



**Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting
November 8, 2012 @ 12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Jesse Maine Room, 225 Fifth St. Springfield, OR**

Attendees: *Ed McMahon, Rick Satre, Eric Hall, Shaun Hyland, Carole Knapel, Renee Clough, Joshua Burstein, Philip Farrington, Mike Koivula, Greg James (PC), Sean Van Gordon (CC), Matt Stouder, Jim Donovan, Joe Leahy, Karen LaFleur*

Call to Order:

The agenda was reviewed.

Public Comment: *none*

Criterion Discussion: *Group consensus on criteria*

- Committee Chair Renee Clough opened the discussion by asking the committee, if after review of the draft DAC analysis matrix, was there any matrix criteria that they felt should be added/removed or edited?
- Matrix Criteria:
 1. Meeting Council Goal(s): Using all Council goals provides a "fair and balanced" test of benefit to the community at large.
 2. Mandate
 3. Public Involvement: This criterion is a measure of land use process required by state law.
 4. Demand: This criterion is an indication of prevalence and a cost-benefit factor.
 5. Resources/Cost: This criterion measures the practicality of the undertaking financially.
 6. Time: This criterion is a measure of whether the issue's relevance over time.
- Staff Jim Donovan gave a brief background on how the criteria had been established with group discussion following.
 - Commissioner James asked how the demand criteria fit into the matrix. Jim Donovan stated demands are pretty variable, with his definition of a demand as one measure of final result. Demands typically, are structured in the manner... is it steady, is it increasing minimally/moderately, is it wide scaled, it can even be a negative number, and does it further council goals. Matt Stouder noted that often demand is used in service levels, such as police.

Commissioner James feels we need to clearly define demand so that everyone can apply it in the same way. A good criterion is something measurable. If we can frame demand as our opinion, as to what is going on in the community at large, it will define what this group sees as its demands.

- It was agreed that a column for demands needed to be added to the matrix.
- The group needs to remember to consider how the criteria are going to be weighted. Will some be weighted higher than others, etc?
- Joe Leahy stated he felt that the last set of numbers on the far right need to have a column header. He suggested possibly "Degree of Difficulty". Joe agrees that no matter what number the committee comes up with in this column the committee will be able to say this is the item we want to do first, because of a, b, c, reasons. Likewise, the Planning Commission can do the same thing, as well as City Council.
- Carole Knapel asked for clarification of the time column. Jim Donovan stated it was thought to be short-term, mid-term, and long-term frames.
- Commissioner James reminded this group that this is a new committee, not the same group as the committees in the past. The Development Advisory Committee is a specific development advisory committee that meets the requirements of state law for public involvement by working with these issues that were charged by the City Council for that purpose. We need to be careful not to superimpose previous committee work. This committee's final document needs to be very systematic, with clear direction of how we produced its outcomes. Both Planning Commission, and City Council, will need to be able to see a direct path to the committee's conclusions.
- Joe Leahy added it was his opinion, that a second page should be added listing out each priorities recommendations in detail and order. Each priority would define out clearly what this would mean in terms of time, city costs, and staffing, rather than just listing a number.
- Shaun Hyland asked how the final decision will actually be made.
Joe Leahy explained:
 - The DAC recommendations first go to the Planning Commission where they review and give their recommendation to City Council.
 - City Council reviews Planning Commission recommendations, gives staff their recommendations, staff then prepares and brings back an ordinance to council. It then proceeds through the Public Hearing process, testimony and appeal.
 - City Council decision

Review Priority Matrix: *Review draft priority matrix, scoring criterion, suggested changes, etc.*

The committee went through a chalk board exercise and came up with a draft priority matrix. See attached matrix.

Next Steps:

Confirm next meeting topics-

- Prioritization of items on the matrix
- Refining sub-categories
- Hear back from Jim and Matt on how they are progressing on determining public involvement - calendar time.
- They will be breaking down what was listed today from the matrix exercise
- Schedule additional meeting in November. It was decided to hold additional meeting on November 29th @ Noon - 2:00 p.m. Meeting room to be announced. The January 10th meeting is tentative at this time.
- Chair, Vice-Chair and staff will break down and itemize the "Low Hanging Fruit" items onto one list and have ready for the November 29th meeting.

Adjourn:

Meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.