Development Advisory Committee (DAC) Meeting
December 13, 2012 @ 12:00 – 2:00 p.m.
Library Meeting Room, Springfield City Hall

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

Call to Order:
The agenda was reviewed and approved.

November 29, 2012 meeting minutes were approved

Public Comment: none

- Jim Donovan mentioned that he and Matt Stouder had met with Jody Rolnick, a consultant working with the Cottage Grove Community Development Corporation. Ms. Rolnick was interested in learning more about the DAC, how it came into existence, how folks were chosen to serve on it, and what the committee has been able to accomplish so far.

Recap Takeaways from Breakouts (Site Review & SDC's)

- Renee briefly gave an overview of the DAC priority matrix supplemental information sheet, and asked for comments from the group.
    - Discussion occurred
        - Jim Donovan suggested that each document when created be dated and authored, and in the last paragraph on page 2 edit the word *consensus* to "group mindset" or "sense".
        - Josh mentioned that under the Systems Development Charges section, second paragraph, he was uncomfortable with the negativity of the word "freeloaders". It was decided that the sentence should read, *Equity covers the idea of each person paying their own way*.
        - Greg James would like to see Jim Donovan's complexity sheet/site plan flowchart be added as part of this document.
        - Joe Leahy mentioned what would be helpful for him and staff. When items come up that the committee wants to include, that may need to be looked at from a legal standpoint, particularly SDC's,

that those items be sent to him as the process is moving along instead of waiting until the end. This allows Joe to advise the group if this is something that can't be done, or can be done if you do it this way. etc.

- Ed McMahon suggested that the low-hanging fruit items should be looked at now. Ed told Joe there was a list of those items already attached that he could begin looking at.
- Philip Farrington noted that the first bullet item on top of page 2 "Could Site Review be simplified by using overlay zones" had only been one example, that he felt there were others that could be used too.

Project Communications & Advocacy

Divisional Structure Recap –

- Matt Stouder handed out the new Current Development division organizational chart that became effective July 1, 2012, and reviewed with the committee.
- Discussion occurred.

Review project workflow at City for Planning & Building applications -

- Philip Farrington felt it would be helpful for this group to see a chart listing the names of those on the development review team, showing what the discernment process is when there are conflicts.
- Eric Hall agreed with Philip that a separate chart that listed all the departments involved in the site review process, listing who moderates and would handle competing interests within the group.
- Jim Donovan added that the organizational chart handed out has Director, Len Goodwin overseeing all the newly formed departments.
- Greg James felt the group needs to remember this re-organization has just recently occurred, meaning that continuous tweaks/improvements are still continuing to occur. The committee's feedback should be helpful for the city, which could show what problems still exist and what issues the re-organization has fixed. Greg would really like to see the entire re-organization (all departments) shown on one page if possible
- Rick Satre agreed with Greg's comments, adding he'd also like to see an internal flow chart of communication roles and responsibilities for Site Review (DRC review list).

Advocacy –

- Jim Donovan walked the committee briefly through the timeline of Site Plan Review from start to finish again, with the intent to give a better idea of the flow and department involvement in the process with each step. Jim stated there

actually are three advocates, project planner, project engineer and economic development – John Tamulonis.

- Eric Hall would like the committee to try and test out the organization chart and see how conflicts actually are resolved.
- Shaun Hyland felt a simple approach would be an ultimate person on the top that could make the final decision in conflicts that would allow the process to move forward and not get bogged down.
- Philip Farrington stated that it really comes down to the key point of the DRC Review, and how to empower the planner or project manager to be able to navigate through the conflicts prior to the decision. Currently, once the decision is given the only avenue for the applicant is to appeal the decision.
- Rick Satre noted that the city already basically has an advocate in the planner they just need to be given a little more empowerment. Rick would like to see a graphic if possible of who or what position might be assigned an advocacy role in certain circumstances.
- Question was posed to Joe Leahy. Currently who ultimately has the final authority on decisions. Joe responded 1) Planners/Engineers should be looking for ways to make the project happen within the city council requirements/guidelines. 2) Agreed, there needs to be a mechanism to address concerns with assigned staff, hopefully other than having to go outside to councilor or city manager.
- Ed McMahon noted that sometimes when you elevate an issue to councilor or city manager, staff has to take on a new role which may limit some flexibility that they had. Eric Hall added we need to be solution orientated rather than political whenever possible.
- Matt Stouder wanted to mention that staffing levels are down and will continue to be for awhile in all departments working on development issues.

Fees – Planning Applications & General:

Building fee structure –

Matt Stouder handed out the building fee schedule and explained the structure.

- Discussion occurred.
  - Categories are set by the State and are uniform throughout the state.
  - The Building fee schedule will be going to council for the building fees to be looked at by council for their determination whether to increase or not.
  - Shaun Hyland asked if a projected cost is set at the beginning of a project, and after project completion it is less, are refunds available. The answer was yes.
  - Ed McMahon would like to see the city be able to identify cities actual cost on projects.
  - Over the last four years, all dollars collected from building permits go directly to a building fund, and are not added into the general fund.

