

GMHB EXHIBIT 154

2022-09-28 Planning Commission Transcript

0:01

and we are live thank you everyone

0:07

um good evening and welcome to the September 28th I believe is the date today 2022
Planning Commission regular

0:16

meeting it is now 603 p.m and the Planning Commission is now in session

0:22

my name is Daniel Hubble I am the Planning Commission chair in tonight's virtual Planning
Commission meeting is

0:28

being brought to you using video conference technology provided by Zoom the zoom video
of this meeting is being

0:34

broadcast live and will also be uploaded to the city's YouTube channel at the conclusion of
the meeting

0:40

Deputy CPD director Allison van gorp and other staff members are also

0:46

participating in tonight's meeting remotely uh there may be public audience members

0:52

of the public uh listening to the meeting by telephone or using Zoom as

0:57

well so thank you all and welcome for welcome and thank you for joining us

1:03

tonight uh our first uh item to do here will be to call the role

1:10

um our admin coordinator devastrada will be conducting the role so if you could

1:16

please have your microphones unmuted uh as she calls her name thank you chair and I will start with

1:22

begging your forgiveness if I mispronounce your names this time around but commit that I will have them correct

1:28

next month so we have chair Daniel Hubble present Vice chair Michael Murphy president

1:36

commissioner Kate accuse president commissioner Carolyn Bozeman president

1:43

commissioner Michael McCurry present commissioner Victor rashes

1:51

here and Commissioner Adam

1:56

president okay thank you I wasn't sure if it's a long a or short a

2:04

everyone's present thank you very much Deb uh as I mentioned before for this

2:10

meeting we will continue to utilize the zoom platform hopefully in the near future we're going

2:17

to be back at least in person in a hybrid form um as always I will do my best to

2:23

recognize you in the order in which hands are raised um I have all of you up on my left hand

2:30

screen uh so feel free to use the electronic hand raise that's probably

2:36

the easiest but if you're trying to get my attention you can also do one of these and try to get my attention

2:43

uh after which point I will uh recognize you uh to the best of my ability and

2:50

um allow you to ask your questions um the next uh

2:55

item on the agenda will be public appearances uh this is the time for

3:01

members of the public to speak to the commission about issues of concern uh if you wish to uh speak

3:08

um you would have to have registered ahead of time I will

3:14

mention that we have a public hearing on the agenda this evening related to a comprehensive plan Amendment CPA 22-001

3:25

um if you have comments related to that uh we will ask that you refrain from those comments until the public hearing

3:31

with that do we have uh Deb any uh members of the public looking to make an

3:38

appearance sure thank you as of the time of 607 I

3:43

do not I have not received any requests to speak however I don't believe I was the original contact for the public

3:50

hearing so perhaps Deputy uh director Allison can speak to that we have not received any requests to

3:57

speak so no thank you um and to be clear that's for the public

4:03

appearances uh so hearing that we have no appearances this evening we will then move to item number one which is related

4:09

to the public hearing um this is related to uh CPA 22-001

4:19

um a comprehensive plan Amendment uh and again uh do we have anyone who has

4:26

registered for comments during this the answer from me is the same again I

4:32

will defer to deputy director Allison angort and again we do not have anyone signed up to speak

4:39

great thank you very much uh with that I think there's some official language

4:44

here that I will go ahead and state for the record

4:50

um that uh the public hearing for uh CPA

4:56

22-001 is now open as of 608. uh I have

5:01

been informed that there is no one uh present to speak uh to that public

5:08

hearing and given that there is no further testimony the public portion of the hearing will now be closed at 608 pm

5:18

thank you very much and the public hearing is now closed

5:23

um great with that item number two uh is to approve the minutes of the meeting of

5:28

July the 27th uh do I have a motion to approve the minutes

5:36

uh I heard Carolyn first so it's been moved By Carolyn is there a second second

5:42

thank you Victor uh approved by Carolyn seconded by uh Victor rashish uh are

5:48

there any comments Corrections or updates that need to be uh brought in

5:54

front of the group

6:02

okay hearing no changes to the uh

6:07

minutes of the meeting of July the 27th um we will go ahead and take a vote dab

6:14

if you would like to uh just take a roll call vote approving the um minutes of July the 27th
thank you here Hubble yes

6:23

Vice chair Murphy yes commissioner accuse

6:28

yes commissioner boatsman

6:33

you're on mute Carolyn yes

6:39

commissioner Curry yes commissioner rishis

6:44

yay and commissioner Regan yes thank you

6:50

thank you very much the minutes have passed seven to zero

6:55

um with that we will move to item number three which will be uh related to our

7:01

public hearing CPA 22-001 uh related to a comprehensive

7:07

plan Amendment uh and uh uh CPT director

7:13

Jeff are you leading us through this discussion this evening

7:18

great the floor is yours well thank you chair

7:25

um for the record Jeff Thomas interim CPD director um it's nice to see uh those of you

7:31

again that I haven't seen here in a while and for the couple of Commissioners I have yet to
uh meet yet

7:39

directly um welcome to the Planning Commission I understand you've already had a couple meetings in so you're uh your crafty

7:46

veterans at this point of the process um with that I'm going to try and be as

7:52

succinct as possible uh with this item it is extremely riveting in nature which

7:58

uh was probably reflected in the uh turnout for the public hearing but um I also want to introduce uh reintroduce

8:05

Sarah bluevis uh Sarah is our former Economic Development coordinator with

8:10

the Department she is now working in public works as a capital projects manager but is uh still uh lingering on

8:19

a few items uh helping out CPD here uh through the end of the year as we look

8:25

to wrap a few things up this effort with Town Center code amendments and

8:30

subsequent Amendment we're going to discuss tonight is one of them um sir do you want to advance to the

8:37

next slide please thank you really um for the benefit of our uh relatively

8:44

uh new uh tree planning Commissioners I would just take a moment to provide a

8:49

little bit of background um as to how we got here tonight um

8:54

in June of 2020 uh the city council

9:00

enacted a partial Town Center moratorium um on major new construction

9:06

and that was the beginning of essentially a two-year process which

9:12

culminated in June of 2022 as reflected here on this slide where

9:18

um the city went through um some analytical work and then lots of

9:26

public discussion and um meetings with both the Planning Commission and the

9:31

city council related to some code amendments that would help the city exit the partial Town Center moratorium that

9:38

had been again enacted in June of 2020. um the Town Center code amendments uh

9:44

that were being discussed through this period of time uh related to

9:50

um uh ground floor uh commercial uh where it's required

9:56

um how much uh should be required uh whether there should be some regulations put in place

10:02

around that and um how it can be preserved or where it can be preserved as well

10:09

so um there were a number of iterations in all of those uh little subsections that

10:16

I just stepped through and uh but um it culminated with the adoption of

10:22

ordinance 22c-09 by the city council again in June of this year

10:28

and one of the key components to the Amendments was actually some

10:35

revisions to an existing figure that was already in the code um and it was commonly referred to

10:41

through this two-year process as the pink line map and Sarah do you want to forward two

10:47

slides real quick for me thank you it's uh essentially this figure that was

10:53

um in the um Town Center code requirements as I believe uh figure two

11:00

and we can go backwards now thank you that pink line map what it does is it's

11:06

the wear it's uh where when major new construction is occurring where is that

11:13

ground floor uh commercial required on our street frontages in the Mercer

11:18

Island Town Center so what happened was

11:24

um the ordinance has been adopted and it um the city council in its wisdom recognizing that um we will need to take

11:32

a look at the conference of plan because the same map actually appears in the uh

11:38

current comprehensive plan as well and for consistency sake we can't have

11:45

um a map a figure in the conference of plan saying one thing and then in the

11:52

city's development regulations having a version of that that same figure saying

11:58

something else so we've got a consistency issue there so the city council in adopting Ordinance 22c-09 set

12:06

an effective date for those new regulations of December 1st of this year and that intent was very specific to

12:13

allow uh and directs to a direct staff and allow staff to initiate a

12:19

comprehensive plan Amendment to go back and um propose to remove that pink line map

12:27

from the comprehensive plan okay next slide please

12:34

when we're looking at amending the conference a plan um there's some criteria that are

12:41

outlined in the city code that need to be considered um so this is straight from the code

12:49

um micc 1915 230 sub Ave and you can I'm not going to go through

12:56

each one of these but you can see basically uh it's you know taking a look at

13:01

um consistency with the growth management act in other applicable policies and then there's some uh

13:08

state-specific um considerations as well and number two so uh what we're looking at here tonight

13:14

because this map applies to a broader area than just a specific property the entire town center

13:21

um item one comes into play and specifically uh 1B which

13:26

um is looking at the amendment addressing changing circumstances of the city

13:31

okay next slide please again this is the map we flipped to a

13:37

moment ago so it's figure two in the code regulations um in the conference of plan land use

13:43

element is referred to as figure tc1 and then it's also referred to in I

13:49

believe goal 4.2 so the proposal in front of you this evening is to remove

13:55

this figure tc1 from The Landing settlement of the existing comprehensive plan

14:01

and then to also remove the reference to figure tc1 in goal existing goal of 4.2

14:10

and next slide please so I touched on this a moment ago

14:18

um will uh I think I've covered all this but we'll get down to the bottom bullet

14:24

the recommendation from staff is that um the ordinance that was adopted in June

14:31

uh 22c-09 it's reflective of changing circumstances in the city so for

14:38

consistency purposes uh the recommendation to the Planning Commission from staff here this evening is to remove the figure and the

14:44

reference and goal uh 4.2 which will eliminate any potential for

14:49

inconsistency between the comprehensive plan and the new regulations that will be become part of mercury Island

14:57

Municipal Code of 1911 on December 1st 2022.

15:02

and next slide so that was it yeah

15:09

that was the last slide so chair um that concludes the staff presentation on this matter and I will turn it back

15:16

over to you uh thank you uh Jeff for

15:22

um the group um I believe the plan this evening and the request here would be to uh

15:30

uh move forward a motion related to the proposed change but before we get to the

15:37

action portion of this um I'll open the floor for clarifying

15:43

questions um for the staff um if there are any

15:49

um and then we will move to getting a motion on the floor and then we can have any discussion uh beyond that so are

15:55

there any questions for clarifications from the staff at all

16:08

I am not oh I'm Victor I'm sorry I see your hand there but it's like white and I can barely see it so go ahead

16:15

sorry about that um so just I I understand the justification for the change I'm just

16:22

actually wondering I thought that we were going to make all

16:27

adjustments to the comprehensive plan and all clean up at some future time

16:33

what's the specific reason for making this change here and why not just lump

16:39

it in with all the other changes we're going to make when we clean up the complex line that's actually an excellent question

16:46

and the reason for bringing this change forward at this moment in time again is

16:52

to beat that December 1st 2022 effective date of the new regulations that were

17:00

adopted by the city council in June you're absolutely correct though with

17:05

the periodic update of the conference plan um which you're going to be tackling a

17:10

couple of those elements in the conference of plan uh tonight I believe looking at the broader updates of the

17:16

entire plan um it's situational commissioner where

17:22

um there may be some things of I don't want to say lesser significance but not of the timeliness isn't critical

17:31

perhaps uh where we may just say hey that'd be a great item to fold into the

17:36

periodic update um with um the nature of the effective data the ordinance and you know the

17:42

sensitive timing and making sure that our comprehensive plan and development regulations are consistent

17:50

um that is what pressed this matter forward as opposed to folding it into

17:55

the periodic update got it thank you

18:06

any other questions for staff

18:12

okay um hearing none I believe there is a is

18:17

there an is there a proposed uh trying to see if there was did you have

18:23

a proposed uh Motion in the packet um either way is there a motion to

18:31

approve uh the uh CPA 22-001 as has been

18:39

presented I will make that motion okay it's been moved by commissioner

18:46

boatsman is there a second second okay uh it's been seconded by Vice chair

18:52

Murphy uh anybody have any comments or commentary around making the change

19:03

discussion no I'll excuse me

19:09

um I'll just make the statement that uh you know we encounter well first we

19:14

spent a lot of time on the proposal that's necessitating this change related

19:19

to all the retail Frontage so for those of you that were on the commission as we went through that thank you

19:26

um there is a a bit of an administrative uh piece to this specific action show

19:31

related to that um and uh we uh we encountered a similar

19:37

issue when it came to the uh zoning changes that had been proposed as a part

19:43

of the housing element updates uh related to The JCC and some other things

19:50

so um it's not the first time that we've had to to look at doing stuff sort of

19:57

out of band with main comp plan updates but uh

20:02

so with that uh it doesn't sound like there's any other discussion um if I could call

20:09

um Deb if you could please call a roll call vote thank you sir uh chair Hubble

20:15

yes Vice chair Murphy yes commissioner

20:22

commissioner hey could you pronounce the last name for me accuse okay

20:27

yes I'm very conscientious of those things so thank you thoughtful thank you commissioner
boatsman yes and

20:35

commissioner rishis bye commissioner Curry yes and commissioner righheb yes thank

20:43

you great thank you the uh your comp plan

20:49

amendment has passed seven to zero thank you very much Jeff and uh hopefully this

20:55

uh allows the council to move forward with the uh adoption of the ordinance as

21:01

they proposed great thank you very much uh for that everyone

21:10

um item number four let's move to uh the first element in the comprehensive Plan

21:16

update uh this is the transportation element it's the second time that we have come forward uh with this and I

21:23

believe the version that we all received as a part of our packet included a number of uh

21:29

updates and revisions based on commentary and feedback both from the public and from a number of you

21:38

uh Allison are you leading us through this this evening um well I'll introduce our consultant

21:44

Michael Lapham from kpg who will be leading us through this tonight um kpg has been handling the Lion's

21:51

Share of the work on the transportation element and so Michael go ahead yeah thanks for having me here tonight

21:58

we've got uh comments like like the commissioner mentioned um on the transportation element and

22:04

want to walk through uh the comments and how we incorporated them into the

22:09

transportation element um encourage you all I'll share on my screen here in just a little bit

22:16

um the transportation element with the track changes version but if you all have either on another screen or on a

22:23

hard copy that comments themselves that might be a nice efficient way to go through them having both of those that

22:30

at your accessibility yeah yes please go ahead Carolyn

22:37

I just want to mention that I have some comments which I have brought to the meeting I've sent them to

22:44

um Allison and Adam a short time ago so um do you plan on just going through the

22:50

whole document or do you want to just take you know let me know what would be convenient for you okay okay thanks

22:58

yeah so when you step maybe stepping back just a little bit um yeah we can definitely here oh go ahead please sorry sorry um

23:06

Kate did you have a question or comment before we get started yeah I had a comment I wasn't able to

23:12

make the August meeting but I had submitted comments earlier on the transportation element and it looks like they were not rolled into the element

23:19

um I shared those again with Allison via email today um so probably similar similar to

23:25

Carolyn just wondering what the process is on making sure those get in thanks

23:33

um yeah either Michael or Allison I don't know if you're on I believe this is all in

23:38

preparation for us coming back with another version that will be the version

23:44

that will move towards a public hearing so there's plenty of opportunity to

23:49

bring um you know all those additional comments to make sure that they're rolled in I think the question for this

23:56

evening for either Michael or Allison will be do we want um the the two members of the commission

24:02

to go through the commentary so that everyone can hear it or should we

24:08

um just have you guys incorporate that feedback um uh in the background

24:13

well let's see so I did receive um a couple of additional comments from

24:20

Carolyn and Kate kind of just as the meeting was about to start so I can I can forward those around here at some

24:26

point um I think it probably would make sense to put them on the table for

24:32

consideration tonight um and then kind of depending on

24:37

where we're at in the discussion and and you know how the time is Flowing this evening we can make a call as to whether

