



City of Madison

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

Meeting Minutes - Amended ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Wednesday, April 2, 2008

5:00 PM

215 Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd
Room LL120 (Madison Municipal Building)

CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 5:07 pm.

Present: 7 -

Zachariah Brandon; Victoria S. Selkove; Susan M. Gleason; Richard A. Slone; Sandra J. Torkildson; Edward G. Clarke and Ralph Kauten

Absent: 1 -

Peng Her

Excused: 1 -

Noel T. Radomski

Also present were Mark Olinger, Director DPCED; Matthew B. Mikolajewski, Office of Business Resources; Alder Judy Compton, Alder Mark Clear, Alder Marsha Rummel, Alder Michael Schumacher, and Alder Brenda Konkel.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Slone, seconded by Clarke, to Approve the Minutes of the February 27, 2008, meeting. The motion passed by voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers are listed under individual items.

1 [09550](#)

Adopting the Stoughton Road Revitalization Project Plan and the goals, recommendations, and implementation steps contained therein as a supplement to the City's Comprehensive Plan.

Rebecca Cnare, Planning Division, explained there are two plans being developed for this area, one by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) for Hwy 51 from Deforest to McFarland and the second plan, Stoughton Road Revitalization Project (SRRP) for a 4 mile section of Stoughton Road by eight neighborhood associations and the City of Madison. The Cunningham Group was hired by the City of Madison to work on the SRRP. The SRRP has been developed over a three (3) year time frame.

The SRRP divided the area into 3 development focus areas; the Garden Development from Hwy 30 south to Buckeye Road, the Grid Development from Buckeye Road to Pflaum Road and the Gateway Development south of Buckeye to McFarland. Ms. Cnare noted the proposed TID # 39 is adjacent to the Gateway Development area.

Gary Peterson, 210 Marinette Trail, registered as neither supporting or opposing the plan,

commented that the SRRP is an example of the point made in the Economic Development Draft Plan about the lack of economic development culture in the City. He said the SRRP is a huge plan that lacks job creation. The summary of the plan uses the word "employment" only twice.

Alder Marsha Rummel, District 6, registered as neither supporting or opposing the plan, spoke as an Urban Design Commission member. She said the fly-over bridges proposed in the WisDOT plan are not good for this area.

Alder Judy Compton, District 16, registered as supporting the plan, stressed the importance of this area as a front door to the City of Madison, not just a gateway. She mentioned the WisDOT plan lacked input from the neighborhoods. She further stated this plan is a pro-active effort by the residents to say the southeast quadrant of Madison is important. This plan sets the framework for adjacent industrial development.

Ms. Cnare added this plan does stress business more than other neighborhood plans.

Mark Olinger confirmed that this is a job generation corridor and the Gateway area is critical to the TID's future.

Alder Zach Brandon asked that if this plan is a facelift for Stoughton Road, do businesses buy into it? How would the facelift be enforced? Through an Urban Design District? Ms. Cnare noted that businesses were involved and bought into this plan process. They are happy the frontage roads will be maintained.

Alder Zach Brandon asked if there any generators proposed for the TID? Alder Compton responded the movie theater, the BioAg Incubator, Tradewinds Park, GE Healthcare, the Danisco expansion, and proposed hotel are all generators.

Ms. Selkove expressed her concern about the proposed Flyovers called for in the WIDOT plan. Could anti-Flyover language be added into the SRRP? Ms. Cnare described the Flyovers as huge multi-story bridge structures that would limit access to some of the parcels in the Gateway Area. The SRRP does say Flyovers are not preferred, but also does give options for land use if they are constructed.

Ms. Torkildson expressed her concern about the visibility of the businesses and signage for the businesses along Stoughton Road if it is depressed as called for in two of the WisDOT options.

Alder Compton responded that a street level Stoughton Road is more neighborhood oriented and the Flyover option is most expensive and probably will not be constructed.

Mr. Clarke stated the relationship between the SRRP and the neighborhood plans is not clear. On page 16 it mentions "supports" the neighborhood plans. He is concerned that this is similar to the East Washington BUILD plan and might be in conflict with other existing adopted plans.

Mark Olinger stated this is a business corridor plan, which doesn't have the same type of conflict with neighborhood plans, as was the case with the East Washington BUILD.

Mr. Slone was concerned about the type of businesses and the continuity of design for businesses, called for in the SRRP. Ms. Cnare explained design guidelines are included in the SRRP. Alder Compton mentioned that if an urban design district is created, and the style is dictated, she would prefer the businesses voluntarily adhere to these guidelines.

Ms. Selkove mentioned the lack of metrics on the number of jobs or businesses this plan could create. Mr. Olinger said the proposed TID Project Plan could set a specific number for job creation.

A motion was made by Brandon, seconded by Selkove, to Return to Lead with the Recommendation for Approval to the PLAN COMMISSION. The motion passed by voice vote.

2 [09033](#)

3 - 5 Year Strategic Economic Development Implementation Plan

Mr. Matthew Mikolajewski, Manager of the Office of Business Resources, mentioned the three public review sessions held by Mr. Ticknor last week. He noted pages 41-65 of the final draft are complete and in the draft plan the Commissioners now have. Mr. Ticknor changed the first three sections based on last week's (March 25) review session comments. He listed possible actions the EDC could take as:

1. Request Mr. Ticknor to make minor changes and clarify sections.
2. The EDC could make changes themselves,
or
3. The EDC could ask staff to complete further research.

Kevin Little, representing the Greater Madison Chamber of Commerce, 615 E. Washington Ave., registered as neither supporting or opposing the plan, asked for the plan to clarify the toolkit section, specifically what is meant by "using the CDA and the CDBG for economic development;" further define what the \$3.5 million project facilitation fund would be used for; and to be more specific on the leadership aspect of the various parts of the plan.

