



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Approved OSCAR MAYER STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 23, 2018

5:30 PM

Warner Park Community Center
1625 Northport Drive, Community Room 1

1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Sheppard arrived at 6 pm.

Present: 11 - Larry Palm; Rebecca Kemble; Maurice C. Sheppard; Syed (John) Mustajab Abbas; Satya V. Rhodes-Conway; Renee A. Walk; Douglas Leikness; Chandra M. Miller Fienen; Annette M. Gelbach; Gary J. Wolter and Paul F. Jadin

Excused: 2 - Steve King and Ken Opin

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Kemble, seconded by Abbas, to Approve the August 13, 2018 Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

4. DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

5. Owners Status Report

Nathan Wautier, the attorney representing Reich Brothers and Rabin Worldwide, provided an update from the owners. He said that the infrastructure work is progressing, with MG&E trenching for new electrical feeds. The gas infrastructure is underway, and there are now separate water connections in all of the leasable buildings. They continue to work with the Building Inspection Division and Fire Department to mothball a large portion of the multistory production building and hope to shut off the space in the next few weeks. Wautier mentioned that they are also redesigning the HVAC system, and each building will have a separate heating system in place by December. In terms of leasing, they currently have two tenants in the office building, TASC and a start-up called Assured Leads, and are in discussion with other potential tenants as well. They are moving forward with the maker space in building 20 and talking to other potential users for that building. Wautier said that they are also finalizing site plans with an industrial user for buildings 43 and 50 and are engaged with a national food distribution group for the cold storage space.

6. Timeline and Next Steps

Tom Otto, Economic Development Division, described the upcoming timeline for the rest of the planning process. He explained that the Strategic Assessment Report will be introduced to Common Council in early December and adopted by Council at their January 8 meeting. They will enter into a contract with the consultant for the Special Area Plan in early 2019, and the SAP process will run through August 2019.

7. Review Draft Report Recommendations

Rhodes-Conway explained that some of the redevelopment objectives clearly flow into the Special Area Plan, but it is less clear how a land use planning document will address other objectives in terms of who will be responsible for them and how they will be implemented. The solution was to create additional recommendations that are aligned with particular objectives to ensure they are acted on.

The group reviewed the recommendations and provided feedback. Regarding recommendation four, Walk pointed out an opportunity to acknowledge existing neighborhood groups, and Rhodes-Conway said that it could also fit with recommendation 5. Wolter mentioned that he wants to be sure that community participants who provided feedback are recognized, and that we continue to engage the public throughout the planning process. Kemble noted that everything in the plan flows from the public participation and feedback they received, and the objectives are a direct result of those comments. She suggested that they more clearly state that message in the report. Walk suggested that constituent representatives be added to the end of recommendation 4 where it mentions major property owners. Palm said that recommendations 4 and 5 could be combined because they both discuss community engagement.

Regarding recommendation 6, Rhodes-Conway pointed out that it refers to property owners in the area, not just the Oscar Mayer site owners. Jadin mentioned the importance of the relationship with the site owners, suggesting there should be an indication that the City is working with them to advance their mission as well. There was discussion about splitting recommendation 7 into two sentences in order to mention the Little League fields and the wetlands separately. In the implementation matrix, Palm suggested that Engineering be added as a responsible agency for recommendation 7 because of the wetlands.

Palm pointed out that the words "corridor," "area," and "Northside" are used interchangeably throughout the report, and they need to be defined more specifically. Miller Fienen said that the language in recommendation 8 implies that we are giving up and housing costs are going to become unaffordable, rather than proactively creating a market mechanism for a sufficient amount of affordable housing. Jadin pointed out that recommendation 9 also supports

objective 10 because we are ultimately going to use financial resources from the community and region for these specific issues related to affordability for businesses.

In discussion of recommendation 11, Palm suggested that biking be mentioned. He also suggested that the word transportation be added to the first line to clearly indicate what they are discussing. Miller Fienen agreed, and pointed out that transportation is important to include because of all the community comments on this topic, which they should mirror in the recommendations to show they listened. Walk said that this is the only item where transportation is mentioned, so they could also add a component about coordinating with other agencies.

Rhodes-Conway asked if there are any recommendations they are missing. Kemble mentioned jobs, noting that there was nothing explicit in the recommendations about employment aside from linking tenants with training organizations. She said that throughout the process, she felt that jobs and transportation seemed like the biggest topics, so it is important that they are specifically mentioned here. Palm suggested calling out Neighborhood Association involvement because several neighborhoods are included in the Special Area Plan boundary.