24:43

it makes sense to make a decision on everything tonight or if you'd like to direct staff to go to some additional

24:50

work and bring back an updated draft at the October meeting for further review

24:55

um I think you know prior to receiving these additional comments we were thinking that perhaps we could finish the review of this element tonight

25:03

um given that you know we had a smaller set of amendments to go through and it seemed like it would be fairly

25:09

straightforward to get through them in one reading tonight um you know I haven't looked at what

25:14

Caroline and Kate sent over I just received it as the meeting was starting so I think just depending on how that

25:20

feels once we all take a look at it now we can make a call on whether we need more time or if we can settle things as

25:27

we go I'll send maybe um so we've kind of prepared to respond to the original comments it might be good to

25:35

have some time to think of through and get more formal responses than um

25:41

just trying to react to them on the fly um I don't know but we can go either way

25:47

but that possess my initial recommendation is to take some time and um

25:52

to process them and think how we want to incorporate them

25:58

yeah I think I think that would be fine

26:06

sensitive mute trigger button um my comments are not new um they have actually been heard by the

26:12

council before and um I think they were agreed to potentially be added to the

26:17

scope so um just they're very short they're two sentences so I don't think it would be a tremendous amount of

26:23

trouble to at least have a first reading of them there's no narrative it's just two sentences for mine anyway yeah

26:28

that's okay oh that was ensure the magnitude that sounds that sounds totally reasonable

26:34

Carolyn did you have another comment um I would like to go through the

26:42

straightforward I've got to break out underlying language you know it's it's not nebulous it's just you know specific

26:49

words here and there um I just think it would be helpful to the process to get these moving they're

26:56

not very lengthy and not very complicated so I think it'd

27:01

be great to go through them and kind of the way we've done things in the past we can bring comments to a meeting but I

27:07

understand if you wish to you know deal with them and want to to look at each

27:12

one um uh more with more scrutiny that's fine you know it sounds like they're

27:19

both um just a couple comments I think that's totally let's yeah let's totally go into them that sounds fine so why

27:25

don't I suggest this um Michael why don't you go through what you were prepared to present that's in the draft

27:32

and then once we complete that um uh Carolyn and Kate we'll go back and

27:37

you guys can present um the suggestions to add on top of

27:43

those if that's okay and then uh and then that way everyone on the commission will have heard that and then we can

27:51

look at how um you know all or any of those get rolled into the draft as it moves

27:58

forward so that sounded good to both of you yes awesome thanks

28:04

go ahead Michael yeah so um again thanks for having me here tonight oh this update is kind of a

28:11

lighter update we're focusing on you know changes that have occurred since the comprehend conference plan was

28:18

updated in 2018 um future projects that have changed or

28:23

are new and then lastly um incorporating the King County

28:28

county-wide Planning policies that have been adopted since the last time the comprehensive plan was updated I'm gonna

28:35

share my screen and again the street screen sharing will be on the

28:40

transportation element itself um and then if you have at your disposal either on another screen or hard copy uh

28:48

recommend having the comment sheet and the responses uh open or in front of you there

29:04

so can everybody see the transportation element here great so we've got the couple got some

29:10

color coding going on here tonight uh what you see in the purple with track changes is the original edits uh that we

29:18

made to the transportation element to kind of bring it up to speed uh moving forward the last four years and then

29:24

we'll also see here that we want to focus on tonight we'll see in Blue uh identified places where we gotta comment

29:31

and then sometimes you'll see a change in the text resulting from the comment

29:37

um so I'm going to kind of skip forward uh to the oh yeah go ahead please um just a an odd request maybe for the

29:44

future um I have issues with colors like blue and purple is it possible to pick

29:49

different more different colors for the future yes that's a great comment and much appreciated my original version was

29:57

um green and something else but when you open word um I think it got changed different

30:04

people's things highlight in different colors and you're right these are not the ideal blue and purple and I apologize no no worries different

30:11

computers have default color selections and this is kind of what it ended up with

30:17

um but I'll try to be clear and maybe follow my cursor as far as hovering in on what we're talking about

30:23

here but I'm just going to kind of skip uh the text and just kind of go and seek out the comments one at a time and just

30:29

walk through them the first one we got here and sometimes it might say page two but when we've

30:35

added additional track changes sometimes it gets moved to the next page so it might be a comment on page 20 that may

30:41

now be shown up on 21 or something like that so just to be aware um there's a couple comments related to

30:48

this and again this is you know we're obviously in mid-2022 but by the time

30:53

this gets uh adopted and published it's going to be early 2024. so there's some

30:58

references uh to the Light Rail station and there's a comment about it not being open yet well we went to have this be

31:06

you know we all this thing to last for years and be appropriate so we went ahead and are describing the Light Rail

31:12

station is being opened it was originally scheduled for 2023. um my understanding is it slipped about

31:18

a year but it's still expected to be online about when the the comprehensive plan is going to be adopted so we want

31:25

to still keep the change the language um that it that it's open um which is what the schedule is still

31:31

looking like to uh to occur and definitely you know I want this to

31:37

be less of a presentation format so if people have comments or questions on something you know please go ahead and

31:43

Jump Right In and we can just kind of you know work through this as more of a workshop format than a than a

31:48

presentation um but with that I will I will kind of go through the comments pretty quick just for to get us through this tonight

31:55

um the comments two and three uh are pretty similar uh they're regarding

32:01

documenting some of the data and labeling and you know big picture for the transportation element we've got a

32:07

couple pages of introduction up front we want to kind of keep these kind of high

32:13

level and just to get the reader um get them the highlights of what's out there and as we get in the farther back

32:20

Parts we'll get a little more of the details we think is the effective way to communicate the information

32:27

um so um which for the most part unless we want to get into it we definitely

32:33

recognize uh the second and third comments and we actually made some minor revisions back in the

32:39

existing part related to those but up front here um we wanted to kind of keep it pretty

32:44

high level we do reference like the planning year 2024 or 20 party 2044

32:50

um which is what psrc is looking at but for the most part we didn't want to get dive into the weeds um right off the first two pages so if

32:56

that's okay um we didn't incorporate these for the most part except for later on

33:03

um okay moving forward

33:09

you have two questions yes yeah again you know I can't always see her just go ahead and please jump in

33:15

yeah sorry about that guys it's off the side of my screen there so um we'll start with you Victor and then uh and

33:21

then Carolyn yeah so just going back to the discussion about uh Light Rail station

33:28

not being open I understand that we're this may be published in the Light Rail

33:34

station might be open by then I guess my question is what if it's not

33:40

um given that we've already had one slip and maybe we should consider putting in

33:46

language that says it is planned to be opened by whatever the date is

33:51

um rather than actually pretending that it is or assuming that it is open

33:58

yeah that's a good comment I you know we do have some time in play here how about this that we're again we're a

34:05

year and a half out from why don't we kind of keep tracking the project and if it does seem like that may

34:12

continue to be an issue where this is going to be adopted and there's another delay or something

34:17

um we could go that route but I think we still have some time uh before rather than make that change right now

34:24

when it very well may be open is that okay to kind of monitor that that's fine as long as we have that flexibility okay

34:30

and I think we do that's a pretty minor it's not a substantive change it's just more of a timing

34:37

Carolyn did you also have a question yeah Michael I I don't have a second screen I don't have a printed copy of

34:45

what we're looking at here so I'm finding myself not really knowing what you're talking about

34:51

um okay yeah if you could kind of fold that in a little bit I would appreciate it thank you okay

34:57

yeah I will try to um Allison is it possible to

35:02

email the comments or I can I will try to summarize them and maybe if they're

35:08

really detail specific I can read them verbatim um but basically the comment the first

35:13

two first comment was about Light Rail and the second two were about providing additional uh data details that I think

35:21

regarding to like traffic count when the counts were done and weren't planning documents were created oh go ahead well

35:28

I I just want to say I I was just if you would just point to what it is you're talking about even on the screen with

35:34

your cursor and then I would know where you're talking about okay and I not really

35:41

don't need much detail but just if you could just that the briefest summary of what's the issue here and

35:48

sure yeah thanks thanks so uh yeah just to clarify again the purple

35:55

uh edits are the original changes and then the blue highlights Carolyn is that's

36:01

um we kind of highlighted to see what what the comment was related to so every time you see a blue that's uh what the

36:07

comment was specifically addressing does that make sense okay great

36:14

um yes okay moving down um let's see page three

36:28

one second here trying to the next one

36:41

okay um

36:49

find in the next comments here bear with me just a second

37:07

okay yeah thanks sorry Paul apologize just getting squared away here so there's a comment um on page three on

37:14

this um on this uh policy right here

37:21

this about where does the policy come from and this language

37:27

again a lot of some of the changes were to incorporate the most recent version of the city or the county-wide planning

37:34

policies um and this change here that we incorporated was specific to King County

37:41

policy t22 that focused on encouraging Partnerships

37:47

um and let's see it was talking about I'm gonna you know what this one is technical nature
I'm gonna go ahead and

37:53

read it verbatim just if we're all clear I read that this language is encouraging Partnerships
with non-profits for

37:59

maintenance of the transportation infrastructure um that does not sound like a good idea
this is this is that's meant to be a

38:06

government function we weren't intending to imply that Partnerships were or

38:12

um private sector or non-profits we're going to maintain sometimes what we're trying to do
in here is we've got an

38:18

existing policy and to be efficient we try to maybe modify existing policy just

38:24

a little bit so that it captures the intent of some of these county-wide planning policies
rather than because

38:29

sometimes they're pretty close so this is an example of we had a existing policy that was
pretty close to what

38:36

King County wanted us to add so we kind of tweaked it a little bit to be consistent with what
they're recommending

38:42

um but based on the comment we heard the main takeaway and we haven't also read the policy to

38:48

make sure everyone feels like it's an okay it has changed the new policy the policy would read and current

38:54

Partnerships with non-profit providers and the private sector in the provision operation and maintenance of the

39:00

transportation system and then based on the comment we heard we're applicable so it's not intended that

39:06

they're going to be maintaining the system or anything like that but where it where it's appropriate

39:13

bring them in to help um to help provide different uh transportation resources it

39:19

could be all across the board um is that anyone everyone okay with with that change or anyone have any

39:25

heartburn on that Victor can you just provide an example of that

39:31

I'm not I'm not actually following where a non-profit would sure you know it could be

39:39

um but you know some kind of um transportation service maybe it's a you

39:45

know a van pool or um let's see

39:50

yeah something to that effect a way to maybe move kids kids around for some kind of

39:56

program um that's that's me the best example that comes to mind

40:02

um the private sector could be all sorts of things um you know it could be another private

40:07

bus service it could be maybe working with you know Lyft or Uber to partner

40:14

with them to you know provide some services on the island to maybe get people to the the park and ride when

40:21

it's over capacity or you know there's some some options like that got it okay thank you for the examples

40:30

okay um let's see sorry a couple more questions um Adam

40:36

um yeah I'm I'm still I'm still reading our 2-3 and I I'll admit I I this is one

40:42

of the I think four that I still have heartburn on uh just reading it I I can't I can't read it any other way than

40:49

non-profits maintaining transportation system I think maybe I'll revise the comment based on that I'm looking at t22

40:56

from kccp why don't we just copy t22 verbatim

41:03

um from the planning policies okay let me just pull it up here

41:10

I can read it um but I say like what I see there is respond to changes in

41:15

Mobility patterns and needs for both people and goods encouraging Partnerships with non-profit providers

41:21

and the private sector where applicable so piece that I understand a lot of my

41:26

comments tree up to that I have a better understanding of it but I I still read 2-3 here as written as encourage

41:33

Partnerships with non-profit providers and the private sector for maintenance of the transportation system and to me

41:40

that that's still a red flag okay so but yeah maybe this is a good one to have

41:46

you all I'm just sharing pulled up another people want to read it verbatim

41:51

maybe this is a good one to have you all I don't know want to weigh in on if you want to make that change I'm I'm totally

41:57

on board with that if you do here you can see here is this specific uh quote that uh that

42:03

Adam just read do we want to change it to that

42:09

yes so Mike my question has to do with what is where applicable what exactly does

42:15

that mean and how do you define that how does it kick in when does it kick in who kicks it in

42:21

yeah it's a you know it's just a general yeah I hear you it's it's a little it's a general qualifier of you know not all

42:28

the time is all it's trying to get at not every case is it going to be

42:34

um applicable um is all it's trying to get at

42:41

Caroline oh what is this thing we're looking at

42:48

here with these numbers t18 1920 et cetera I'm not familiar with this yeah

42:53

this is this is our own tracking sheet of how the King County policies are on

42:58

your left this is just our own inner workings but it's the best way I had to share the basically the county-wide

43:06

planning policies are on your left and on the right is kind of where in the city's goals and policies we're

43:13

addressing them it's just I think this is the best way I had to pull up the county policies at this moment

43:19

um you know and I think you have a good comment Adam the one I when I agree with you the most is the word maintenance

43:25

um is one I I think is is probably the one if I was gonna move one change one thing

43:31

I would probably remove that word and maybe just be the provision in operation but we can also change it directly to

43:37

what the county-wide policy said I'm fine either way I'll I'll defer to the rest of the commission on that one

43:44

um my only question for you Adam is like what specifically

43:50

is giving you the heartburn that makes you think that this is a like

43:57

like a directive sort of a sort of a thing so like I'm not reading that with

44:02

the language around and encouraging uh Partnerships so

44:08

um not not there but I think the provision operation and maintenance whereas I think the intent of the

44:15

planning policy from King County is just encouraging Partnerships in general not

44:21

in specifically operation and maintenance of Transportation so that that's that's

44:27

kind of where I think it gets a little ours gets a little specific and maybe that's yeah instead of just starting

44:33

clean slate copy paste from King County trying to modify existing to add verbiage maybe we

44:40

do lose some of it so that that was that was the the asterisk I kind of had there got it

44:47

that makes more sense so the way I interpreted your comment is it's less about the maintenance aspect than the

44:52

specificity of the way it's worded around um yeah operation and maintenance rather

44:58

than just hey we should be pursuing Partnerships related to Transportation yeah could include these things right

45:05

were in some ways potentially excluding others by being so specific

45:10

or or if making people focus on something that is like whoa where we just say like General Partnerships but

45:17

if we start citing specific things then people might take issue there yeah like

45:23

as I did yeah great that makes more sense thank you Carolyn yeah in the interest of accuracy I I do

45:30

find the idea of encouraging Partnerships for operation and maintenance just just to maybe just be a

45:37

bit inaccurate the word provision is pretty benign so I would agree with a change there

45:43

to remove the operation and maintenance side of things

45:49

so um I uh if I can summarize there's been I think a couple of comments in

45:55

favor of generalizing this statement whether that's through the removal of operation

46:02

and maintenance or uh something um uh that has less specificity to it

46:11

um is there sort of consensus uh to give I don't want to Wordsmith specifically

46:17

but just give direction to Michael that the the direction would be to go and

46:22

sort of like remove some of the specificity from this to um maintain the connection to the King

46:28

County Planning policy but uh not over engineer what's there

46:33

um is that do I get a thumbs up from everyone that that's Kate did you have a question or a

46:39

comment before sort of yeah I just one one quick one just related to um I know

46:44

we're trying to do more with bike infrastructure at least there has been some and I'm wondering if

46:51

part of the reason for this statement here is has to do with um Partnerships with non-profits that do

46:58

build and help maintain run volunteer programs or whatnot to help maintain cycling infrastructure so that's my only

47:06

comment I mean I'm fine with the change as is but I don't want to if the intent there was to include alternative to

47:13

roadway infrastructure to get from A to B um that might be why that's in there so

47:19

maybe Michael can respond to that but I'm fine with it either way I don't think an intent is to get at one mode of

