



## Office of the Mayor

Paul R. Soglin, Mayor

City-County Building, Room 403  
210 Martin Luther King, Jr. Boulevard  
Madison, Wisconsin 53703  
Phone: (608) 266-4611  
Fax: (608) 267-8671  
[mayor@cityofmadison.com](mailto:mayor@cityofmadison.com)  
[www.cityofmadison.com](http://www.cityofmadison.com)

---

June 28, 2016

To: Community Gardens Committee Members

From: Mark Woulf, Food and Alcohol Policy Director

Re: Guidance on Recommendation for Future of Community Gardens Committee

The conversation that the CGC had with stakeholders at your April meeting was productive and should help provide context for any potential changes to the CGC. If you recall my memo dated January 26, 2016, any structural changes to the CGC will require City Council action. Ideally, there would be consensus from the CGC on a recommendation(s), which then we can put into a formal resolution and/or ordinance change for full consideration. As you approach the point of recommending changes to the structure of the Community Gardens Committee (CGC), I thought it would be helpful to outline some possible options for your consideration. The options, with some variation, basically fall into three categories: 1) Continue as a stand-alone city committee; 2) Formally integrate into the Food Policy Council; 3) Informally request work to be conducted by the Food Policy Council.

Hopefully the committee can work through these options and determine a course of action. I will be able to join you at your next meeting in July, and I'd be happy to bring formal ordinance/resolution language based on your recommendation for your review.

**1) Keep the Community Gardens Committee as is.**

The CGC is constituted in City ordinances. Its charge in ordinance is very general and references the 1999 report that the committee was working off of in this last process to create the grids. This option would presumably result in the smallest amount of change to the committee's function. At the very least, the work done to update the report should be referenced in the ordinances. This option is best if there is uneasiness about making major structural changes to the committee based on the recent changes and discussion.

Another option, along these same lines, would be to make more significant changes to the structure of the CGC. In this scenario, the CGC would use the information collected and results of the final report to essentially create a "new" committee. The charge and perhaps membership would be altered. All changes in this option would require an ordinance change.

**2) Reconstitute as an official subcommittee of the Madison Food Policy Council and dissolve the Community Gardens Committee.**

This option would result in a formal acceptance of the mission of the CGC into the work of the Food Policy Council. A subcommittee would allow there to be a formal body that would be entered into the Legistar system, meaning it would have official agendas, minutes, and membership. A subcommittee can be given a specific charge and all of the work will flow through the Food Policy Council. Subcommittee members may be non-Food Policy Council members and appointed at the discretion of the chair. The CGC could provide to the FPC a list of items (presumably as a part of your final report) for the new subcommittee to cover in its mission. This would give the FPC guidance in creating the parameters for the subcommittee's work.

In dissolving the CGC, the CGC could finish its final report and send it to the City Council. A resolution could be crafted to dissolve the committee if the Council "adopts" the final report.

**3) Request that the Madison Food Policy Council assume responsibility for community gardens policy and dissolve the Community Gardens Committee.**

This is the less formal version of option #2. The CGC could send a list of recommendations or policy considerations to the Madison Food Policy Council. Then, the Food Policy Council would decide what course of action to take. One example is for the FPC to create a work group, which is less formal than a subcommittee, which would focus on gardens issues. Work group members can be pulled from outside of the FPC.

This option would be the least formal. The CGC could finish its final report and send to the important stakeholders asking for follow up. This would allow each of the stakeholders groups or bodies to make a determination on their own how to address the recommendations. Then, an ordinance change would be introduced to dissolve the CGC.

---