8. Review Draft (80%) Report

The Committee then provided comments on the draft report. Annette Miller, EQT by Design, who developed the public engagement process for this phase of the plan, noted that she did have an opportunity to review the report before it was sent to the Committee. Miller Fienen and Kemble suggested that there be more of an explanation of the Strategic Assessment Report and Special Area Plan in the Overview section on page 8 so that people understand why the recommendations were created. Miller Fienen suggested that the owners status reports and their relationship with the Committee over the course of the process be mentioned somewhere in the report. Sheppard said that because this will primarily be an electronic document, they should provide links to key definitions and additional information, where appropriate.

Regarding the Summary section of Part 2, on page 14, Walk suggested that they provide more detailed information to summarize the planning process. Kemble pointed out that some of the topics mentioned in the summary list are not reflected in the recommendations, so they may want to consider adding recommendations to specifically reflect these ideas. She provided examples of supporting people of color-owned businesses, opportunities for kids, and an inclusive sense of place. Abbas agreed, and said that they discussed supporting people of color in employment and diversity of jobs, but these ideas are not included in the recommendations. There was discussion on whether the Summary section should be moved or re-titled because it summarized Committee discussions early in the planning process rather than at its conclusion.

Palm suggested that Part 4, Vision and Redevelopment Objectives, be highlighted somehow so that people understand that this is the most important part of the report and is what the Common Council will be adopting. Walk said that they should more clearly draw the objectives back to the recommendations, and the implementation matrix may help with that. Miller Fienen asked if a summary section regarding the Big Picture Opportunities in Part 3 would be beneficial to summarize discussion and feedback from the Committee. Rhodes-Conway asked if any other recommendations are missing aside from jobs and employment, and Kemble suggested diversity of businesses. There was discussion on the appendices and how much information should be included there versus being stored electronically on the City website.

9. Report on Commission Informational Meetings

Rhodes-Conway explained that the opportunities, objectives, and vision were presented to three different commissions to check in and gather feedback. Rhodes-Conway reported that the Food Policy Council was pleased that food is mentioned in the report as a potential opportunity for the area. Fruhling presented to the Plan Commission and Otto to the Economic Development Commission. Otto said that it was well-received and they thought the process was moving forward well.

10. Introduction to the Racial Equity Social Justice Tool

Fruhling introduced the Racial Equity and Social Justice (RESJ) Tool to the Committee, noting that racial equity has been at the forefront of a lot of their discussions, and the redevelopment objectives should reflect that. He pointed out that there are no right or wrong answers as they work through the RESJ analysis; it is an opportunity to intentionally pause and think about the racial equity and social justice impacts of the work they are doing. Rhodes-Conway said that she has thought about the analysis in terms of if their vision and objectives are realized in the site area, what would the impacts be and who would benefit versus who would be impacted negatively? She said that the other side of it is that if they fall short of their vision, what are the dangers and on whom will it have a disproportionate impact?

In discussion of question 1a on the RESJ tool, Miller Fienen pointed out that objective 7 sounds neutral, but the reason they are so focused on transportation in this isolated area is because it would positively affect communities of color and low-income residents of the surrounding neighborhoods. Regarding question 1b, Rhodes-Conway mentioned comments they received in the focus groups about mistrust of the process and people feeling as if they are not part of the decisions being made. She asked how we can better represent low-income communities and communities of color in this process, and what we can do to make the Special Area Plan different.

In section 2 of the RESJ tool, Rhodes-Conway said they need to consider the impacts of the redevelopment of the area and whom that affects. She mentioned Kemble's comment about jobs and who has access to them and

Abbas' point about diversity in jobs and who is benefitting as questions to consider.

Jadin suggested that the RESJ analysis be distilled into a narrative and included in the report. Palm agreed and said that it should be included in the report itself, not in the appendix, so that it is part of what is adopted by the Common Council. Walk commented on the tenor of the objectives, and wants to ensure that the language is such that we are providing opportunities and engaging with the public as partners in this process. Kemble pointed out the structural issues within the city that make people feel as if they don't have power in the decision-making process, and asked how we can use this report as a way to call that out. Rhodes-Conway asked Committee members to continue thinking about the RESJ analysis for further discussion at the next meeting and inclusion in the report.

11. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Jadin, seconded by Walk, to Adjourn at 7:28 pm. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

[49726](#)

Oscar Mayer Strategic Assessment Committee Meeting Materials