47:27

travel versus another but um yeah which would you say would you comment it could be an example of what

47:33

uh this could be a partnership the city could pursue but in in that uh in that vain

47:41

generalizing this more wouldn't preclude any of what Kate said correct that I

47:48

believe so yeah cool so um I I thought I saw consensus earlier about just generalizing

47:55

um item 2.3 do I get enough thumbs up to support that great okay we can we'll

48:02

revise that um based on what I heard from everybody moving forward

48:09

we got comments here

48:14

uh commented on the word so again we're highlighting the word comment on the word optimize here uh recommend to

48:21

change the word optimize to maximize um and I get the I get with uh that there's

48:27

a meeting or more in the engineering word that might conflict with this but I think we do recommend staying with the

48:34

word optimize uh it's specifically used in uh King County policy t33 optimizes

48:41

referring to like deficient use of the existing Transportation infrastructure switching to maximize uh could be

48:48

interpreted as increasing the use of um which is not the not the intent of

48:54

this um and recommend keeping the same wording unless unless anyone objects here

49:00

okay um try to get through these uh quickly as we can um

49:06

moving down here is one uh one to get url's input uh there's a comment here about uh for

49:15

policy 3.1 we got two versions uh for you to pick from

49:21

uh here's the one we had originally and based on the comment we heard there uh recommended removing uh for all

49:28

communities so you can see this uh first one um let's see Contin contains off for all

49:36

communities in the second version of 3.1 does not have uh we were we used all

49:41

communities that specifically uh mentioned in this countywide planning's policies

49:46

um but you know if you all want to take it out we're fine either way I don't know if you want to do a quick Vote or

49:52

any thoughts on that we're okay either way Michael in the um County Planning

49:58

policies do you know how typically their use of communities how

50:04

are they defining that are they defining that as geographical communities or social communities or uh

50:12

yeah socioeconomic Community like do you know how that's being typically referenced by

50:18

King County and this yeah good question and this specific case uh it was referring to and we were kind of keeping

50:24

it simple again this is another example we're kind of uh trying to incorporate the planet county-wide planning policy without

50:31

within existing policy but in this case they were specifically the community they're talking about that

50:37

have benefits and quotes that have been disproportionately affected by Transportation decisions

50:43

um is what they are specifically referring to so we could have a third version here that spells it out verbatim if you

50:50

wanted to um you know these are kind of very detailed things um that I don't think there's a right or

50:57

wrong of oh yeah please I I think it's good to have the all

51:04

community statement in there it just basically says that these good things should be done for everybody if you

51:10

don't say that then you're just saying you should do these good things well maybe you don't do these good things

51:16

everywhere I mean if it it seems to me it was a policy that's you know as you pointed out directed toward toward

51:23

equity and um I think it's better to to say that I would favor leaving it in

51:32

Adam oh well I understand I'll play Devil's Advocate just for the sake of

51:37

discussion um just if we say all communities here then the absence of it may imply that we're not meaning to do

51:44

it equitably unless we actually State all communities um that being said I I

51:50

have no no more issues on on this one but do we have an equity policy

51:55

somewhere else Michael that affects that that covers the entire Transportation

52:01

element uh let's see an equity policy

52:06

you know not not like I catch-all phrased it is addressed a couple of times in here

52:13

um in other referring to other things but there's not I catch-all

52:19

um no I don't believe so maybe we should have one I think it might might be a

52:25

good idea then we don't have to have these Oddball little phrases in specific policies here

52:32

and there yeah I mean I can I can look through it

52:37

a little bit to make sure we have well if you want to well I'm hesitant to go through

52:43

this whole thing here to no you know look for things like that um no maybe the next meeting if you

52:49

might be able to let us know that would be that would be great okay and there you're going to see as we go

52:56

through these some more you're going to see more comments that do specifically get at Equity issues

53:01

um that either you'll see in purple that have been applied or um

53:07

well it's definitely it's it's worked through um through this especially the county-wide planning

53:12

policies are that's a specific uh emphasis they have on that good

53:18

uh commissioner I'm sorry commissioner baldman were you

53:23

yeah never mind never mind I I don't think yeah never mind okay uh I'd I'd

53:30

actually be in favor of the second 3.1 um if it's already written in King

53:35

County policy I don't think we need to actually Echo it in our policy um because we actually do do have tail

53:40

up to that correct so this isn't like I did oh go ahead no

53:48

go ahead go ahead go ahead so what we have here is you can see the previous

53:53

comment we're trying to incorporate trying to keep having all those these

53:58

old policies and all new country planning policies we're really trying to be efficient here and in some cases in

54:04

some cases you'll have We'll add verbatim the county-wide planning policy like you can see 3.4 you know this is

54:10

word for word the county-wide planning policies in other cases we look for opportunities where we could capture the

54:18

intent of a county-wide planning policy within an existing City policy with just

54:23

a couple changes to word smithing and and that's what's going on here we don't have this isn't exactly uh the

54:30

county-wide planning policy so we're trying to capture the intent of one uh within the existing surround policy yeah

54:37

I'd be in favor of removing the last three words honestly okay

54:43

um Kate

54:50

sorry that's that mute happy trigger again um so I I kind of like Carolyn's idea

54:58

that we have just an overarching policy um we're not overarching but somewhere

55:05

somewhere where you're talking about the general goals of transportation to serve people

55:11

um that explicitly says the county phrase that have been disproportionately affected by Transportation decisions

55:18

um because I think that would serve um you know if that comes up front and go one or two

55:24

um or or down lower um ideally it's more up front um or maybe it's an aspirational

55:30

statement um in the narrative leading up to the goals um in my experience there's a lot of

55:37

folks who are not familiar with the um outcomes of inequitable distribution

55:43

of Municipal goods and and I agree with Adam that it is

55:49

confusing to people if you just have that vague kind of statement so I think we should be very explicit and say

55:55

somewhere in this document that have been disproportionately affected by Transportation decisions and I really

56:01

like Carolyn's idea that that's just sort of a broad statement that applies to everything that comes below

56:08

in that case I wouldn't mind at all if that for all communities was removed

56:14

um but I I wouldn't want it to be removed if we didn't have some general policy that says we're going to pay

56:20

attention to people who have been disproportionately affected

56:25

okay so um I'll I'll close on this uh so that

56:31

we can keep moving through because I know we've got a lot to still cover Michael

56:36

um what I would uh say is I I hear that there's some consensus around

56:43

um you know there's probably a community um appetite for just being more explicit

56:50

at a broader level for a statement around Equity I'll make the comment that

56:57

knowing King County and how they do stuff there are some very specific places and projects given the much

57:05

broader diversity of of King County as a whole as to why this was included

57:11

um that I don't want to say is irrelevant to Mercer Island because it's certainly not um but it has a different relevancy and

57:18

so from that perspective I I do think it's important for us to to

57:23

um make sure that we're enumerating it in the case of what I look at the replaced in in the first version of this

57:31

we did strike some language around neighborhood impact and the way I am reading this is that all communities is

57:38

a replacement for neighborhood which to me is just a little bit of a broader and it's why I asked my original question

57:45

because to me it just broadens the definition a little bit you can Define neighborhood very differently than a

57:50

community and so um I do think it's congruent if we can't find a way to include something more

57:57

broadly I don't see a problem with retaining it because I do think it's just a refinement of the language that

58:04

currently existed so um Adam

58:09

um yeah I I think you're you're discussion of it yeah looking at losing

58:15

neighborhood replacing with Community uh I think I'm I'm at I like your suggestion so I think I was going to

58:22

raise the issue um I'll I I like as is um so the first 3.1

58:31

great was that clear as mud Michael for you to take action yeah I think so I think I did get that I

58:38

I believe I heard the message of the intent behind the comments and we'll come back with some with our our effort

58:45

to make those changes great okay great see moving moving

58:51

forward um

58:57

let's see got another comment here

59:03

comment is uh suggest revising to maintain it's referring to this

59:10

uh this comment here uh suggest revising maintain public transit service in the island in

59:16

accordance with on island demand and I thought this was a good comment we did what we ended up recommending to you

59:23

all is rather than make that change you know the introduction

59:28

some of this is getting a little redundant the introduction I thought did a nice job of saying work with King

59:33

County Metro Sound Transit and other providers to ensure adequate transportation services to meet the

59:39

needs of the island with that this one is a little redundant and we actually just recommended uh deleting it Adam I

59:46

believe this is one of your comments again and I think we're capturing your intent if by just taking it out because

59:52

it's already kind of in the introduction to this one has everyone okay with that change

59:57

okay great um just down here a little farther uh the last comment on the comment sheet if

1:00:03

you have that um let's see it's talking about

1:00:09

is there still need to enhance um connection to the or to enhance the connection to these communities

1:00:16

and that's talking about here and I think there might have been a little bit of um just want to clarify a little bit

1:00:21

this isn't intended to be um the connection between Mercer Island

1:00:27

and other communities this is meant to enhance the connections uh to Regional Transit stations on the island uh is

1:00:35

what this is intended to get at and we but if that so if that's okay I think we'd like to

1:00:40

just leave this one as is okay uh thanks Adam I saw you sorry a thumbs up again I'm gonna go through these pretty quick

1:00:46

I had a lot of questions and I think it just just because I'm I'm very new to this process so yeah

1:00:52

I read through the responses make a lot of sense yeah Adam on the whole you know

1:00:58

I thought your comments are really thoughtful and appreciate all of them um and definitely spark some methods to

1:01:04

this document that have been helpful um let's see going to come to the second

1:01:10

page here uh second is more of a question here on what

1:01:16

um Innovative transit services are are provided in just a quick um you know King County Metro

1:01:23

provides Dial-A-Ride um it's got some different kind of flexible if you see the comment there

1:01:29

there's several uh Innovative things that have been going on there's some custom bus routes uh that are working

1:01:36

with some of the private schools to get access from Mercer Island rather than have their own private bus there's

1:01:42

several Innovative services and they're listed here I won't go into all of them so I do think it's applicable to keep

1:01:48

this um this bullet yeah and I thought I'm

1:01:53

reading the response and I don't want to take up all the time so I'll be quick because like I thought it was interesting when I when I read that I

1:01:59

thought it was referring to like the the lift and uh Like Bike Share pilot

1:02:05

projects that were done I think that's that the info and the response is kind of interesting and if there's space

1:02:11

somewhere in the document I think that's worth um articulating that because me as being

1:02:16

somewhat new to the island I was not aware of you know the darts and those custom bus services so I think I think

1:02:23

it's useful info okay

1:02:30

uh moving down here let's see uh

1:02:38

question policy four four

1:02:45

oh yeah okay so here's question four four was it question related to this is this so the policy reads investigate

1:02:51

opportunities for operating constructing and or financing Park and Ride Lots uh for Mercer Island residents only

1:02:58

currently uh the primary Park and Ride Transit Center is available for

1:03:03

everybody so this is getting at um looking for opportunities that would be for Mercer Island residents only

1:03:10

um and my understanding of talking to staff this is still something that's ongoing and they have been continuing to look at

1:03:17

um several opportunities to provide some mercy around only parking uh close to the the transit center so I think it is

1:03:24

applicable to uh maintain that comment uh moving down here

1:03:29

the next um comment was on 4.8

1:03:34

um I'm going to read this one uh verbatim here

1:03:40

edit or remove black indigenous and other people of color

1:03:45

um to not differentiate how the city provides services based on race

1:03:52

um we should however be based on socioeconomic needs uh

1:03:59

revise revise people with flow and no income to people with low or no income

1:04:08

um a person cannot have both low and no income so maybe an and or statement I'm

1:04:14

just going to also read our response this is directly um from King County policy T8 and T9

1:04:24

um and I think that's talking to staff I think we want to keep it the way it is

1:04:30

but I'll you know open it up up for discussion if people want to uh any comments or if we want to change this

1:04:35

we're we're open to ideas

1:04:43

okay I do agree that the end that is probably yeah we have one go ahead Kate yeah

1:04:48

please oh I I disagree with leaving it as is um there's a lot of intersectionality between economic and

1:04:56

racial issues um I would encourage everyone on the Planning Commission to read the book
The Color of law

1:05:02

um which describes a lot of those intersections um and might be useful for these kind of

1:05:08

conversations so just want to comment I support leaving it as is

1:05:14

just to clarify I do think we need to change this and or at a minimum

1:05:26

sorry about that Outburst Trend and help my dog here get out the door um

1:05:32

Adam sorry you had a comment um I guess kind of in light of the discussion earlier I would
kind of

1:05:39

suggest why why not why not constrain ourselves you know these are the guidelines

1:05:44

suggested that the framework suggested by King County let's go broader than

1:05:50

those guidelines and say promote access to opportunity for all communities um like other
parts of the document say

1:05:55

not just very specific ones but that being said I have not read that book

1:06:01

um yet so um it's a personal opinion

1:06:11

um any other comments on here on the direction we should Point Michael in

1:06:20

but and Kate was I correct in um understanding you were the one that um either asked this question or

1:06:26

suggested the change originally or 4.8 no no oh I don't think so

1:06:35

Michael this was this wasn't from a comment this was just something that you

1:06:41

uh This was um okay yeah

1:06:50

um it looks good to me you know you want another another person to weigh in

1:06:55

um other than low or no as Michael said that should be changed yeah I mean from a from a grammatical

1:07:02

perspective I'll take whatever is uh uh common nomenclature Michael in in that

1:07:08

direction uh commissioner Murphy yeah I see no reason to change it

1:07:14

especially if that's straight out of the King County language

1:07:19

yeah I mean I look I um it would be foolish of me to uh attempt

1:07:27

at all to uh as as um as much as I try to be uh sympathetic to

1:07:36

um you know doing right by our community for

1:07:42

um people who have traditionally been underrepresented I was in many training since I've gone to I can't say that I

1:07:49

um am any expert in doing what's right um in here I am inclined to say that if

1:07:58

this is the language that King County has adopted that it has had a tremendous amount of public input it's been looked

1:08:04

at by members of the community that are impacted by the statement being made

1:08:11

um and so I'm inclined to uh say that I'm I'm no better judge of how to

1:08:17

address this other than by saying I I fully support the intent of all of this

1:08:24

which is I think as a community we want to make sure that traditionally underrepresented

1:08:29

um groups are represented um in our planning and how we do that

1:08:35

and if this is the language that King County uses to um to make that statement then that I'm

1:08:42

not one to say I'm in a position to to make any alternate suggestion to that so

1:08:54

so I've heard a couple of people in both directions I guess the best way to do

1:08:59

this is um uh uh let me just I guess I'll ask it in

1:09:05

this way um how many people are are sort of in favor of retaining the King County

1:09:11

language as it's presented um in 4.8 with no changes

1:09:19

so I've got three is that four commissioner Murphy

1:09:24

and then um the people that would prefer either a

1:09:30

change or removal of um the language that's uh highlighted if

1:09:35

you can give me an indication if you favor a

1:09:40

change I've got two so I think the consensus is that we

1:09:48

should stick with the King County language um at least for the next draft of this that goes to public hearing and if those

1:09:55

of you that want to make changes um I would definitely say you know

1:10:01

there's opportunity to bring specific language forward that you might want to change this to and then we can discuss

1:10:07

that again as a group and take a vote on it um when the when the time comes

1:10:16

okay okay all right thank you Michael yes there's a follow-up question on this same policy

1:10:23

and I think to help get the meaning of it I'm gonna I'm gonna read the policy again just because it kind of a it's a

1:10:28

word choice um so the policy again reads Implement Transportation programs and projects

1:10:35

address the needs of and promote access to that to opportunity of black indigenous and other people of color

1:10:42

people with no with low or no incomes and people with special Transportation

1:10:47

needs and here's the part while preventing and mitigating displacement of these groups the quite follow-up

