Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting
January 30, 2013 @ Noon – 2:00 p.m.
Jesse Maine Room, Springfield City Hall

Attendees: *Renee Clough (Chair), Ed McMahon (Vice-Chair), Eric Hall, Joshua Burstein, Greg James (PC), Mike Koivula, Sean VanGordon (CC), Shaun Hyland, Matt Stouder, Jim Donovan, Joe Leahy, Karen LaFleur*

Call to Order:
The agenda was reviewed and approved.
January 10, 2013 meeting minutes were approved as written.

Public Comment: none

Review PC Meeting/Revisions:
Renee gave a brief summary of what transpired at the Joint DAC/Planning Commission meeting that was held on January 15.

- Went very well
- Few typos to correct
- We need to convey the project advocacy communication concept in a clearer manner

Discussion occurred

- Commissioner Greg James stated he appreciated the supportive/clarifying comments from others in the committee as Renee gave the presentation. This portrayed to the commissioners an engaged committee. Planning Commissioners were supportive and excited from what they heard. Greg reminded the committee as they bring their message forward to not overlook the progress that the committee has already accomplished so far.
- Mike Koivula asked if Planning Commissioners were more supportive of a few items, or were they supportive over all of everything that was presented. Renee and Ed commented they felt Planning Commission was generally overall supportive on everything, once they understood the project advocacy aspect.
- Councilor VanGordan felt there really wasn't the need for a whole rewrite of the packet, maybe just minor tweaking.
- Ed McMahon would like to see the matrix simplified.
- Joshua Burstein would like to see the priority column moved from the far right to the far left, or rename the first column to read Item/Priority Ranking.
- Commissioner James would like to see a revision to the mandate column by adding Federal/State or Local to the heading and listing which category it falls into. He would also like to see more of a description given to the demand column.

- Councilor VanGordon's perspective is giving an informative presentation will be more important to council rather than making a lot of revisions to the matrix descriptions.
- The committee asked Renee Clough and Jim Donovan, at their discretion, to make any necessary revisions to the matrix that came out of today's discussion.

Determine action items between now and City Council meeting:
Discussion occurred on what to begin working on prior to the March 11th City Council meeting presentation.

- Site Review which potentially could be very time consuming or go with an easier action item that could be presented at the CC meeting as already completely?
- Eric Hall is aware we can't complete Site Plan prior to the CC meeting, but we could talk about what it might mean to at least begin looking at possible solutions to site plan.
- Commissioner James agreed the fuller concept brought forward to council will increase the chances of their endorsement. Suggests we look at the approach to site plan. How do we plan to address, tackle, and move this forwards.
- Renee asked if the committee would prefer to do the items as a whole group or break down into sub-groups.
- Councilor VanGordon questioned how many sub-groups and how would public meeting requirements be handled? Joe Leahy's response.
    - Groups would need to be smaller than the majority of the committee.
    - Run in a business-like manner
    - Scheduled and advertized sub-groups meeting times
    - Minutes taken listing what was discussed, recommendations, pros & cons
- Mike Koivula suggested this alternative. Continue meeting in regular DAC meeting format, opening meeting with short entire group discussion and then break-out into the smaller sub-groups for discussions. Whatever comes out of the sub-groups would be presented to the group as a whole before anything would be decided on. The group agreed with this idea.
- There will be flexibility to move in and out of the two sub-groups. The sub-groups will be a place to start gathering ideas prior to the city council meeting. After the meeting we will be able to advance/expand on those items.
- Joe Leahy offered his perspective for the group to remember that the council is the final decision maker. There make be areas where citizens or staff may not always agree with all of the recommendations the DAC would like to make. The DAC would still have the opportunity to make their recommendations to council, but know that staff may be asked by council to voice their opinion too, which may be in opposition. Joe stated it's in everyone's best interest to work out the majority of issues before the DAC presents the recommendations.
- Councilor Van Gordon stated the if we truly want to accomplish things, we don't want to take a set of recommendations to council and have staff give a long list of reasons why that's not a good idea. It will be important that we lay this whole project out with consensus in mind and try and get to a point where we have a united front.

- Eric Hall asked if staff is allowed to vote on the consensus model. The answer is no. Councilor VanGordon noted though that staff has a lot of expertise and relevant opinions that we should continue to try and come up with a workable solution that will allow staff to be able to agree with the recommendation going forward.
- Shaun Hyland asked if there is a point of disagreement between the staff and committee that just can't be worked out can outside opinions be brought in. It was answered yes, they could be.
- Councilor VanGordon suggested he'd like to see the committee encourage professionals in the community to take the opportunity for public involvement and comment throughout this process. It really does help city council a lot when making a decision if the public has weighed in with their comments.
- Matt and Jim mentioned a quarterly Development & Public Works Department newsletter will be going out shortly. The newsletter lets the professional community know what the department is working on. DAC and HBA mailing lists have been included. The intent is to have this be as broad based as possible.
- Discussion continued on how many sub-groups to have and which members would be in each group.
- It was decided that there will be two sub-groups. Group A with a Councilor, staff person, and several DAC members. Group B with a Commissioner, staff person, and several DAC members.
- See Attachment 1 for Sub-Group A & B breakdowns.

Future Meeting Schedule:
Renee feels a definite meeting schedule needs to be established for the group with alternating meetings between day and evening. A Doodle pool will be sent out with several scenarios for the committee to vote on next week. Results will be sent out once everyone has voted.

Adjourn:
Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.