

## Minutes of University Area Leadership Team – Oct. 23, 2012

Meeting called to order at 7:00

In Attendance: Emily Howell, Jane Kelly, Dave Chrisman, Bill Miller, Joel Fleischer Catherine Brady (University Ambassador), and Amie Thurber (Meeting Facilitator).

Emily: Spoke to Connie regarding the use of Sentinel HS for the November 14 meeting. She was unable to confirm the site as Connie is required to sign the form and she is currently out of town. Emily did say that we are first in line for the Sentinel Cafeteria. Amie said that St Pat's has a room that will accommodate 200. The consensus of the group was that we could consider Sentinel as the final site of the meeting.

Catherine Brady, the University Ambassador, said that Stephanie had left the program and they are currently short an ambassador. That area will temporarily be covered by several existing ambassadors. She mentioned a new program for problems at party houses.

The dispute of ADUs came up and Amie asked for clarification. A definition of ADUs was discussed.

As the subject of ADUs was introduced, Bill Miller asked Jane if there was any problem with him voicing his opinion. Jane said that he was free to voice his opinion as any citizen may, but to be careful not to do it representing the Neighborhood Council.

Amie returned to the subject of the Golf Course Meeting. She inquired about the purpose of the meeting. Do we want an explanation of the project and get feedback from the University administration. Emily replied that there is disagreement over whether we wanted feedback or give the residents an opportunity to vent over the issue.

Amie suggested that, if expressing personal views was part of the program, it would best be handled by breaking the attendees into groups to discuss issues more personally. She suggested giving file cards to people so they could be given to the University Administration with the provision that the questions raised would be answered.

Joel expressed some concern over splitting into small groups as he had had negative experiences with this format at the City Club.

Bill Miller said that we could come up with 7-10 questions that cover the main concerns of the residents and allow for follow-up questions. It was agreed that the number of follow-up questions would have to be limited to 2-3 per question.

Emily expressed a concern of the Lewis & Clark area residents: If the College is located elsewhere, what would happen to the land?

Dave expressed concern that a number of people could end up controlling the meeting and the way questions would be answered. He was also concerned that follow up questions could derail the entire process.

Amie said: “The map is not the territory. We can change the process on the fly.” She believes we could limit the meeting to 90 minutes with further questions to the President (if he agree) to follow. It was suggested we contact Sentinel to determine the times we can use the facility and how much would be devoted to clean-up.

Amie then said that if attendance were 100 or less, we could forgo the group process. Bill asked how many facilitators would be needed. Amie said at least 20 but if it is not logistically possible to use facilitators, we would have to rely on written questions. Emily volunteered to find facilitators and would check with the school on number of tables, capacity of room, and sound system.

The group agreed that questions would be generated by emails. Emily asked how far in advance we have to give Engstrom the questions. It was agreed that, if possible, he should have them a week before the meeting.

Jane discussed the need to allow public comments on non-agenda items. (This is mandated by law.)

The group agreed to meet again next Tuesday at 6:30 and the Lewis and Clark Meeting Room.

Dave dismissed the meeting.