1:10:53

question was there evidence of displacement on Mercer Island

1:10:58

um I can't I can't answer that um and the follow-up is uh should we

1:11:03

remove the word mitigating um as it applies that it is happening and I don't think uh well so I'd

1:11:10

recommend the one part I can say about that I don't recommend taking out mitigating because if we take out mitigating

1:11:16

um then it would be actually a stronger statement of just preventing so

1:11:21

um I do recommend keeping it in there because then it just gives more flexibility to

1:11:27

the island I I don't think it's correct to take that out is that is that Adam I see or not again this is your comment

1:11:32

yeah okay yeah um and I guess yeah it really boils down to the question is there evidence of

1:11:39

displacement specifically right here um my concern there is if people say oh

1:11:44

displacement displacement if it if it's repeated enough times without evidence

1:11:50

sometimes it does become assumed to be a fact that was the only concern there if if there are any data that support that

1:11:56

I I'm sure it does exist at the county level yeah I can't speak to that part of it if

1:12:02

it's happening yeah and you know the question is is you know is it um current or historic I mean

1:12:09

this isn't related to Transportation but I can tell you the deed to my house says that my property shall not be sold to a

1:12:16

person of the black race and it's in my deed so um while there are laws on the

1:12:21

books that prohibit that from being um addressed you know there could be

1:12:27

changes to those laws that could then uh reinstitute the language on on my deed

1:12:33

right so I think that as a we may not in

1:12:38

our current social environment or our current awareness know of where all of those uh potential

1:12:46

um things could be I gave an example that was related to land use not to

1:12:52

transportation that I guarantee you there are things that are probably buried somewhere in our code language or

1:12:59

in things that we have done that that have had an impact here that we're just probably probably not aware of so I'm

1:13:06

inclined for the reason you stated Michael like you can't remove one without creating a catch-22 with the

1:13:14

other so again if this is the language that is comes from King County it's it's

1:13:19

I'm guessing there for a reason it's been vetted pretty thoroughly so I would

1:13:24

I would favor retaining it I'm Carolyn yeah I I like a policy like this because

1:13:31

we're not necessarily looking at what's happening today although I'm again not

1:13:36

knowledgeable about exactly what's happening today but we're looking at a plan here that goes to 2044 and I think

1:13:44

it's a good policy about what could happen uh what we don't want to happen and to make sure that we we don't allow

1:13:51

that to happen great

1:13:57

um okay Michael next okay thank you moving down the next comment is on

1:14:02

policy 5.4 um and let's see

1:14:10

just reading it through here I can summarize Mike yeah

1:14:17

um and I promise you of all the questions this is the last one I still have a

1:14:22

I think that I don't feel was fully resolved by the staff response um on this one when I see State policies that

1:14:29

promote um you know Equity at the transportation level what comes to my head is House

1:14:34

Bill 1782 um and I think that may hamstring the city

1:14:40

um if that were you know said like you know the middle housing one that was a contentious issue

1:14:47

um you know mayor nice wrote an article a letter kind of um about that so I

1:14:52

think that that kind of divide that it's a contentious issue um so I would just be concerned that the

1:14:58

way that's written as is would kind of forced the city to advocate for something like House Bill 1782 which may

1:15:06

have a very um divided opinion um so that that's where my comment there

1:15:13

um stems from

1:15:28

oops sorry Michael did you have any uh comment to that not that I want to put you on the spot but

1:15:35

um I'm not familiar enough with the house bill to have context there so that that was the

1:15:42

middle housing bill that was a blanket requiring the duplexes

1:15:49

triplexes and fourplexes at one point within a certain Geographic distance

1:15:54

um so just as re as reading it that this would force the city to advocate for

1:16:00

that state policy um because that's Equity of bearing

1:16:05

um Transit oriented development got it I understand the the connection

1:16:10

now uh Carolyn yeah um you know I regardless of what kind of

1:16:16

housing we might I just think this policy uh uh asks us to advocate for programs that

1:16:23

promote safety equity and sustainability in transportation so I think it's good

1:16:28

policy okay

1:16:34

um anybody else have any comments on this I I would say I'm probably not um

1:16:40

educated enough to give any additional commentary Kate

1:16:46

yeah just um working on the housing work group um and and being at that last Planning

1:16:52

Commission meeting we are we have a mandate now from the state

1:16:57

however that gets resolved to address equity in housing and I don't see how we do that not concurrently with

1:17:04

Transportation so I agree that this is a good policy and uh we should be

1:17:10

consistent um how that gets resolved the specifics of it um

1:17:16

you know I think there's a reason the statement is vague because there's a lot that's coming down from the state that's new and um

1:17:25

I I think we kind of need to roll with the diet a little bit here Victor

1:17:35

apologies I have a relatively unstable connection here um but I'll be quick

1:17:40

um I agree I agree um uh

1:17:45

I'll just I'll read status uh his uh concerns but I'm with Adam on this one

1:17:56

okay um you were cutting out a little bit there but we heard that you concur with uh Adam so I think that hopefully

1:18:03

suffices for the uh uh intent of your comment

1:18:08

um okay does that Michael we've gotten enough

1:18:14

consist like enough uh

1:18:19

so uh let me all right maybe Adam can you summarize uh did you have a specific

1:18:25

change you're advocating for or is it really more just a concern that you had around the policy as a whole I guess the

1:18:33

the concern is as as written I would read it it would require the city to

1:18:38

advocate for any state policies that um assert they they promote Equity

1:18:46

um whether or not it's a policy a state policy that you know the

1:18:52

residents of Mercer Island agree with I think it would have it would put the

1:18:58

city in a corner and require them to support it okay base chair Murphy

1:19:06

uh seeing this is in the transportation element

1:19:12

um I think I understand Adam's concerned uh but I don't think that would bind the

1:19:20

city to oppose or to attempt to influence uh various housing

1:19:27

um laws that might come down the pike I think that would be a stretch given

1:19:35

the nature of comp plans and their uh aspirational

1:19:42

focus and vagueness I just don't see that as being something that is as

1:19:47

handcuffing the city from taking different positions

1:19:58

um okay well let me uh since I want to give Michael clear guidance here

1:20:04

um I see two options which is keep it as is or uh make some changes I don't think

1:20:11

we need to wholesale remove this but at least change some of the language to address uh Adam's concerns uh so let me

1:20:19

ask this is there a consensus to retain uh the language of 5.4 as it was

1:20:27

presented um show me a thumbs up if you have

1:20:32

so I've got four that um that support that and then

1:20:39

um are there any number just for clarity who is uh advocating a change in the

1:20:46

language here um two and I know Victor um has frozen

1:20:53

but uh I know he agreed with Adam so um

1:20:58

uh uh so it looks like what we'll all suggest the same as before which is

1:21:05

um oops I lost my screen what I'll suggest is the same as before is for the

1:21:10

draft Michael let's leave it in the way it is um and Adam if you have some specific

1:21:15

language that you want to propose during um the deliberation a portion of this

1:21:21

feel free to bring that forward and we can have a stronger conversation around it

1:21:27

great okay thank you moving out of the goals and policies section and then

1:21:33

deliver the technical content here moving on down I'm waiting for the point

1:21:38

where you can just fly through about six pages yes you get your wish right here

1:21:44

uh moving down to page what was 14 has now been bumped to 15.

1:21:50

um okay uh sorry one second Kate did you have a question

1:21:59

I don't want to ruin your night here with more fun but my two comments were related to policy 12. okay so I don't

1:22:08

know if we want to consider those now or yeah let's go ahead and do that and then

1:22:13

we'll since we were right there

1:22:20

okay where is my mail

1:22:30

and I think Allison sent this out um so I was proposing under

1:22:37

transportation you want me to speak yeah okay I was proposing under

1:22:43

transportation element goal 12 that we should establish up her prioritized

1:22:48

implementation plan and timeline for periodic review of The Pedestrian and

1:22:54

bicycle facilities plan and the reason that I propose that is

1:23:00

because there is no implementation plan for um The Pedestrian bicycle facilities

1:23:07

Plan and there's a lot of confusion in the public about um what are the priorities when when are

1:23:12

things going to get done first next last and when are they scheduled to get done um and I think what that does is it

1:23:19

leaves it subject to a little bit of political whim rather than what uh been

1:23:24

planning planning for things to be done in a sensible order just to clarify you're specifically uh

1:23:32

recommendation is to policy 12.2 is that uh not specific to 12.2 just somewhere

1:23:39

in in there and maybe it gets added to that or

1:23:46

it could get added 12.2 .2 you know it does talk about implemented pedestrian bicycle

1:23:52

facilities plan it doesn't you're referring to uh commit to periodic

1:23:57

updates um maybe putting a quantifying I yeah I was I was proposing actually developing

1:24:05

an implementation plan this just says implement and so I'm proposing develop a

1:24:10

prioritized implementation plan and timeline and let that have periodic review

1:24:19

okay so let me I I am understanding where you're going with this and I don't

1:24:25

know if Allison you want to chime in on this um uh just where that sort of language

1:24:32

so if I think about the role of the comp plan which is to make a statement around

1:24:38

like we should take this action around implementing this thing but the comp

1:24:43

plan really shouldn't get into the details of what that looks like and do

1:24:49

we have other examples because I know there are other places where we've used similar language but it's usually drawn

1:24:56

out as a part of the code right Allison versus like the language that she's specifying is more code language that we

1:25:04

would put around sort of how we prioritize and Implement versus just

1:25:09

this being the direction that we shall implement this I mean I would say it can

1:25:15

be done either way um we've actually been talking about this exact thing the staff have a bunch

1:25:21

behind the scenes related to the housing element the economic development element um

1:25:28

you know where does it make sense to have implementation policies

1:25:33

or timelines or schedules or you know budget kind of information and

1:25:40

I think where we're Landing in that conversation is that we should have some general language in the comp plan that

1:25:47

refers to you know the city should adopt an implementation strategy

1:25:52

that includes priorities timeline Etc

1:25:58

um and this should be reviewed as a part of the biennial budget every two years

1:26:05

so that we can you know look at funding priorities and you know look at what's

1:26:11

in the plan and figure out how it can fit into the budget you know in every simple way so

1:26:17

we were drafting some language for those elements that might work here I think

1:26:24

but really I'm also thinking the the bicycle and pedestrian

1:26:30

facilities plan is an implementation document it's just that the one we have now is very

1:26:37

outdated and it doesn't include any prioritization or strategy around

1:26:44

how the facilities that are shown there should be actually built and so I think

1:26:49

my recommendation would be when we update that plan it should include this

1:26:54

information it should include a priority list it should include you know kind of

1:27:00

phases or some kind of schedule for how these would be implemented I would have just drawn in two cents I

1:27:07

would agree generally agree with Allison I do know uh to your question about where these things are often I can speak

1:27:12

to that the city code does have a few uh language in there about how

1:27:18

often it'll update and monitor things such as City's concurrency program there's a few places in there that do

1:27:25

place every so often the city will you know update the concurrency uh tracking

1:27:31

system okay Carolyn

1:27:37

um during the uh in the docket last fall there was a proposal to update the bike

1:27:45

ped plan every eight years and that it needed to be done in concert with the

1:27:51

arrival of Light Rail so I guess the bike ped Plan update is coming up shortly if I understand correctly

1:27:58

because I think the council did adopt that so oddly enough uh this kind of comes up

1:28:04

also in our parks and open space policies which is uh policy 20.1 in the land use element

1:28:12

there actually is something there that says that you know Parks and Rec and bikes and ped plans

1:28:19

should be updated periodically but it doesn't say when so that's a little bit of a you know odd

1:28:24

for it to be there perhaps um but um

1:28:30

so I also wanted to say that um Allison your comment that the implementation of

1:28:36

the plan is something that's probably going to be in the bike ped plan which is adopted by reference seems that that

1:28:42

will cover uh implementation and then those things appear in the transportation Improvement

1:28:48

plan every year they get added in and funded right according to those priorities

1:28:54

correct yeah yeah so like we right now the transportation Improvement plan includes

1:29:01

an update to the bike in ped master plan for I believe it's starting in 2016 and you know allocates a big chunk of

1:29:07

funding for that and so 2016. sorry 2026. um

1:29:13

so you know that'll kind of move through the tip over the next few years until we get to the biennial budget for for 2026

1:29:22

when you know the funds will actually be allocated to go do the work so by updating the bike and Pad in 2026 all

1:29:29

right I believe that's the right year I know it's out not as soon as I uh

1:29:35

understood from the policy language but okay uh anyway that's my two cents worth

1:29:42

thank you I'm Kate

1:29:48

likes likes Allison and others are gonna figure out where that idea might need to

1:29:53

go and hopefully we don't lose the idea entirely and then I had one more in goal

1:29:59

12. if we're ready to move on yeah if I can just close the loop on on the last thing there and it sounds like based on

1:30:06

your last comment my suggestion was going to be Allison um if this is being thought about more

1:30:12

broadly around just what I'll call framework language like I think we've in

1:30:17

the past had a um like very directive like this is what

1:30:22

the plan should be and look like versus more language around like a framework as

1:30:28

you put it like you should have priorities in this and a defined timeline but we don't Define it

1:30:34

in the document so it sounds like you're working on some broader language for the housing element when that's complete it

1:30:40

might be worth just looking at how some of that could be transferred to some of these other elements I'm guessing this

1:30:48

isn't going to be the only one um that's exactly what I was going to suggest I think that sounds like a great

1:30:53

plan yeah so I would suggest that's sort of how we should uh move uh forward with

1:30:59

that so but thank you Kate for bringing that up um so go ahead Kate for your second one

1:31:05

okay okay so my next one is I notice we do have studies in the comp plan and so

1:31:11

my next one was study opportunities to expand electric bicycle infrastructure near Light Rail and in town center

1:31:21

is that a proposed policy yes oh okay

1:31:28

um and so 12.6 yeah I don't know if folks have been

1:31:33

able to look at the email but essentially it was the

1:31:38

proposal to add an element that as Kate said to

1:31:45

um add language that's that directs the city to study opportunities to expand

1:31:50

electric bicycle infrastructure near Light Rail and Town Center do you want to talk at all about that as far as

1:31:58

a well I think the intent is clear and then my follow-up question for staff

1:32:03

will be um is this covered anywhere else and if not like does it make sense to include

1:32:10

this from from your perspective so um Kate if you have any additional comments you can start

1:32:17

I think the intent's pretty clear the the wave of e-bikes has come to Mercer Island and there's not infrastructure

1:32:24

for it and with light rail coming online shortly I think we're going to see a lot more people

1:32:29

um using uh transit to get to and from

1:32:35

um and I think a lot of folks are going to lean on e-bikes as that last mile solution

1:32:41

um and then if we are adding another thousand units and most of them are going to be concentrated in town center

1:32:46

you know I think those all the more reason to to consider it whether or not it's a good

1:32:54

good use of funds yeah uh either Michael or uh Allison do you

1:33:00

guys have thoughts on this and and an appropriate answer could be like we need to think about it and

1:33:06

come back but yeah I think big picture you know I think what these goals and policies are intended to do is you know

1:33:13

guide the city's decisions around Transportation I'm a little I know there

1:33:19

is one about study I guess I'd um maybe not that would be an intent of

1:33:24

a to-do list um and be a little below I'm not suggesting that's not a good uh

1:33:29

suggestion um and we could add it here but but I'm just saying in general I think the intent of this is to be kind of guiding

1:33:36

the decision the decisions of the city around Transportation um and it wouldn't have to be in here to

1:33:44

be you know something the city pursues unnecessarily but that's just my my

1:33:49

initial reaction to to the thought yeah just looking at this um if I can

1:33:55

offer maybe something to think about and then and then we can move on um item 12.3 study opportunities for the use of