Rick Richards, 710 Spruce St., registered as neither supporting or opposing the plan, referred the EDC to his 4-page handout (*attached to File 09033 as "RichardsCommentsReEDCPlan"*). He likes the input from the sessions and wants the City to adopt the plan. Mr. Richards urges the EDC and staff to work on the overall lack of vision in the plan and to define the economic footprint for Madison in the next five years. He thinks the plan should define the type of jobs and career ladders, look at industries, do a "linkage analysis", and address transportation.

Carole Schaeffer, representing Smart Growth Greater Madison, registered as supporting the plan, agreed with prior speakers and views this plan as a framework with good opportunities for new directions: it needs to drill down into some more detail. She liked the data about what Madison is doing right and is nervous about the 34% higher income outside of the City of Madison.

Susan Schmitz, President of Downtown Madison Incorporated and representing that organization, spoke in support of the plan and agreed with the prior speakers. She approved the plan as a frame for the EDC to use to prioritize economic development. She liked the customer service and toolkit sections.

Gary Peterson, 210 Marinette Trail, spoke in support of the plan. He suggested placing the plan on every EDC agenda as a way to continuously monitor implementation of the plan. He noted that the plan is lacking in detail, especially in suggesting TIF policy be changed but not giving specific points. He also urged the EDC to review the AAA bond rating the City has. He mentioned it is often used as a reason for not borrowing money to fund projects. He stated it saves the City money on interest payments; however, it discourages business growth.

Alder Brenda Konkol, District 2, registered as neither supporting or opposing the plan, noted that she could nitpick each page of the plan. However she thinks we have learned about some more of the big issues from the plan, and started a conversation on economic development in the City. She called for a joint EDC and Common Council meeting to discuss the plan. Alder Konkol wants the City to have economic development goals that everyone knows and agrees with, and she suggested that the EDC have a resolution for Council, separate from the plan, with the top economic goals for the City listed. Alder Konkol also suggested splitting the draft into two documents, one containing the vision and

direction, with the other including the charts and working components for staff.

Alder Mark Clear, District 19, spoke in support of the plan and echoes Alder Konkel's call for a joint Common Council and EDC meeting. He stated we need the "duh" (basic economic development) plan and we "crawl before walking" approach. He stated his top three issues for the City are economic development, schools, and transportation.

Chairperson Gleason said the EDC were clear they wanted a specific implementation plan, and not just a visionary plan for economic development. She wants the format and appearance of the document to be changed. She sees the plan as a combination of vision and a work plan for staff.

Mr. Clarke thanked the Alders and Rick Richards for their comments. He thinks the plan is positive and asked for the vision part of economic development. He was glad to see the structures and systems recommendations in the plan. He also supports a meeting of the Common Council and the EDC.

Alder Brandon explained that the CDA has a function as a redevelopment agency, such as when it financed the redevelopment of Block 89 and also as a housing development entity. He is on the TIF Policy Committee and feels they are near the end with economic development at the forefront of their work. He sees the City's AAA bond rating as more than cost savings.

He thinks the plan needs to be fine-tuned. He said Common Council retreats are in vogue and not well attended. He does not support dividing the plan as it disrespects the process we went through to create it. He would like the EDC to do the fine-tuning and then send it on to the Council.

Mr. Slone liked the strong buy-in from the public and supports a joint meeting with the Common Council for more buy in for the plan.

Ms. Selkove reviewed the RFQ and thinks the plan lacks benchmarks and objectives called for in the RFQ. She asks how we measure success and wants to flesh the plan out with more specifics. What are the specific goals and objectives and how do we make it happen?

Ms. Torkildson noted that peer cities may spend more dollars for economic development and do not get any better results than Madison. She would like for Madison to be doing at least what our neighbors are doing for economic development. She also noted that national economic trends impact Madison and benchmarks might not be reached because of these external forces.

Mr. Clarke questioned the number of jobs created as shown on page 39 and wants to get rid of the job numbers on this page. Ms. Gleason wants to work with staff on deciding how to measure or show progress because of these national economic impacts.

Mr. Kauten would like the EDC to step up and finish this "good working document".

Alder Zach Brandon asks for Tom Ticknor to fill in areas he did not cover as called for in the RFQ. He does not want the document split into two parts.

Mr. Slone questioned how the Common Council could accept a "working" document, asking if it is frozen once adopted or accepted?

Alder Brandon said it could be amended after adoption. If the changes are major they would need to be accepted again by Council.

Ms. Torkildson noted that there are some rather big numbers included as part of the plan

that will need to be reviewed in greater detail.

Mr. Clarke noted that some of the next steps include having each member of the EDC forward their comments to staff, add language about what the plan is laying out, and reaching out to the Council and others.

Ms. Selkove would like the EDC to do the edits and accept what Mr. Ticknor has done.

Alder Michael Schumacher, District 18, said once the Council has accepted the plan the staff makes it come alive and would come to the Council for money to implement it.

Ed Clarke moved, seconded by Richard Slone, to create a subcommittee to edit and reformat the draft plan, with Ms. Gleason, Mr. Clarke, Ms. Selkove and Mr. Slone as subcommittee members. The motion was passed by voice vote.

3 [09731](#)

Downtown Plan Update

Staff referred to the memo and handouts from Brad Murphy, Director of the Planning Division. The EDC has been invited to participate in the Downtown planning process.

Commissioners also requested City staff to provide a list of planning efforts currently underway within the City.

The documents were accepted.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Brandon, seconded by Clarke, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote and the meeting was adjourned at 7:05 pm.