

MINUTES

Community Development Authority Meeting

March 2, 2016

Members Present: David Doll, Stephanie Brassington, Art Weber, Clair Utter, Ken Brost, Eric Johnson

Members Absent: Tom Hanson

Staff Present: Eric Rindfleisch, Pauline Boness, Karen Knoll

Others Present: Rob Peterson; Cubic Industries

1. Call to order. Boness called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and asked for a nomination for a temporary chair. Brost nominated Weber, Doll seconded the motion. Motion carried.

2. Election of Chairperson.

Doll moved to table election of chairperson until next CDA meeting, Weber seconded the motion. Motion carried.

3. Review and possible approval of draft minutes from the February 3, 2016 Community Development Authority Meeting. Brost moved to approve the minutes, Utter seconded the motion. Motion carried 5-0-1 with Johnson abstaining.

4. Concept discussion for possible relocation of Cubic Industries within McFarland - Rob Peterson.

Rob Peterson owner of Cubic Industries is in the beginning phase of possibly making some changes to his current location. He is interested in sharing a concept with the CDA and looking for feedback to see if there is a possibility of his idea moving forward, no firm idea, just planting a seed at this time.

Cubic Wall Systems is a specialty trade contractor, working mainly in Wisconsin. They improve the exteriors of commercial buildings. Employees range from 15-20 on average, but up to 45 or even 60 at times. The business started 28 years ago on Meinders Road; they still occupy two small parcels there. In 1999 they moved their administration office from downtown Madison combining locations. The administrative part of the business occupies 4921 Triangle Street; this facility doesn't necessarily fit their current needs. He does not feel there is a way of adding on to this current site, and they do not require visibility for their business. When they purchased this building in approximately 2001, it not fully occupied.

They are looking into bringing the properties together into possibly one location. There is a site they are considering which presents itself as a potential opportunity, and looking to see if they can merge their three sites into this one with some improvements. Peterson has considered improving the current structure located on the site, but understands there may be some setback issues; he is in the beginning phases to see if it is even feasible. He has not been able to inspect the property to see if it is sound, and what he may need to do for improvements. Boness asked what he would do with his current properties? Peterson responded they would move the headquarters to where ever their new building would be. They would like to lease the property on Triangle Siggelkow. Brassington wondered if they would sell all three sites. Peterson replied they would prefer to retain all three, but if needed, would sell them to be able to purchase a desired property where they could house everything under one roof. They are also looking at other properties off of Femrite Road which has come available; they have a variety of options. They like this area due to the convenience and ease of access to the location. The Citywide property has Hwy. 51 frontage which is not necessarily something they need, and the potential that the building may have to be raised causes them concern. The frontage on Hwy. 51 may better suit for some other business than theirs. Weber asked Boness is there any other reason the building would have to be raised? Boness responded it is a non-conforming building; if left as is, with just a new exterior, there would probably not be an issue. Brost inquired what the footage is for where it is and where it would need to be? Boness responded she would have to look into the details. Peterson said the building is on an angle, 10' from one lot line and 7' on the other end, he knows if they were to do a major change there would be issues to be dealt with. The building as it sits, with exterior improvement, would be ideal for them. They would have light manufacturing on the site as well as their administrative office. He does not have the specifications right now, but they do require quite a bit of space. They may require an addition, which would then require them to raise and reconfigure the building. He has been sketching out a few ideas.

Boness inquired as to what type of product they are manufacturing. Peterson responded they utilize home insulation products and apply coatings to them and pre-coating of shapes which are used as enhancements, such as crown moldings. They no longer do much signage work, they are not looking to bring that area of the business back, but can do sign bases.

Boness indicated the Capital City lot is 1 ½ acres. Doll asked is there anything else available, he knows from a committee perspective they had been hoping to do something with the Hwy. 51 site, would Peterson be moving all the material on the Meinders site to this one? Peterson responded no, what they have are years of accumulation, there are probably ten trailers which are housing products, which if they moved to the site as discussed would not be needed. It would give them a much neater space. They use an enormous amount of scaffolding, which would all be inside along with potentially a vehicle or two. They are in the beginning stages, size wise he believes there are possibilities for them. Brassington asked if they would still leave some vehicles on the Meinders site. Peterson responded no, they would keep the site as potentially something for some other opportunity in the area. He has spoken to other businesses in the area as it could be potential expansion area for them. Boness asked why they did not build a warehouse on their current site; they are not really gaining anything in size. Peterson replied back in 1997 they had thought of that, but their concern was they

would not be able to do so due to not being able to maneuver a firetruck. Even trying to improve the property across the street has its challenges; if the property adjacent to them came available, it would provide an opportunity. Brost inquired about the warehouses on the adjacent parcel, how far are they off the lot line. Boness responded the buildings in that area been there for a long time, each would have to be looked at.

Brost stated as part of a master plan, they had been looking to assemble smaller parcels. Would Peterson be willing to do something along those lines, has he considered that as a possibility? Peterson responded this is a relatively new idea, he has not looked at all possibilities, and some of those lots would open up possibilities for him. He does feel what he is looking at is a bit of a longshot as he does not need the frontage on Hwy. 51.

Members and Peterson discussed various parcels of land in the Madison and McFarland area which may or may not at this time be available. Boness stated tonight's meeting was to bring Peterson and his idea in front of the CDA. There had not been time for him to meet with the project management team prior to this as he came forward recently with the idea. She will touch bases with him after the meeting. Peterson indicated he was not fully prepared at this time with many details, but the parcel was available, and, he did not want to wait to look into it; there are some minor environmental issues which will have to be looked into. They are just looking at potential ideas at this time. He does see how improving the space will increase marketability.

5. **CLOSED SESSION. Motion to convene in closed session in accordance with Wis. Stats. §19.85 (l) (e) to deliberate or negotiate the investment of public funds or other specified public business whenever competitive or bargaining reasons require a closed session (Land Acquisition).**

Utter moved to move into closed session, Brost seconded, motion unanimously carried on roll call.

6. **Open Session:
Motion to adjourn Closed Session and reconvene in Open Session to discuss and take action on items of business discussed in closed session.**

Utter moved to adjourn closed session, Brost seconded, motion carried unanimously on roll call. No action was taken.

7. **Adjournment:** Brost moved to adjourn, seconded by Doll, motion carried unanimously; meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.