1:34:02

innovative methods for pedestrian Crossings colored textured Pavements within the city Etc

1:34:07

um I'm almost thinking about what Kate just said and maybe this should be broadened to study opportunities for the

1:34:14

use of innovative methods for Last Mile pedestrian facilities right and we could cite

1:34:21

examples like pedestrian Crossings electric bike facilities right but it

1:34:26

broadens it to like we should have a policy that we continue to study opportunities for Innovative

1:34:33

methods to solve some of these last mile problems and it includes a number of

1:34:38

these other items so I don't know if Kate that would meet sort of the the

1:34:45

spirit of what you were going for um and I think it would frankly be

1:34:50

relevant in sort of update being that item that's on there

1:34:56

yeah I mean I think it would be uh it would be a compromise from uh from my

1:35:02

end I think if it's not strongly worded and stand alone it's not going to happen explicitly

1:35:08

um but I understand the notion of having it there

1:35:15

um in a in a combined effort um I think there's I think there's folks

1:35:20

that uh think we're gonna miss out on this um miss out on an opportunity with

1:35:25

this Redevelopment that's gonna and the infill development that's going to happen if we don't explicitly try to

1:35:31

make this part of that yeah

1:35:36

I can compromise um this is one of the sort of frustrations when you have a topic which

1:35:44

is dealt with by another plan a plan adopted by reference you're always

1:35:49

puzzled as to well should we put something here about that or should we wait until that other thing gets done in

1:35:54

four years from now so I kind of I like what Kate is proposing I think if it's in there I I

1:36:00

think it should be separate because it's a bit of a separate topic and you know while we while we like to not

1:36:06

get too specific in uh comp planes this is a really hot topic and it's a really beneficial topic

1:36:14

we if we can make it great for people to hop on an electric bike and go get on

1:36:19

light rail that's really cool for our climate impact I'd be I'd be favor of it

1:36:27

yeah I mean totally understand both um uh statements there and I guess the

1:36:34

only thing that I would say is you know the next time we go back and review this language it's going to be seven years

1:36:41

from now and and what I dislike about policy documents

1:36:47

like that that become so specific is that um sometimes the technology or the

1:36:54

methods can outpace the um uh you know outpace the the policy

1:37:02

Direction when it's when it's that specific and so I hate for us to restrict ourselves

1:37:09

um you know I'd make the argument the thing that's actually better for the environment than electric bikes is

1:37:14

non-electric bikes um and so you know there's there's a

1:37:20

whole lot of ways to um promote um

1:37:25

you know promote all of this which is why I branded as like this to me is actually more it's less of an

1:37:32

environmental issue other than encouraging people to use um uh public transit but it's again I

1:37:40

I'm in favor of the broader language around Last Mile versus the specificity

1:37:46

of it and then we can Define that um in uh on the projects that get

1:37:52

proposed through you know anything like the the tip or or other stuff so

1:37:58

foreign since we are gonna have another look at this

1:38:03

um can we ask for that to be um have an option of having it as a a combined one versus

1:38:12

a separate one and then we can have a clear discussion on the specific language in our next meeting

1:38:19

is it possible to do that and then we choose we vote or choose which one we want to put forward

1:38:26

are you okay with that approach Michael Allison can you um maybe

1:38:31

clarify what our kind of schedule is going forward um as far as are we going to have

1:38:37

another yeah you can just talk a little bit about the schedule of next check-ins yeah so I mean I'm just you know reading

1:38:45

the room here we're an hour and 15 minutes into this conversation I think we've probably got some time to go still

1:38:50

on this element so um it does seem like we might need to have another discussion to kind of close

1:38:56

the loop on some of these items so let's let's just go ahead and plan to do that

1:39:02

um schedule wise our next meeting is at the end of October October 26th

1:39:08

um we will also have the docket to review that night which historically has been a

1:39:14

quite lengthy conversation so I think we'll have to do a little thinking about whether we want to do all those items in

1:39:19

the same night or if we want to um hold the third touch on the transportation element for a later

1:39:26

meeting maybe November um just you know in the interest of time on

1:39:32

that meeting so okay but dancer your your main question

1:39:37

yes we can definitely uh take a shot at incorporating the comments we heard here

1:39:43

about coming back with a an optional combined one that gets a little more At Last Mile like you mentioned

1:39:50

yeah and I think um the commissioner was suggesting maybe can we have two

1:39:56

alternates like what would the language look like if it were Standalone and what would the language look like if we

1:40:02

broadened it into a single okay I like that idea

1:40:10

and who knows maybe we end up uh actually adopting both of those so

1:40:18

why not do the work now um good okay uh two uh uh Allison's

1:40:25

point I I was actually looking at uh time check um and we've got sort of a natural break

1:40:31

here in about 15 minutes just from the clock perspective um I know uh commissioner boatsman has a

1:40:38

number of uh items she wanted to cover off uh Michael how much more towards the

1:40:44

end of this document do you think we need to go through can can we be uh efficient at just looking at the high

1:40:50

level ones you know things that maybe that was consensus with the comments

1:40:56

um and maybe we can skip over like if if there was agreeance from the staff on the comments that were made in the

1:41:02

proposal and maybe just go into the ones that you guys need Clarity on yeah I mean I leave that I don't want to

1:41:09

make the decision of which ones are um you know important to cover and which

1:41:14

ones are not we have about 10 left I I do think that now that they're progressing into more the technical issues and not some

1:41:21

of the subtle language of goals and policies I do think we can get through them a little quicker great um let's see if we can get through those

1:41:28

so that we can uh decide uh uh maybe we can take a quick break and then come back to commissioner boatsman's comments

1:41:35

uh in a few minutes so if you want to go ahead and continue my goal and then we'll

1:41:41

okay I do see I just see a hand up there oh sorry Adam go ahead I was going to say I'm in the interest of time I

1:41:47

believe I'm responsible for all the remaining comments and the staff response addresses all of my comments so

1:41:55

I have no more um no no more questions I want to discuss on the on

1:42:01

the transportation one from the from those questions okay that's that's great you know there

1:42:07

was just to clarify what Adam said mostly which is kind of some more questions that we provide responses we

1:42:14

did have one minor change but um I think it's all pretty straightforward if in the sake of time if we want to uh

1:42:21

move on great well if everyone else is good with

1:42:26

that given that um Adam uh is happy with the responses that he

1:42:31

received I see that there's a couple of um items I haven't had a chance to look

1:42:38

through these Carolyn so I don't know how lengthy and in depth that they are

1:42:44

um uh so is is there are you organized uh

1:42:50

with your with what you've got to be able to walk us through some of these uh

1:42:56

top to bottom or do you want us to take a quick break so that you can organize how you want to present all this stuff

1:43:02

or um I would just say do people want to take a break go ahead and take a break and if they don't want to take a break

1:43:09

I'll start in so um I I couldn't really comment on that oh well I just I want to know whether or

1:43:14

not you're prepared to like I know sometimes you ask for a moment to sort of prepare your the organization of your

1:43:21

comments to go through it I'm I'm ready for addressing my comments

1:43:27

as as per usual okay um and I I haven't seen the extent of

1:43:32

them like or how how thorough are these is it going to

1:43:37

take us a while look like I

1:43:42

I sent the on the screen and we can just look at

1:43:48

them so okay special why don't I suggest this I'm looking it

1:43:53

looks like there's like four or five maybe um individual documents correct

1:44:00

I like to propose a break I mean we've basically taken a break from the document now anyway why don't we just

1:44:06

take a break and come back to it great so um why don't we do that let's uh is

1:44:11

747 why don't we take 13 minutes uh we'll come back at the top of the hour and then we'll walk through

1:44:18

um commissioner boatsman's comments and Allison are you gonna be okay walking us

1:44:23

through the documents that she said so we can put them up on the screen yeah I've got them here and I'll I'll

1:44:29

get them opened up during the break so that I can kind of shuffle them around on the screen awesome great okay see you

1:44:36

all in uh 13 minutes

1:44:42

check check sibling siblings check check five by five

1:44:50

all right uh thank you everyone for returning looks like we're waiting for Carolyn

1:44:59

foreign there she is um okay so uh Allison do you know the

1:45:08

intended order um

1:45:13

looks like there were several documents that were sort of by I just went ahead

1:45:18

and copied them all into one document everything that pertained to the transportation element so that we could

1:45:24

kind of just scroll through goal three is the first one

1:45:29

I'll go ahead and share what I've got here

1:45:34

so I just put the whole there just for context and the new thing I'm proposing

1:45:40

is just the part in blue there um this uh goal seems to pertain kind of

1:45:47

to the general impact of Transportation on the environment and in neighborhoods

1:45:53

big impact of transportation is just heat and

1:46:00

um also the opportunity opportunity for using large areas of Rights of way that

1:46:07

are currently you know quite often have uh Lawns

1:46:12

planted out to the pavement and then maybe sometimes rocks there to encourage people not to drive on the lawns

1:46:20

um so um I'm trying to get at rights of way and

1:46:27

um you know this this matter when I've explored bringing it up before it's

1:46:32

always been well that's actually a transportation matter so to me this is the place in the transportation element

1:46:39

where um how rights of way are used can be

1:46:45

considered so um the idea here is that um

1:46:50

in many cities um the

1:46:55

City welcomes the planting of trees in unused areas the right-of-way in other

1:47:01

words these are areas that are not paved which are sometimes you know 20 and 30

1:47:06

feet wide next to the pavement more commonly more like 15 maybe in in

1:47:13

residential areas 15 to 20. so um

1:47:18

this this is a proposal to encourage the city to welcome the planting of trees in

1:47:25

the rights of way with their permission because there's all kinds of utilities down there and you can't there's lots of

1:47:32

places where it's not appropriate to plant a tree so um this would get at the heat that's

1:47:40

generated by the pavement in neighborhoods encourage might be the wrong word I I

1:47:47

don't know if that's I'm trying to think of a different word Maybe um evaluate the feasibility of

1:47:56

I would just mention briefly I've gone around here a bit but um city of Seattle for example has

1:48:02

something called trees for neighborhoods and they issue the permits to people they actually give the trees

1:48:09

and we'll tell them where they can plant them in the right-of-way and then there's a volunteer group that also

1:48:15

works with the people that receive the trees and help them with the planting similar program in Portland

1:48:22

so anyway that's what it's about um might be a better way to word it but

1:48:27

um trying to reduce the impact of roads and neighborhoods

1:48:36

um uh I guess before going to everybody else um staff do you have any direct uh I

1:48:43

know you're just digesting this in real time but either Michael or Allison do

1:48:49

you have any immediate comment to that before I go to Adam

1:48:57

I I don't really I think I definitely see

1:49:03

the the reason for the policy and and that makes sense

1:49:10

okay um I guess let me go Adam you had your um hand up I know you took it down are

1:49:16

you I oh no I I took it down because you were asking Staff first

1:49:22

um I I like it um one thought might be just or to

1:49:27

articulate that you know where it doesn't impact safety um concern would be like you know line of sight or

1:49:33

blocking a stop sign but I I I support adding this as a goal

1:49:39

I would like to comment briefly on what you just said Adam um you know there's probably any number

1:49:45

of things that could go wrong with planning okay here and there so I was

1:49:51

wondering if you thought that perhaps the phrase with the permission of the city

1:49:57

um would address that because they're not going to allow it if it's true you

1:50:02

know um yeah I guess go ahead

1:50:08

oh I was gonna say yeah uh the moment as I suggest safety is I think we were one of the new goals was like improving

1:50:15

safety like I understand we don't need to specify oh where the roots aren't going to destroy Subterranean

1:50:21

infrastructure or tear up the road but I thought perhaps safety might be worth mentioning but as I I like it certainly

1:50:29

doesn't hurt adding it I it certainly doesn't mean so I appreciate it Victor

1:50:36

hopefully my question will get heard um question for Carolyn just for

1:50:42

clarification is this an additional goal or is this an amendment and an addition

1:50:49

to 3.3 this is an additional additional policy

1:50:54

under goal number three minimize negative Transportation impacts on environment so it's adding a policy I

1:51:02

put it between 3.3 and 3.4 because I thought it read well there

1:51:09

so it would be a like a 3.5 or whatever we would shoot things around but yeah

1:51:14

it'd probably make it 3.4 and change 3.4 to 3.5 if if this were included got it

1:51:20

thank you commissioner Curry who would uh who would be on the hook to

1:51:26

pay for any of the maintenance and damage repair and everything else and anything else that might occur from the

1:51:31

planting of trees too close to power lines or or cable lines or whatever like that is the city responsible for that

1:51:38

well typically in a program like this the city issues a permit to to plant the

1:51:44

trees so they basically are saying you know you can't plant it they're not going to less you plant it where it's a

1:51:50

problem so um um uh but you know that that's something

1:51:55

that can be explored you know this is just to open the door so these types of

1:52:01

programs are going on all over the place but we don't have a policy in our comp

1:52:06

plan that supports the idea so I look at a policy as we need to just

1:52:12

open the door and then if the feasible means of doing it can be worked out

1:52:18

um you know then you can do it but if it doesn't you don't have to do it you know it's just

1:52:26

so uh something that comes to mind for me and and I certainly

1:52:33

um uh uh appreciating them aligned with the uh intent here

1:52:40

um the way I've seen this done before is typically through the development of

1:52:45

a street tree program and it includes a number of things like how

1:52:54

um you know unimproved rights of way are um planted who can do it how that's

1:53:01

happened and I and it's and at least in my experience is done as a part of a

1:53:07

broader Street to be program that would be not for that goes beyond just you know

1:53:15

unused um rights of way so I'm wondering if this is an opportunity for us in some

1:53:20

ways almost promote something a little stronger which is rather than

1:53:25

encouraging uh the planting of trees but rather be more directive which is

1:53:34

um develop uh you know or or you know develop or create a street

1:53:42

street program that could incur the error that could include a number of these elements

1:53:49

um and as a goal to me that makes a lot more sense of like we have a goal of

1:53:56

developing a street tree program that's going to address a number of these um

1:54:02

a number of these issues and can have a number of elements to it that would be

1:54:07

just a lot more comprehensive um over the long run so for me I'm I'm

1:54:13

inclined to take that direction um because this to me is is a little

1:54:19

ambiguous although I completely understand the intent um so anyhow those are my thoughts and

1:54:27

that's interesting I mean I like what you're saying you know you're always weighing with being prescriptive being

1:54:33

you know opening a door or being prescriptive but I uh yeah I think

1:54:39

developing a street tree program is um leaves a lot of flexibility it's

1:54:45

basically saying there's a heck of a lot of real estate out there it could be being used for value

1:54:52

to the to the to the citizens to the to the environment um for temperature control and you know

1:54:59

can be figured out how to do it lots of lots of models anyway good good

1:55:04

input um commissioner Curry did you still have your hand up from before or is that a

1:55:09

new hint um okay great Adam I'll go back to you all right um yeah and uh chair Hubble in

1:55:17

response to yours it's that starts to me to sound a little potentially overhead heavy

1:55:23

um things might get bogged down and developing this plan and maybe some people may see that and think oh well I

1:55:29

don't want to pay for that um I I'll I'll stick I'll suggest I like the encourage planting because it could

1:55:35

just be you know someone says I'd like to plant a tree here and get sent to the City Arborist says sure and that could

1:55:42

be it without without a plan without a study um I like to open the door and see what

1:55:47

happens as opposed to prescribe a more formal path forward suggestion

1:55:53

yeah I mean I I guess the the I'm going to argue the opposite which is the way

1:55:59

you're present like the way it's being presented there is every situation has

1:56:05

to be um dealt with as a one-off consultative like engage a bunch of

1:56:11

people where the street tree plan um as I have seen them in the past is

1:56:17

prescriptive in the sense that it says these are the conditions these are the like here are all of the the

