6:37 PM.

Present: 7 - Marsha A. Rummel; David Ahrens; Joseph R. Clausius; Alnisa T. Allgood;
Susan Thering; David L. Wallner and Maurice C. Sheppard

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Clausius, second by Ahrens to approve. Motion carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT

John Steines (Madison, WI) – Steines asked the Committee to consider neighborhood input in the RFP. He noted that there were two neighborhoods that border the Garver property. He said that the neighborhoods have put a lot of time into creating a vision for the North Plat and Garver area. He asked that the Committee consider these items as they crafted the RFP. He said that he would prefer to see something active and engaged, but sensitive to the green space around it. He said there was a stark lack of appreciation for the North Plat in the draft RFP. He said it was unfair to the neighborhoods, by giving so few points in the criteria section.

Carl Landesness (Madison, WI) – Landesness supported the comments made by Steines. He highlighted the number of meetings that the neighborhood had held, along with the large number of participants from the neighborhood members that attended. He said he felt that there was a large opportunity for synergy and interconnectivity that could be achieved on this site. He felt that the site could be a center for co-creativity. He endorsed the study / plan by Parker Jones. He said he would like to see the additional 3 story “castle” portion of the building re-created if at all possible.

DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING DRAFT GARVER FEED MILL RFP

Motion by Rummel, second by Clausius to open the public hearing. Motion carried.

It was noted that Steiness intended his comments to be part of the public hearing.

Motion by Clausius, second by Rummel to close the public hearing. Motion carried.

OLD BUSINESS

DISCUSSION OF REFERENDUM REQUIREMENT FOR GARVER FEED MILL

No discussion.

34500

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

Attachments:

[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](#)

Discussion took place around the different versions of the proposed criteria and point selection options that were sent in by various members.

Sheppard said that he generated his proposal as a suggestion, based upon the work of the previous committee. He said he collapsed it down from six categories to four. He indicated that he would like to add under the "context sensitive" section was adding additional language to work with the neighborhood. He also said he wanted to add language to ensure that the OBG donor intent was met. The revised point total was now 100, instead of 130 in the draft section.

Clausius said he liked having 100 points for the criteria.

Thering provided an overview of her proposal for the criteria and point scoring.

She identified four themes from the existing RFP that went into her proposal. She said she felt that the issue of “context sensitive” design and response are issues in and of themselves, and should be given equal weight as other issues. She said she appreciated OBG, but felt that the needs and input of the neighborhood surrounding Garver should be of equal weight. Ahrens said he felt that proposals should get some points for an excellent design. He also said that he felt that proposals that requested more than the \$1.825 million set aside by the Mayor or did not provide the space OBG required should be a non-starter. Staff indicated that if there were items that the Committee felt were non-starters, the criteria should reflect that.

Rummel said that she would like to see the Financial aspect as the most important and should receive 20% of the points. After that, she indicated that she would like to see everything else weighted equally.

Allgood said her point totals went up to 150. She said that the City Budget amount of \$1.825 million is a non-starter. She said if proposals went over that dollar request, they did not get any points at all. She said she would like to see specific categories get more or less weighting based upon the Committee’s desires. She said she would like to see more focus on pedestrians in the final criteria.

Motion by Ahrens to have as a baseline requirement that the respondent request no more than \$1.825 million in city assistance, to provide the space for OBG, and to agree to the the framework for the sale of the building and lease of the land. Second by Allgood.

Rummel indicated that she felt that the most important thing was to save the Garver Feed Mill, and that the issues that OBG faced should be secondary.

Ahrens amended his motion to only include the \$1.825 million and the agreement to the framework for the sale of the building and the lease of the land as baseline requirements which would be minimal requirements for a responsive the RFP, with any proposal that did not meet both of these requirements as being non-responsive. Second by Thering.

Discussion took place around whether or not this might eliminate a proposal that did not meet the potential minimal requirement of \$1.825 million, and if the City Council might approve a project that requested additional funding. Rummel expressed concern about whether or not this decision should be removed from the Council’s purview. Allgood said if these items were not removed as “non-starters”, they should be given enough points to make it very clear what the focus was and ensure that it would be difficult to compete.

Ahrens withdrew his motion.

Rummel said she wanted to ensure that the building was redeveloped. Sheppard and Ahrens discussed the proposal Sheppard made. The Committee worked on a criteria and scoring method based upon the proposal made by Sheppard. The Committee referred further work on the criteria and scoring until the meeting on Sept 4, 2014.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Ahrens, second by Sheppard to adjourn. Motion carried at 9:20 PM.