Pursuant to SB 1008, the Village of Spring Lake will conduct its business via conference call to mitigate the spread of COVID-19.

I. Call to Order

Chairman Heins called the meeting to order at 7:30 a.m.

II. Roll Call:

Present: Heins – Chair, Dull – Vice Chair, Callen, G. Hanks, Lopez, Sunderlin, Van Leeuwen-Vega, Willison and M. Hanks (Council Liaison)

Absent: None

III. Approval of Minutes (1/14/2021)

Motion by Willison, second from Sunderlin, to approve the minutes of the January 14, 2021 Regular meeting. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

IV. Approval of the Agenda

Motion by Van Leeuwen-Vega, second from Willison, to approve the agenda as presented. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

V. Financial Reports – Burns shared the Financial reports with the Board.

Motion by Lopez, second from Willison, to approve the Finance Report as presented. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

VI. Business

A. Tanglefoot Update – Burns reported that staff had reviewed all six proposals submitted and determined that Progressive AE and GDK met the requirements and, while both firms were completely capable of providing the outcome the Village desired, staff recommended awarding the project to GDK based on the difference in construction oversight costs, with the understanding that there would be additional reimbursable costs that would be pass-thru costs and not part of the 3.9% CM fee. Van Leeuwen-Vega asked if there were any concerns that the terms were not clear if 2/3’s of the bidders did not meet our requirements. Burns said that if they had not
received any complete proposals, she might have thought that, and it stated at least 3 times in the RFP that complete oversite was needed and also stated that if there were any questions to contact her. Burns said they might have fallen down with the title on the title page, but the requirements were stated very clearly throughout the RFP. Burns explained the differences between the 2 proposals. Sunderlin, being in the construction business herself, cautioned that actual costs often get more expensive than projected costs. Heins said he was comfortable with staff's review and recommendation of GDK's proposal. Burns said that the focus group would need to reconvene and the DDA would see a design submission from Driesenga because it might look different than the design from Progressive AE, however, those designs belong to the Village so Driesenga had the option to use them.

Motion by M. Hanks, second from Van Leeuwen-Vega, to support entering into a contract with GDK for the Tanglefoot Park Redevelopment. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

B. 109 S Jackson Building Update – Burns reported that they were getting closer to reaching an agreement for a property swap and explained how the property valuation was reached through 3 different scenarios and staff felt that the assessor’s valuation was the most accurate. Burns shared the most recent sight plan and said that Council was in favor of this swap and felt this was a onetime opportunity to open up that area, but they did want to make sure that the DDA was also on board. The Board agreed they were in favor of the swap. Stanford-Butler updated the Board on the demolition date of the old Height Building.

Motion by Callen, second by M. Hanks to support moving forward on a property swap with ARM for 109 S. Jackson. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

C. Digital Sign Policy – Stanford-Butler explained that, because the Village sometimes received requests to have a message on the message board sign, staff felt a policy to determine a fee, length of time a message would be displayed and what messages would be allowed was necessary. The Board discussed policy ideas for posting messages other than Village business.

Motion by M. Hanks, second from Van Leeuwen-Vega, to approve the policy language with amendments limiting the messages to DDA supported events and authorizing final approval of this language to be made by Chairman Heins. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

D. Issue Media – Stanford-Butler reported that the Chamber was interested partnering with the Village and one other entity to share the $12,000 cost, splitting 3 ways, to advertise through Issue Media.

Motion by M. Hanks, second from G. Hanks, to share the cost of advertising through Issue Media with the Chamber and one other entity.

Yes: 7  No: 2 (Dull & Willison)
E. Facade Grant Updates – Stanford-Butler reported that the Village Baker Façade Grant had been closed out, Weis Chiropractic’s progress was held up by the weather and the Façade Grant for 606 E Savidge that was approved in Dec. 2020 would be coming along later.

F. Easter Event Opportunity – Stanford-Butler shared that Stefanie Herder, Spring Lake Country Club, has offered to head up an Easter Egg Hunt Event with the DDA businesses sponsoring prizes and services in eggs for people to find.

Motion by Lopez, second from Sunderlin, to support an Easter Egg Hunt Event throughout the DDA businesses.

Yes: 9  No: 0

G. Miscellaneous

Stanford-Butler reported she was getting ready for the Capital Campaign for Tanglefoot Park and would be submitting a Mixer Grant request for benches, picnic tables and drinking fountain. Dull asked that an outline of the schedule of the Capital Campaign be created. Stanford-Butler said she would create a schedule for the Board.

VII. Board Member Comment – Dull said he was surprised that the results from the Goal Setting meeting had not come in yet. Burns said those results had come in late last night and she would get those results out to the Board.

VIII. Public Comment – N/A

Adjournment

Motion by M. Hanks, second from Callen, the meeting adjourned at 8:37 a.m. All in favor, motion carried.

Yes: 9  No: 0

Doug Heins, Chair  Maryann Fonkert, Deputy Clerk