1:56:28

um Criterion like this is where the city would like

1:56:33

this activity to happen this is how it should happen and so there's actually less interaction which is a lot cheaper

1:56:42

for the city in the long run and so there may be a little bit of overhead but you know it is in my view the role

1:56:49

of I don't want to say the government to add bureaucracy but to certainly have a

1:56:56

very structured way of managing um managing any sort of development or

1:57:03

Improvement which I think this would fall under um it would be like saying we're going to have a policy for building houses

1:57:10

where we don't publish a building code and we just say well come to us with your plan and we'll go look and tell you

1:57:16

whether or not um it's going to work well on your lot or not like we have to have in my mind a

1:57:24

structured plan that says these are the tenants by which we are going to

1:57:29

um and the the tenants that we're going to use to

1:57:35

um Advocate or at least allow this development to happen and then

1:57:40

um and sort of go from there so that's all I'm suggesting is that we should

1:57:45

just be more explicit about how that's documented versus just a goal that says we want to

1:57:53

encourage planting um to me that's uh it's incomplete to me so okay

1:58:04

hi there um I used to actually I had a little experience in this because I used to work for a non-profit that partnered

1:58:10

with the city of Seattle to um do a community Street tree planting program

1:58:16

um and I also was briefly the urban Forester for the city of Seattle and there might be like a little hybrid

1:58:22

ground here um because I'm hearing both sides of this argument you know anytime you have

1:58:27

a program and it's volunteers volunteers cost money you know and and you've got

1:58:32

to do care and feeding and in this case we're asking residents to volunteer and

1:58:38

plant trees um in property they own but the city has a right-of-way over

1:58:44

um so I agree with chair Hubble that it needs guidelines um otherwise it's going to create like a

1:58:52

some burden but I think there are guidelines out there that we can adopt that are very uh simple and

1:58:58

straightforward for example city of Seattle has a right tree right place program and they have um you know all

1:59:05

this guidance that's pre-packaged that has types of trees that can be planted under power lines types of trees that can be planted in tall areas how much

1:59:12

width of sidewalk do you need to plant a tree with this type of roots so I think I think we could probably hybridize the

1:59:18

ideas and um save save some administrative overhead by by adopting guidelines that are

1:59:26

clearly established on cities around us and that gives that framework they even

1:59:32

have special permits documents prepared for that kind of thing so it would be

1:59:37

some overhead for the city to get it started and put it in place but it wouldn't need to be like a

1:59:45

like a a ground up program if that makes sense

1:59:52

great input everybody um I have a little WeChat of background

1:59:58

to add based on what I've heard here um I took some training with the city of Seattle's trees for neighborhood program

2:00:04

online training just to kind of see more about how it works and I think Dan makes

2:00:09

a good point when you have very clear roles established in a program it can make things a whole lot

2:00:16

less hassle and use less staff time so in Seattle for example the city buys the

2:00:22

trees you know and they have certain trees they'll allow you to plant and then they open up the application period

2:00:29

at a certain time people send in their application and request their tree

2:00:34

and then there's um they wait for the weather to turn so that it's time to plant trees and then you have to come

2:00:40

and pick up your tree there's a volunteer group that works very closely with they're from the

2:00:45

center from Urban Horticulture and they actually go out there and if a person

2:00:51

wants help with their tree they go out and help them they give them one of those bags that lets moisture come into

2:00:58

the ground around the tree and they get to keep that for a year or two and the volunteers check back one year later to

2:01:05

see how their tree is doing and give them advice so the city is involved in hey we've got a bunch of trees here over

2:01:11

at Luther Burbank Nursery you can come and get them you have to apply get your free tree

2:01:17

and then you know you plant it and you request help they give you instructions on how to plant it

2:01:23

Etc so anyway people um you know it's very efficient that way

2:01:29

um and efficiencies of scale by by doing it that way so it's a public-private partnership so I'm just hoping to see

2:01:35

you know this be a possibility for Mercer Island so let me suggest this for for

2:01:43

um time and uh Michael and um Allison tell me if you're okay with this

2:01:49

um maybe just get consensus from the group around the idea of this concept

2:01:57

being included um somewhere here I also have questions

2:02:04

about whether or not this is um best in the transportation element or in one of the other elements but um for the sake

2:02:11

of the discussion we'll assume that it's correct here

2:02:16

um if if we provide guidance that we want

2:02:22

some sort of language that sort of gets to this without trying to word Smith

2:02:28

whether it's the encourage of planting trees or creating a program and there's obviously a lot of things there but

2:02:36

if if I get consensus from the group like do you have enough to go forward and sort of maybe create something or do

2:02:42

you need more any more specific direction from us

2:02:50

I think so I think I think we've heard enough I do think it needs a little bit of work it needs to be I think it needs

2:02:56

something about clarification of whether it's the public the city's responsibility a city's lead

2:03:03

or the private lead I think it's just maybe it's missing a little bit of that clarification in the way it's written

2:03:08

now but um Allison I think we could I think we could fine tune this a little bit too

2:03:14

yeah I think we can come up with something that works and I think it probably makes sense here in the

2:03:19

transportation element given that we're talking about Street trees I could see an argument to put it other a couple of

2:03:26

other places too but for now let's just run with this and we can we can wordsman something

2:03:32

so um given that like is there consensus do I have at least four people that are in

2:03:38

favor of at least for our draft that goes to the public including some

2:03:45

language around this um to include as a part of this

2:03:51

part of this element okay all right well I see at least four

2:03:58

so um yeah if you guys don't mind uh pulling something together there's obviously a whole lot of detail and it's

2:04:05

not about actually creating the plan it's just we're gonna have a policy that

2:04:10

says that we strive to have a plan and then we'll have to deal with the down

2:04:16

the road impacts of okay how do we actually go about doing that and that could be a longer process but at least

2:04:22

the policy can be there that will direct us in that direction yeah I'll I'll touch base with Ross too

2:04:30

about whether or not this has an intersection with the climate action plan and you know whether or not there's

2:04:35

some way that we should be referencing that so far they don't have anything in the cap draft on that but I'm still you

2:04:42

know pushing that angle as well because you know heat island impact or heat island effect whatever

2:04:49

um thank you for your input um before we close the others I'll just say most of

2:04:54

my others are much more brief uh but I also want to add that in regards to my

2:05:00

fellow Commissioners my bringing this stuff the way I am here um I did ask for permission on this I

2:05:05

checked with Adam towards the end of August and uh said that for me August 31st wasn't going to work out too well

2:05:12

and wondered what you know if there was some ability to continue to bring policies he

2:05:18

just said go ahead and bring him to the to the meeting so so that's what I'm doing here so I hope yep works out okay

2:05:23

so let's go to the next one yeah number five uh this one is just a tiny um change in

2:05:31

the language of policy 5.6 um

2:05:36

again I I think a lot about mitigating the effects of climate change again this this idea of trees along the rights of

2:05:44

way is it's mitigating so in this policy we have improving air quality reducing

2:05:49

air pollution and promoting clean Transportation but we don't have anything about mitigating what we're

2:05:54

already dealing with and I really think we need need to do that so I would just suggest adding that phrase there

2:06:01

okay are there any objections to that

2:06:06

not a strong one but I see directives related to climate change and mitigate

2:06:12

uh to me it's duplicative but I'm I'm not opposed to it okay and this is all

2:06:18

just again for the next draft that's going to go in front of the public so it probably serves as a great discussion

2:06:24

point with uh uh the public hearing so

2:06:29

uh okay hearing no uh Discord there uh let's go ahead to the next one yep 7.9

2:06:35

here I am proposing alternate language for

2:06:42

7.9 that is there because I just find 7.9 to be extremely confusing the way

2:06:48

it's worded so this is my bid to make 7.9 more

2:06:54

simple and understandable what do you think in um in the context here Allison uh or

2:07:03

Michael is in in the original language the avoidance of closing streets is that

2:07:12

um permanent closures like through blocks or is that just a temporary

2:07:17

closures for events or things what is actually meant by the closing of streets I am my interpretation is permanent

2:07:25

closure like cul-de-sac a street is what what this referring to

2:07:30

the city um I can speak for some some staff where they periodically get

2:07:35

requests to want to close the street for on whatever reason um and this would just kind of help them

2:07:42

support for the for the most part we really try to not do that if we if we you know if we close it close the

2:07:48

connection you know we create further out of Direction travel um if there's an incident you know it's

2:07:54

longer emergency vehicle response times you know there's a whole bunch of uh more VMT vehicle models travel you know

2:08:01

there's it's just a kind of this is a a request the staff gave us to have have this in

2:08:08

there it's pretty common for a lot of cities or I say most cities have something to this effect

2:08:13

so are you discourage cul-de-sacs is that what you said just the closing of streets yeah that would kind of create

2:08:20

something similar to not to get rid of cul-de-sacs but to

2:08:25

uh close close Street connections this typically happens in neighborhoods

2:08:31

where there's a lot of cut through traffic avoiding backups on major thoroughfares think of Bellevue where a

2:08:38

lot of the streets off of 148th actually don't go through and are artificially closed off to prevent people from

2:08:44

cutting through a neighborhood I would say it's probably not a huge problem here the

2:08:50

um I think the intent in both of these alternates is the same

2:08:55

um and maybe what I'm reading here is like is there a way to clean up the language it does seem a little wordy uh

2:09:03

in the original statement so yeah if it's just reworded so that it makes I I

2:09:09

if it just is reworded so it's very clear I'm I'm happy I just can't make sense of it the way it's written

2:09:16

okay okay I can yeah there's definitely again this would fall in the category of

2:09:22

working with what is out there yeah we can I think there's some cleanup we could do here all right thanks much

2:09:27

great I have something in nine the next page uh

2:09:33

okay now this one is a little bit more meaty uh this again is using the rights

2:09:39

of way um what we have in residential areas a lot of

2:09:45

uh is again um we have a small paved area down the road

2:09:51

and a lot of spare right-of-way next to that paved area now depending on where

2:09:58

the pavement is in the right-of-way you might get a nice big contribution to your front yard or not a very big

2:10:05

contribution in your front yard but basically this is is unused for the

2:10:10

pavement so a lot of a lot of times again people landscape right out to the

2:10:15

pavement and there's nowhere to park in front of their house there might be lawn

2:10:21

there with rocks in it or there just might be you know a whole wall of

2:10:26

landscape uh there so it's dangerous if you're a pedestrian you're walking along

2:10:34

um those people's guests are parked in a traffic lane right in front of their house because there's no parking strip in

2:10:41

front of that house um if their delivery vehicles come they're parked in the middle of the road

2:10:47

because there's no parking strip there um so I'm proposing a policy that

2:10:56

strives to minimize the blockage of traffic Lanes in residential neighborhoods

2:11:01

caused by lack of temporary roadside parking access so or this secondary wording

2:11:09

one more bit of background I'm going to give my house as an example um the pavement in my yard is probably

2:11:17

shoot it's probably 18 20 feet from my property I mean my property line is

2:11:24

about 18 20 feet from the pavement there's a bunch of space out there so we

2:11:30

have preserved a parking strip there of about 10 feet wide

2:11:35

now let's say a new house is built and I see this happening all the time brand new house three million dollar house

2:11:42

paved all the way out to the pave or landscaped Optical pavement if the city were to have a policy

2:11:49

that where feasible you protect a parking strip in front of your house

2:11:55

if it's not feasible and there is no right-of-way to use for that well that's fine you're off the hook but um that's what this is about

2:12:03

Adam I I could anticipate a potential

2:12:08

conflict with the encouraging of trees in the rights of way right good point I

2:12:15

thought um yeah so that I could see this you know and this this may I would I

2:12:22

would think yeah I understand the issue with blocking the road but I mean if someone's blocking the actual Lane

2:12:28

that's uh yeah that's a that would be a call to the police and have a vehicle towed right

2:12:35

um right now it um uh I I don't know what the law is about

2:12:40

parking your okay yeah I don't either we live on an arterial so

2:12:46

nobody cares Park on that um yeah I I like I like your earlier

2:12:53

one and I just see this one conflict with this unfortunately are you are you comfortable with people Landscaping

2:13:00

their yard all the way out to the pavement that's the question you have to ask

2:13:05

I mean from uh from a rain water and like you know

2:13:12

what storm water retention I would art I would think it's better to have some

2:13:17

sort of bushes or small shrubs preferable to just lawn or or even

2:13:23

someone having Turf right well um

2:13:28

you know I I would separate it from an environmental or in water you know absorption question so okay

2:13:35

okay let's say you have 10 houses on a block okay um maybe you know two houses have a

2:13:43

parking strip the next one has no parking strip next one might have a parking strip and so on down the block

2:13:49

maybe three or four of them have no parking strip right where when people come to their house

2:13:55

they're parked in the middle of the road or they're in front of my house it's fine it's not my property but

2:14:02

um you know I think this is a real loss of public value I really do and you know a

2:14:09

tree program and and preserving parking space I think are compatible but

2:14:16

you know has to be figured out okay so let me go to let me go to sorry

2:14:22

um adamu go to Victor and then Kate and then we'll come back

2:14:28

um I am admittedly relatively ignorant around this issue but I I don't think

2:14:36

these these are necessarily designated as parking

2:14:41

strips aren't they just generically public right away

2:14:47

and and wouldn't and so I'm not to me it

2:14:52

doesn't feel like this belongs in a transportation element and I I think to your point Carolyn

2:15:00

which you've made a couple of times which is are weakable are we comfortable with people putting

2:15:06

the lawn out all the way to the public right away stop making it their own to me that's it

2:15:14

that feels like a city property rights issue

2:15:20

um I know whether that falls in the area of code or code enforcement or just property rights it it'd feel odd to be

2:15:27

putting it well that's a that's a good question if

2:15:33

you look at the title of this goal balance the main maintenance of quality

2:15:38

Island neighborhoods with the needs of the Island's transportation system so for me I think you know I think there's

2:15:46

a resonance there with with this topic under that goal but you were asking um

2:15:52

[Music] um you mentioned putting in the lawn out to the right-of-way no the lawn is in the

2:15:59

right-of-way so people are using the public property for their landscape

2:16:06

and it's not available for parking temporary parking by the way right it's

2:16:12

not no we're not talking perfect and there is a Code Enforcement question

2:16:17

here if you want to put something in the public right away that is permanent like you're going to pour a little foundation

2:16:23

and install some sort of you know mailbox or you want to put in a a little

2:16:28

brick pile and put a light in the top of it or something you have to get a permit for that yeah that that's that's

2:16:34

different but when you're just putting your landscape out there and then when nobody's looking put some Boulders out

2:16:39

there um yeah that's there the city doesn't have a rule on on that so so

2:16:47

Kate I think this is a I think this is an

2:16:53

important issue to raise we live off 86 and this happens quite a bit

2:16:59

um we're near the high school and we have cars parking like practically in

2:17:05

the middle and it's an arterial it's crazy and so when kids walk to school

2:17:10

um they're dodging cars and trash cans and all the other things people leave in the right of way so I think

2:17:16

I think Carolyn's raised an important issue um I don't know

2:17:22

that I consider it as much a parking issue as a pedestrian safety issue

2:17:29

um in that I would want to strive to have sidewalks where people

2:17:35

are walking um so and and even if people plan stuff there

2:17:42

there's no it's not there is it still the right of way we can still take it back it just comes at significant legal expense sometimes so there's something

2:17:48

to be said for not allowing people to put you know discouraging people from putting stuff there

