

Meeting Notes for First 3-Way Meeting 7/1/08

Present:

NPC: Facilitator Tim Carlisle, Ellen Barnard

TG Cohousing: Garrett Hughes, Jake H., Don Mickey, David Marshall, Jeanne Merrill

FTG: Clare Strader, Steve Lendved, Marge Pitts, Bob Gragson, Nathan Larson,

MACLT: Bill Perkins, Bert Zipperer, Ted Gunderson, Joann Kelley, Mary Myers, Greg Rosenberg

Tim called meeting to order at 5:35pm. Started with introductions and purpose of meeting: three different stakeholder organizations with three different views of the building under consideration and to see if these 3 orgs can get relatively to the same place. Single underlying question: is there enough support around some version of a multi-use building at TG to design, finance, build it in the next year or so? Goal is to have an answer to this question by September so MACLT can know whether or not this is its next development project.

Make/clarify the rules as we go along, rather than state them up front. Best way to build trust is to start acting like it's here already.

Each stakeholder group asked to summarize the answer to the four questions for the benefit of the whole group:

MACLT: Ted and Bert presented

1. Goals: create gathering place for all stakeholders at TG; place of learning re agriculture; office space for 2 orgs; want project that will attract funders; honor commitments made to homeowners. Want everyone's input but MACLT will be financially & legally liable for decisions made.
2. Concerns: fundraising; amount of work and impact on staff; other pressing financial needs – limited funds, etc. May distract org from affordable housing development; fair process for input & participation while protecting our own interests; possible difficulties if location of building changes; will project meet our interests without office space?
3. Willing to Contribute: fundraising is high priority for staff; GR will be lead developer & project manager; board's role is unclear at this point.
4. Not Willing to Contribute: can't delay decision past Sept 2008; can't forgo compensation as developer fees for this project; not willing to relinquish control over project decisions that may affect financial viability of MACLT.

TG Cohousing: Garret & David presented

1. Goals: A common house where the whole community can get together for meetings, workshops, conversations, spend time together. Would like unrestricted access – small place that they feel is theirs (would share other space in the building). Equal voice on operating committee to determine

- how building is used (scheduling, etc); mission/vision statement for the building – something that would help guide how building is used. Need for storage – mechanical shed for lawn mowers, snow blowers, etc. Want to ensure that the common house feels like the heart of cohousing community as well as for other stakeholders of TG.
2. Concerns: Most of the community’s concerns revolve around the *balance between public & private*:
 - a. In a multi-use building, residents would like a private space for themselves. Don’t want to be exclusive but want a place they can hang out with some privacy. Want space that they don’t have to schedule – spontaneity is important for the community. But noted that they don’t want to be exclusive – shared kitchen, etc. is understood.
 - b. Scale of building is a big concern – there’s not much support among cohousing community for a large-scale building.
 - c. Traffic (foot and car) to and from the building – this is a big concern because the building may be in the middle of where they live. Parking is also a big concern: not enough parking to support a city-wide community center.
 - d. Location of building: center of community or at front of property; each has pros & cons.
 - e. Office space in building: community’s main use of building would be non-business; offices make it a more formal place.
 - f. Cost: What costs will community be responsible for related to the building? As a community they have struggled a bit to figure out their budget (big snow removal costs this year). Do they have the capacity as a community to help take care of a building as well as their current responsibilities with lawn mowing and snow shoveling?
 - g. Lastly, they would like to see drainage issues resolved if a new building is built.
 - h. It was also noted that in conversations, some members of cohousing have figured out that their own needs would be met with a building the size of a 3-bedroom condo (about 2400 square feet including basement) plus a separate place for storage (for lawn/snow equipment, etc). This is not a consensus-level assessment because the whole community hasn’t weighed in on this.
 3. Willing to Contribute: Cohousing community didn’t have time to answer the last two questions.

Friends of Troy Gardens: Bob, Nathan, Claire, Steve, and Marge presented

1. Goals:
 - a. *NEEDS*:
 - i. *Primary goal is infrastructure on the land to run their programs.*
 - ii. Field office on the land (may not be their only office space);
 - iii. space for education programs;
 - iv. commercial kitchen with storage space, dishwasher;
 - v. large multi-use gathering space.

- vi. potable water on the farm;
 - vii. public bathroom space;
 - viii. Storage space for off-season (tomato hoops, cross country skis, etc.).
 - ix. Equipment & tool storage – especially community gardens, but all FTG programs.
 - x. Indoor place to become what FTG wants to become: a learning community. Looking at the building much more as a learning center rather than a community center.
 - xi. Production needs (specifically for farm):
 - 1. greenhouse,
 - 2. barn (storage for farm equipment and coolers);
 - 3. access road to farm (usable in all seasons, plowable).
- b. *WANTS*:
- i. Farm wants include
 - 1. sprout production facility;
 - 2. hoop houses for winter production (with easy winter access via road);
 - 3. lastly, a structure for produce sales at the farm.
 - ii. Unrestricted space for FTG – reserved for FTG use.
2. Concerns: resources put into building would be leasehold improvements not assets of FTG; would they be willing to help fundraise under those circumstances? Would like to have their own operations funding considered as part of the fundraising effort. Length of lease – renegotiating current land lease may be necessary. Proliferation of buildings – let’s do holistic planning for site as a whole. Maintenance costs – how exactly is this going to be paid for? Also, possible conflicts between different user groups – who will coordinate / manage all this within the building? Shared employee for site management?
 3. Willing to Contribute: “Flexible at this point” – depends on what direction this whole thing takes. Open to thinking about it.
 4. Not Willing to Contribute: Same as #3.

After all three groups had presented, Tim asked participants whether people heard new information in the presentations. Some of the comments: How can I trust that the building will meet our needs? Aesthetics are important too in terms of not allowing a proliferation of buildings. Kids in the building – if there are offices then kids would need to be quiet – with offices it’s not an extension of home.

Lastly, dates for the next two meetings: Tuesday July 29 (5pm-9pm) and Wed September 3 (5:30-7:30).

Tim encouraged groups to come up with a proposal that encompasses goals & concerns of themselves and others.

MINUTES TAKEN BY MARY MYERS