Planning fee structure –

Jim Donovan handed out the Planning Fee schedule and explained its structure.

- Discussion occurred.
  - Planning fees are set by city council by ordinance, and are reviewed annually. Changes are not always made every year.
    - Assessed Fees are: City/UGB Application fee; 5% Technology fee; Postage fee when applicable; and additional fees listed under the special instruction section of the fee schedule.
    - Fees in general are discussed at many different levels throughout the application process. At front counter with planner-on-duty; Development Issues meetings; Pre-Submittal meetings; and at the end of staff reports.
    - Jim explained and encouraged applicants to request the planning front counter staff to print out at anytime a cost sheet of any application that is going to be submitted. This ensures that applicant will not have any unexpected fees at submittal.
  - Ed McMahon would like to see the city be able to identify cities actual cost on planning projects too.
  - Philip Farrington asked for clarification on final plat fee if there is additional fee. Jim responded no on the plat fee, but there is an additional 10% fee on final site plans; site modifications; and master plan submittals.

Technology –

- Philip asked about the technology fee and if any consideration has been given to reducing or waiving this fee if applicant submits a digital file or whatever format the city requires. Jim responded his recollection is the 5% technology fee is a city-wide fee that is collected with the intent of maintaining and upgrading the City's tech capabilities. The digital submittal of applications is not widely available at this time; the department is considering a trial program for submittal of building permits. Jim and Matt are both open to discussion on this topic. It was noted that the city would need to have the software and staffing to be able to accommodate for those types of submittals.
- Jim explained the changes that have been made to the Site Plan Review fee, and expansion of the MDS options.
- Ed McMahon asked if the 5% technology fee that was collected went to a dedicated fund or just into the general fund. Jim responded that would be a question to be directed to finance, but it was both Matt and Jim's recollection that the funds collected were allocated to its own fund, not general fund.
- Greg James mentioned that cost recovery had been brought up in this discussion a few times, and he's aware that some cost recovery modeling has been done and discussed with council. Greg's understanding is that issue has been set aside at

this time. This is an important piece of information this group needs to be aware of.

- Renee Clough asked "How does city council determine cost?" Jim responded based on recommendations from staff. In the past they were determined by estimates of the actual work. At some point, prior to Jim's tenure in this position, programmatic costs were also added in. This is consistent with statute that you can recover programmatic costs. Joe Leahy added there is a principal of Oregon Law that applies to governmental entities, that states you cannot charge fees for more than what it costs to provide those services.
- Eric Hall would like to see the city track the time spent on each of its projects, like is done in a lot of public businesses. This allows for pretty accurate cost recovery numbers. Joe commented that he felt the city does a good job of apportioning the costs based on experience factor.
- Jim told the committee that the packet he distributed "Presentation of Development Review Cost Analysis and selection of Draft Recovery Methodologies by City Council ", will serve as a starter packet to the fee analysis discussion.
    - Based on input to City Council on planning fees, council directed staff in 2012 to begin a fee analysis and the true cost of doing business. With a hired consultants help, staff was assisted in preparing estimates of time and true costs in draft form. That draft information is included within this packet for the committees review. In addition, the consultant prepared a detail study. Staff recommendation was given to council on 7-6-10 to delay adoption of planning fee ordinance to allow a review of efficiencies. The Developer Input Process grew out of those concerns and the results of the DIP and this DAC will have an impact on the analysis. The analysis has not moved forward, however the DAC is an appropriate venue for this discussion should the group choose to make it a priority.
    - Ed McMahon encouraged the committee to review the consultant's study.

Criteria Matrix - Final:
Prioritize Criteria Matrix and make recommendations for discussion with Planning Commission –

Renee explained how the draft priority matrix had been laid out for the recommendations for priority to be made today. Only the six, main headings and definitions were listed. The additional sub-categories were not listed.

- The committee went through the six items and ranked them by a show of hands which order of priority they were to be listed for presentation to the Planning Commission.
    - Order of Priority by consensus of the committee:

1. Site Review
2. Project Advocacy & Communication
3. SDC's
4. Fees – General
5. Planning Application Fees
6. Incentivizing Use of Brownfields

- ***There were no blocks***
- ***Opportunity for discussion was opened, with discussion occurring prior to final consensus vote.***
- **Group consensus was given, with a 3 or higher vote that there was agreement on the rankings as listed above.**

Next Steps:
Action items prior to 1/15 Planning Commission Meeting –

- Discussion occurred on whether to hold a meeting on January 10, 2013, 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. prior to the Joint Planning Commission/Development Advisory Committee scheduled for January 15, 2012 to finalize details on committee's presentation to the Planning Commission.

Motion:
Motion was made to have a January 10, 2013 meeting 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. in the Library Meeting Room.
Motion carried unanimously.

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