2:17:54

um I didn't the council just debate this it was related to the Ada plan

2:18:00

um Allison you might recall this um there was some discussion about whether

2:18:06

or not we should adopt an ADA plan and sidewalks and there was some concern

2:18:12

about the cost of that from a couple of the council members and the feasibility of of doing anything physical

2:18:19

I believe that was part of the tip program discussion um there's yeah I've been an ADA plan

2:18:27

kind of on the horizon for a while I also just wanted to clarify that the city does regulate improvements in the

2:18:34

right-of-way and if people want to put landscaping or rocks or

2:18:40

things like that um we often require an encroachment agreement that you know allows the city

2:18:46

to review the planned improvements and make sure that there's not conflicts with utilities or other City needs in

2:18:53

the right-of-way you know Allison I'm familiar with that section and I've discussed it with the

2:19:01

you know various people at the city that enforce it and when it comes to Landscaping bushes lawn

2:19:08

you know whatever you're going to plant out there they don't regulate that um if you're gonna put something there

2:19:15

that has some permanence to it you know I guess you know then then they do but

2:19:20

and then once the Landscaping is there they don't tell you to take it away they could and the part of the point of

2:19:27

the encouragement is they could if they need to access the utilities or do Road improvements well it does mention

2:19:34

um installation of a permanent nature is prohibited without a permit

2:19:40

but so I think the the what I want to get to here though is I think the this is actually a pretty big policy question

2:19:47

so if you look at the technical right of ways of every road and Carolyn we live

2:19:52

near each other so you look at um 72nd where I live the roadway I think

2:19:59

is 25 or 30 feet um like the paved roadway but the

2:20:04

right-of-way itself I think is 75 or 80 like more than double

2:20:09

um the the the paved travel Lane and so the policy question is like today

2:20:17

you walk through First Hill and it's really quaint and yes the streets are a little bit narrow

2:20:22

um but it feels very um developed and homey imagine a 45-foot

2:20:30

Barren travel Lane that's dedicated for parking um that we would be enforcing as a city

2:20:36

and the policy is the way that you're presenting it would basically

2:20:42

um go counter to I think a lot of your previous discussion which is we want to actually see that unused space used I

2:20:50

personally would rather see trees and bushes than cars in that space and if a

2:20:57

car is parked in the in the travel Lane in such a way that it is creating a

2:21:03

safety hazard it should be reported to the police and it will be actioned it

2:21:10

there's there's no um rule that says you can't park there

2:21:15

but there is rule that says that you cannot park in a way that that is unsafe

2:21:21

uh and creates a hazard even if it's in a legal spot and you're parking in a way that creates a hazard it's still not

2:21:27

legal so you know I think that there are tools that we could use or maybe inform the

2:21:35

public about around this issue but um I'll add on to this the

2:21:42

one of the um research projects that I did when I was in college in the late 90s was

2:21:49

actually studying the impacts of improved and unimproved roadways as far

2:21:54

as medians on the side and roadways that

2:22:01

are more of the design that we have in our neighborhood in First Hill or

2:22:06

similar to like what you'd see in Queen Anne where the roadways are narrow and traffic is or parking is actually

2:22:13

there's not a clear delineation between the travel Lane and where parking is at

2:22:19

the safety is actually a magnitude higher because the speeds are

2:22:25

drastically reduced because people have to drive slower in those neighborhoods because of the design and I know it's

2:22:33

counterintuitive but um I I I'm happy to dig up some of the

2:22:39

uh uh books and literature on um on sort of that phenomenon

2:22:47

um so I'm like I'm pretty like staunchly against the Improvement of our uh

2:22:54

medians for for a host of reasons but those are like my two big ones so what I think I'm

2:23:03

hearing from you though is as a group do we want to advocate for a policy change

2:23:08

and I think this is a very big one around how we're going to approach our

2:23:13

unimproved um rights of way around the city because by

2:23:19

stating making this statement I actually think it impels the city to

2:23:24

actually have a plan on what to do with it I don't know if I jump in here real

2:23:29

quick I would just reiterate the comment I heard from a previous commissioner uh this doesn't feel like a pot like the

2:23:36

I think there's value and once you the direction is decided to what you want to maybe make changes here but this feels

2:23:43

more like a city code um issue to really have any enforcement around it it feels uh like a municipal

2:23:51

code Street design standards development code in that place

2:23:56

um and to be really clearly defined versus you know using words like strive I just that's just my two cents on this

2:24:06

I think a policy here might be something like consider expanding

2:24:14

improvements to shoulders or right of ways

2:24:20

to provide parking additional parking in residential neighborhoods or something like that that's all I actually mean

2:24:25

Allison so thank you for that America I didn't actually mean you know

2:24:31

any sort of leaving the whole area as a parking strip I'm talking about

2:24:36

a new house is built part of their requirement is to leave

2:24:42

you know eight to ten feet of gravel for their for their FedEx truck to pull over

2:24:48

on or their UPS truck or their people who are coming for dinner because we can

2:24:54

say that it's not great for cars to park there but we all know they do come you know so um

2:25:01

uh and I think Kate was mentioning you know she was concerned about The Pedestrian and I guess I guess what I'm

2:25:08

getting at is because the vehicle is there it's a great threat to pedestrian because they got nowhere to go but in

2:25:14

the middle of the street so anyway I no I I was what Allison just said is kind of what I meant just like

2:25:22

you know try to preserve enough space for you

2:25:29

know pedestrians and temporary vehicles to have access to houses that's all I mean

2:25:34

yeah so um again it's an open door it's not specifying how to do it it's just like

2:25:40

you know this this is probably an area that needs some consideration um Allison can you restate the last

2:25:48

statement that you made that yeah let me see if I can just type it here while I say it

2:25:54

consider expanding

2:26:01

um parking

2:26:07

you can right away

2:26:12

I don't know I need to word Smith it a little but consider expanding roadside parking in the right-of-way

2:26:20

yeah that should probably say something about why to provide

2:26:27

to provide safe to Safe access access to residences

2:26:34

and safety for pedestrians or something like that you know but I mean I think I'm sure

2:26:40

that you could come up with the right way to say it okay you got it next year let me oh I

2:26:48

see there's two hands I was gonna have to ask for uh uh Adam go ahead while she's typing okay

2:26:54

uh just two quick uh comments I wanted to make to um one

2:27:00

thing I had uh I was or my one remaining comment on the other paper

2:27:06

um I didn't actually have to pull and look at the city code for parking uh 19020 and they do have minimum parking

2:27:14

for like 3 000 square foot house must have three spots a new less than three

2:27:19

thousand square foot house must have two um so in my opinion that's kind of sufficient the other concern I would

2:27:26

have with encouraging parking along the right-of-way um would be you know for parking on grass or something like that I'd be

2:27:32

worried about oil dripping from vehicles I think Vehicles should you know if they're if they're being parked it

2:27:38

should be encouraged on a on a driveway and at least in my personal opinion uh

2:27:43

1902 020 covers that for uh new construction so just just some just some

2:27:50

more data on this discussion and that's that's um you know that's that's the parking requirement that they have to

2:27:56

have on their own property so that's right inside their own property but this

2:28:01

this that I'm talking about is just use of the public property

2:28:06

um you know and how that could be used because you know people yeah I mean

2:28:15

the road yeah okay uh commissioner Curry

2:28:21

yeah um you know and sitting here listening to this it sounds a lot like we're treating symptoms instead of

2:28:26

treating the problem right the symptom is people are parking in the right way because they've been

2:28:32

allowed at this point up to this point to do so they've landscaped out whatever it is because they've been allowed to do

2:28:38

so if we already have code in place within the city why don't we just enforce that code

2:28:48

instead of trying to create additional rules and overhead and applying additional Band-Aids to a

2:28:56

symptom so the let me um just for the sake of time

2:29:03

um rather than trying to solution too much here um is there enough consensus from the

2:29:11

group that we should have staff um sort of take this direction and

2:29:17

um provide a suggestion similar to what Allison has uh on the on the screen like

2:29:25

is this is there consensus that this is something that warrants being added to

2:29:30

the draft for consideration I've got one thumb

2:29:40

anybody else feel compelled that this should be added

2:29:47

okay so um what I'll say is um you know Carolyn feel free to

2:29:53

um you know Wordsmith this a little bit more and have a uh an amendment if you should

2:29:59

feel that way but I think the current consensus is that doesn't warrant um a change right now okay thank you

2:30:09

the last one that I had in transportation um element is irrelevant if this one is

2:30:15

not you know moving ahead so that's it for transportation elements

2:30:21

all right um thank you Carolyn for bringing those that were um several good ones there um

2:30:28

are there any other uh before we move on to the I gotta look up my sheet here to

2:30:35

the next one which is related to land use um are there any other comments on the

2:30:41

transportation element and the items um that are going to come forward to the

2:30:50

to the next conversation great

2:30:55

Michael thank you very much for all of this are you staying for the land use section as well or you're just here for

2:31:02

transportation I'm a transportation expert that's what I thought so well thank you

2:31:09

very much for uh your time this evening and uh um helping walk us through this and I'm

2:31:16

sure we'll see you again at a future meeting I appreciate the time everybody thank you great thanks thanks

2:31:22

all right Allison uh that brings us to item number five around the land use

2:31:27

element um I'm hoping it doesn't take us uh two hours to get through this one as well

2:31:33

but uh we'll try to I think to move as quickly as possible through maybe an

2:31:39

overview of the substantive comment that you received yeah and so

2:31:46

I'll just caveat this with Adam Zach was the author of this document and and did

2:31:52

all of the revising he's on vacation this week so I'm presenting his work

2:31:59

and hopefully I'm gonna be able to answer any questions folks have about

2:32:05

why or how things were drafted a certain way but I just wanted to let you know that up front that

2:32:11

I'm not the author so let's see I think I'll do this similar to how Michael just

2:32:17

did the transportation elements I'm gonna work through the draft and kind of

2:32:22

highlight the places where um changes were requested

2:32:28

um hopefully many of you will also have the comment Matrix that you can look at

2:32:34

on the side um we'll kind of refer back and forth so I this is the Landers element I had

2:32:42

kind of skipped down here to page 13 where the first change was requested

2:32:50

um here in the Town Center section um so the way that this is written

2:32:56

there's kind of two Alternatives presented side by side one was the existing draft and then the one in green

2:33:04

is what was recommended by a commissioner and so in this case it's recommended to strike this

2:33:13

um provision here um I think the thinking was that this was

2:33:20

kind of outdated talks about suburban sprawl

2:33:26

which I think someone didn't really like that phrase

2:33:31

um and the staff recommendation was that it would be fine to remove this piece here so

2:33:39

is anyone in objection to removing the section identified

2:33:52

okay I'm not hearing should I make it a little bigger I see I see ever squinting at their screen
no

2:33:57

I thought the staff recommendation was to not move oh uh I'm sorry maybe I misunderstood

2:34:05

then your last comment there I thought you said that you agreed that

2:34:11

I'm just making sure I'm looking at the right one double checking here

2:34:16

yeah it's the staff response was this land

2:34:21

use issue appears to be outdated striking this issue is appropriate

2:34:30

the description certainly does not characterize what the Town Center is at

2:34:35

least in its entirety today

2:34:42

Allen Center has vast parking lots I mean I think this was drafted prior to

2:34:49

a lot of the Redevelopment that's happened on the north end of town center when there were primarily strip malls

2:34:55

with large parking lots and that's now changed quite a bit in some areas of town center

2:35:10

so um these are just descriptions correct there's actually no like policy implications to any of this language

2:35:16

yeah this language kind of just sets the stage describes what we have now and you

2:35:23

know kind of helps prepare you for the policies of where we want to go in the future yeah I mean we have two options

2:35:30

which is like staff just needs to review this and actually update it to a more current description or we just need to

2:35:37

strike it like those are the two options keeping it as it is I don't think is a

2:35:42

good so with that like how important are these descriptions are they referenced

2:35:48

elsewhere in the document if so we should update them and if not then

2:35:54

uh I don't I don't know how these are used or referenced so Kate

2:36:01

yeah I was just gonna suggest uh the first thing you said which is just revisit it and of the language

2:36:08

I think kicking off the section of town center talking about Street improvements is a little awkward

2:36:16

foreign that's what I was gonna say as well

2:36:25

okay is that too much of a issue um Allison just to maybe see if there's a quick update

2:36:32

someone can sure okay we can do that

2:36:41

moving on the next one is here just below in this section about outside the

2:36:46

Town Center um accessory dwelling units and I think

2:36:52

the change here was just adding the words as much at the end so it's not disrupting character as much

2:37:08

so I think the suggestion was that you know adding accessory dwelling units does have some impact

2:37:15

in residential neighborhoods

2:37:21

uh go ahead Adam um yeah and I guess I'm looking at that

2:37:26

comment I I definitely agree I disagree with stating that there is no disruption

2:37:32

to Neighborhood character looking at my proposed revision as much uh that that's

2:37:38

I guess bad wording because it's not compared to anything but I do feel that this should articulate that there is

2:37:44

some disruption to character um I know staff response was uh referred

2:37:51

to 1902-030 which said that there are some laws on the books that deal with

2:37:58

parking in hopes of keeping additional cars from those adus off the road and if

2:38:04

I may if my reading of that number nine of that law I'm happy to read it if we

2:38:09

want but um it basically says my reading of it is a single family with an Adu

2:38:16

um must follow the parking regulations for a single-family house as if the Adu did not exist so I'm not convinced by

2:38:23

the the Mercer Island City code mitigates those issues so I would

2:38:28

strongly recommend that we have some articulation that this does impact the

2:38:33

residential character

2:38:38

hey I'm Victor uh

2:38:44

my um my only comment Echoes that Adam said around the term as much

2:38:49

how we measure as much so we should probably be a little bit more specific

2:39:02

yeah so I would my comment here would be without disrupting the character

2:39:09

compared to what like it's suggesting that it's an option

2:39:18

to something else but I'm not sure I mean I know what it is but it's not

2:39:23

articulated well here so as much as what like other other

2:39:31

forms of increased density perhaps right so that's the like I think where if

2:39:37

we're gonna look at um this I would just say rather than

2:39:43

trying to summarize it like let's be explicit like

2:39:48

um without impacting the character of our neighborhoods you know as much as

2:39:53

other forms of increased density or something like that

2:40:03

without impacting the character yeah as much as other forms of increased

2:40:09

density I I like disrupting but

2:40:21

uh it's again this is just informational text um so yeah I I I would go for

2:40:29

impacting because um you know it it causes a change in the character but you know disrupting is is

2:40:35

determining that it's very negative and you know I think we should try to keep keep it

2:40:40

open it's just causing a change did I why so we're um go ahead Adam

2:40:49

um our last argument in favor of disrupting um I think it will add more cars onto

2:40:55

the streets and I think that is disruptive to the flow of traffic so uh it's a piece of data in favor of

2:41:03

disrupting okay

2:41:08

um all right I think you know again this isn't a specific policy this is just

2:41:15

background information so the language here I don't think is impacting um any

2:41:22

um specific Direction so I'm I'm not there if you feel passionate about it

2:41:27

come back and suggest a change after the fact but disrupting I

2:41:34

believe is the language that's in there now so in the effort to not disrupt disrupt too much

2:41:40

we'll leave it there um and if I don't hear anything else sorry

2:41:46

I'm gonna try to move us a little more quickly oh autosave I just hit save and

2:41:51

it's very slow so give me five seconds there we go thank you

2:41:58

course all right all right scrolling down scrolling down

2:42:09

okay now we are down here under circulation parking goal

2:42:16

seven um there's a small change suggested here to

2:42:22

remove the word all so it would read Town Center streets should provide for safe and convenient multimodal access to

2:42:29

existing and future development in the Town Center

2:42:34

foreign

2:42:46

I don't remember seeing us go through she's going through the comments that

2:42:53

were provided and there were none provided on those sections I'm just skipping to the places where

2:42:59

changes were recommended by a commissioner

2:43:15

um any I don't know who made the comment um here I believe this was commissioner Murphy

2:43:24

Mike do you want to talk to this yeah that was just a practical comment that

2:43:29

you know in terms of Urban Design we may want to not make all streets

2:43:36

fully multi-modal in all capacities it was just a simple change just to reflect

2:43:44

the reality of living a number of streets in space

2:43:52

okay yeah there may be specific uh areas that just don't lend themselves to

2:43:58

that sort of activity any objections here I mean this is in the

2:44:05

goals section um and I think the language all is the Allison is the existing language that's

2:44:12

there right so correct yeah I don't know if this is a huge policy change but

2:44:18

do we have consensus that this is a reasonable

2:44:26

okay right I'm hearing no descent um cool

2:44:33

okey-doke moving down

2:44:40

to the public realm section here go goal 12.

2:44:46

um number 12.2 again it's a fairly modest change here

2:44:53

from encourage to incentivize the provision of on-site open space in

2:44:58

private development um and clarifying this can include

2:45:04

allowing development agreements and payment of a calculated amount of money as an alternative to the dedication of

2:45:11

land so I think here the comment we received was about kind of strengthening this

2:45:17

provision not just encouraging but really trying to promote and make it happen we

2:45:24

want to have on-site open space

2:45:29

um so my question is is

2:45:36

um first incentivize is not a word the proper way to say this would be to incent the provision but that's just the

2:45:45

English person in me um is there a difference from a policy

2:45:52

perspective between incent and promote like does one connote a different level

2:45:59

of obligation

2:46:10

Financial or other benefit that would encourage someone to do this whereas

2:46:16

promote might just be more of a verbal encouragement or something

2:46:22

it's raising awareness proposing promoting Israel's awareness

2:46:29

and so is the intent in the original language within courage because it does talk about financial

2:46:35

Arrangements in their um I'm just wondering are we changing

2:46:41

the intent here is it making it my guess is that we're trying to make that

2:46:46

language stronger um but I just want to make sure that that's

2:46:52

the intended Direction that was to make it stronger

2:46:59

folks have a recommendation on a different word that would be even more strong that would be fine

2:47:09

incentivize is a word Dan it is yes it is oh it sounds awful

2:47:23

commissioner Murphy you made that comment okay so you want the city to be more definite

2:47:30

about you know making sure that there's open space in private developments

2:47:36

so you don't you mean you don't mean one lot one house but

2:47:42

in multi-lot developments is that what you're getting at this is Town Center

2:47:48

oh I'm sorry Town Center okay I'm our major developments yeah okay

2:47:54

okay I knew I was sort of out of context thank you

2:48:00

um any disagreement with commissioner Murphy's Direction here on just creating some stronger language around the

2:48:08

dedication of of land for open space and

2:48:15

um well okay I I have a comment about it um

2:48:24

[Music] does the city not have I mean I would like to see the city require

2:48:30

this type of open space in in the Town Center for you know new

2:48:36

development so uh neither of the words that are there or I don't think are

2:48:41

really appropriate I I um

2:48:46

I mean there is a code requirement for providing open space in town center developments so

2:48:54

so is that in response to this existing policy already or is this new policy

2:48:59

I think you know there was an existing policy it's just above there it's worded slightly differently

2:49:06

um but you know they're meant to fit together and support each other so encourage you so it says encourage but

2:49:12

the code requires it that's interesting well I would say if we've got the code

2:49:17

requiring it based on the word encouraged we're we're already home free if if people are in favor of this that

2:49:24

is what what is the reason to try to make the policy stronger

2:49:35

Mike do you want to yeah um the original

2:49:41

I didn't draft this language uh staff draft of the language my comment was

2:49:46

simple and that was encouraging public space is inadequate it needs to be

2:49:53

stronger we need to be strongly incentivizing sorry damn uh the creation

2:49:58

or dedication of such space and or their acquisition

2:50:03

so I was looking at you know a range of options to create you know more public

2:50:11

spaces particularly in the Town Center area of a meaningful size not just an alley

2:50:18

walk through or a or a you know small little Fountain out front

2:50:27

so so I think the work smithing is is important here and I did

2:50:33

not attempt to do that but it's something that staff could take a another run at because I'm not really

2:50:41

wedded to any language at this point

2:50:48

okay I'm Victor uh so a question for Allison I'm

2:50:54

actually not aware of a code requirement for open space for new development I'm

2:50:59

aware of a code requirement for a public amenity which could be open space like that but

2:51:06

I'm not aware of any specific code amen or code request for open space can you

2:51:12

uh provide that either send it an email or yeah why don't I review the code and

2:51:18

follow up with what's the specific provision is and I as I'm thinking about it I think you know it is maybe not an

2:51:27

absolute requirement for all development in town center but if you are going above to stories then it triggers that

2:51:34

whole array of design standards that include affordable housing Green Building

2:51:41

um a certain amount of greenery and Landscaping yeah all these different design features so but why don't I just

2:51:49

provide a little summary of that for you I'm not aware of open space on that list I'm not aware of what's on that list I'm

2:51:56

more of public amenity so if you could just provide the language that it

2:52:01

doesn't have tonight but if you could just send that would be great okay

2:52:06

Carolyn I like the idea of adding open space if possible to that other list of

2:52:12

things that Allison was just reading that are you know triggered by building a certain height

2:52:19

um but I don't I'm not too comfortable with word incentivize because usually when you incentivize

2:52:25

it means the public coffers lose money or something happens that's potentially

2:52:31

a negative to the public in order to get this open space so

2:52:36

um I'm not very comfortable with the word incentivize

2:52:42

but I don't know what the word should be and I like something stronger than

2:52:47

encourage so so let me do this um like

2:52:53

again we're we're still in a draft phase I don't know as if we need to entirely word Smith this do we have consensus

2:53:00

that the language in this policy needs to be

2:53:05

stronger than just the encouragement of this

2:53:11

um and so as a goal we

2:53:17

um you know if if in incentivizing is uh

2:53:23

more directive um

2:53:28

well if it's not the right word like it is there consensus that we want this to

2:53:34

be stronger and if so like we can just give the direction to Allison and Adam to maybe just go and look and see if

2:53:41

there's another more appropriate word that fits in with

2:53:47

um with the rest of the document

2:53:56

no yes stronger language yes all right I see at least four

2:54:04

are you okay with that approach uh Mike you made this suggestion right okay and

2:54:11

I'd like to add one further comment on it sure um

2:54:16

now is this is this meant to be public open space or open space for the people that live in the development or this or

2:54:23

that if it's public maybe it should say public Public Access

2:54:33

anybody know well it mentions at the top of the goal about accessible outdoor spaces and so

2:54:40

to me accessible equates public but yeah and it's under public realm so but I do

2:54:46

think it would be important to add that word into the language because you're saying open space and

2:54:53

private development yeah and when we talk about that from a code perspective it usually means

2:54:59

private open space interesting but then maybe that doesn't belong in the public realm here where

2:55:06

it's appeared we just need to clarify what it actually means yeah yeah thank you

2:55:15

okay Allison do you have enough Direction on that item

2:55:24

foreign just taken into notes no problem

2:55:34

okay

2:55:39

that was the great part of having Jenny uh when she was on we had the transcripts always from we could go back

2:55:46

and reference yeah all the zoom just automatically does transcripts now so that's cool that's good

2:56:00

okay so now we're in outside the Town Center goal 15.

2:56:06

it's talking about kind of the low density residential character

2:56:12

um multi-family areas will continue to be low rise apartments and condos and

2:56:18

duplex Travelex designs um this suggestion here is to strike out

2:56:24

this part about the commercial office Zone

2:56:29

foreign back here I think it's really just clarifying the sentence structure

2:56:36

because it was kind of confusing can you scroll that up so we can see all

2:56:41

three varieties of that version yeah sorry about that no problem and so then Adam had just recommended a little

2:56:48

different wording here or just felt it made it a little more clear

2:56:54

confined low-rise apartments condos and duplex Triplex designs to those areas

2:57:00

already designated as multi-family and mixed-use zones this mix

2:57:07

multi-family and mixed use is something that we came up with in a couple other places

2:57:13

I think in the housing element there was a lot of references to different zones

2:57:19

commercial office Zone allows multi-family housing that's the key thing to know so it's already a zone

2:57:26

that allows multi-family you can kind of clean up the language with that understanding

2:57:37

um any comments I kind of like the Simplicity of number of three but Victor

2:57:45

just uh a clarifying question we have a Zone called mixed use

2:57:52

we don't but the Town Center zones are considered mixed use because they um allow both commercial and housing

2:58:00

right but the wording here refers to a mixed Food Zone which you just yeah I mean that's like a multi-family or a

2:58:07

mixed user sort of types of zones rather than the name of a specific Zone

2:58:15

actually these zones that allow multi-family housing or mixed mixed uses

2:58:20

which usually refers to multi-family housing and Commercial I think rather than using the shorthand

2:58:26

I would advocate for being explicit in here you know the alternative here would be

2:58:33

multi-family or zones with mixed uses

2:58:40

that might help or a combination of uses right if you want to not

2:58:46

like overuse mixed use you say multi-family or a combination of uses

2:58:53

something like that might be an alternate Carolyn well I think the the wording in

2:58:59

the the Blue version there is is more clear and explicit and maybe with the changes that you're suggesting to

2:59:06

address what Victor mentioned that might be a good Improvement as well

2:59:15

okay um Kate

2:59:21

I'm just noticing that this statement with the duplex portion of it anyways

2:59:27

and conflict with the recommendations um of the housing needs assessment

2:59:36

yeah I think it's worth noting that some of the existing policies in this section

2:59:44

may need another look after we finish working on the housing

2:59:50

um element because yeah there might need to be some redirection how we're thinking of things

2:59:56

depending on where things land with the housing element yeah I don't want to presuppose how council is going to act

3:00:02

on that they had a pretty strong reaction to the to the hearing on it so

3:00:07

um I I don't know that we can finalize the language on this until

3:00:12

um yeah and I'll just say that some policy choices there it would be okay to leave

3:00:18

it how it is now with the recognition that staff may propose some additional

3:00:23

changes you know several months down the line once we are looking for internal consistency between the draft elements

3:00:31

I guess that's kind of a question about our role in these processes like if we

3:00:38

is our role as a Planning Commission to make recommendations based on what we've

3:00:45

seen from the housing needs assessment like do we propose things like oh we

3:00:51

should follow what the consultant recommended or or do we just sit on that

3:00:57

until councils had time to act on that report

3:01:02

well so the council's not going to act on the

3:01:07

housing needs assessment it's just a report that provides data to inform

3:01:12

the process um but the housing working group will be drafting a housing element and that

3:01:18

housing element will then come to the Planning Commission for further review um

3:01:24

and depending on where that draft lands after this after the commission reviews

3:01:29

it we may say oh we need to go back to the land use element because remember

3:01:34

that policy about multi-family housing I don't think it aligns with where this

3:01:40

housing element is now okay so discussion about what's going to happen with the recommendations that that

3:01:46

report happens at the housing work group and then comes back to us we don't talk about that here

3:01:51

I mean you all will discuss the draft that the housing working group has

3:01:56

developed they're going to recommend it to you yeah it comes back to us you get a chance to review it and then you'll make recommendations to the city council

3:02:03

eventually okay sounds good then I have no comment

3:02:09

commissioner Curry um I like what Victor mentioned about being just explicit let's not add any

3:02:15

ambiguity into garbage itself um and again as a business owner himself

3:02:21

he's bringing up we have mixed-use zones so if he's doing that there will be other business units that do the same

3:02:26

way right so uh just be explicit with it and just basically call a duck a duck so

3:02:32

I would I would second one Victor said

3:02:37

okay so I think the direction here Allison is um let's just clarify the

3:02:43

language there around how we're referring to zones we don't actually have zones that are named in the way that

3:02:50

they are there so let's clarify that and then um just pin this because we know we're

3:02:57

gonna have to come back and revisit maybe this whole section likely

3:03:03

um in uh response to the housing needs assessment

3:03:11

foreign

3:03:23

thank you

3:03:30

so now we're down in goal 16. which is

3:03:36

about achieving additional residential capacity in single-family zones through flexible land use techniques and land

3:03:42

use entitlement regulations come down here to 16.7

3:03:51

I believe this was a recommendation for a new policy um green is what was suggested by I

3:03:58

believe commissioner Murphy eliminate unnecessary barriers and create exceptions and or variance

3:04:04

options to regulations that would otherwise prevent improvements to existing homes to allow owners to enjoy

3:04:10

the full utility of existing Lots preserve value and avoid the incentive

3:04:15

to remove and replace existing homes Adam suggested this blue text as an

3:04:20

alternative reading ensure development regulations allow the Improvement of existing homes

3:04:27

and do not create incentives to remove or replace existing homes so that was just an attempt to kind of

3:04:33

simplify and be a little more brief um let me uh commissioner Curry think

3:04:40

that's your old hand is that correct and then uh Mike you want to speak to that

3:04:47

yeah I think you know we're all aware of the fact that there's great deal of pushback to

3:04:54

allow any type of increased density in the residential neighborhoods

3:05:00

so that creates a real strong incentive uh to either ultimately tear down homes

3:05:10

um but I think it's a more effective use of our housing stock to allow people to

3:05:16

improve homes in ways that maximize their value and maximize their utility

3:05:23

especially older homes and you know having

3:05:28

built a new home in the last few years on Old existing lot

3:05:33

um I become familiar with that and I know many other people who have encountered

3:05:39

problems with them and there are various barriers to doing that and I don't think

3:05:48

that's a good public policy especially if if we're not going to be part of the solution by adding housing stock

3:05:55

with say town homes or things like that we ought to be improving housing stock

3:06:02

to be useful to Island residents and and I think we have to be more proactive in

3:06:10

terms of eliminating barriers and creating options where there are

3:06:16

regulations that would otherwise prevent improvements that don't infringe or

3:06:23

inflict any anything on neighbors and and I think that's really necessary I I

3:06:30

think Adam's attempted a Simplicity which I would be normally in favor of is

3:06:36

good but I think it is too big because it doesn't really get to the point of

3:06:44

being proactive about allowing people to you know effectively redevelop not

3:06:51

necessarily redevelop but improve their homes in ways that will make them more

3:06:56

functional and useful in the long run

3:07:03

Adam um yeah I like staff's suggestion here

3:07:09

I'd seen that eliminate unnecessary barriers to me that's that's actually

3:07:15

kind of vague it's like unnecessary to someone focused on the environment unnecessary to someone focused you know

3:07:21

maybe someone doesn't care about the environment and I think environmental barriers are unnecessary um I like I like staff's proposal there

3:07:28

for clarity um I think the housing element talks about goals of like retain existing

3:07:34

housing stocks so maybe maybe instead of having a negative here we say you know that allow the

3:07:40

Improvement of existing homes to promote maintaining existing housing stock or whatever is the verbiage in in the

3:07:47

housing element um so yeah my thoughts Carolyn

3:07:58

um um when the code was last updated the

3:08:06

development code um there was a real strong goal to remove

3:08:13

uncertainties like deviations and

3:08:18

um variances really make it clear what the code said you know and I think that

3:08:25

that's been quite successful I mean you really do know how big of a house you can build on a certain piece of property

3:08:30

and um you know you're not living you know I we need to also think about the people

3:08:37

who live near the property being remodeled codes are not only to allow people to do things but they're to

3:08:43

protect the public so when you live near a new development

3:08:48

it's nice to know what you're going to be faced with instead of be surprised oh because this is a remodel they get to do

3:08:55

something more so I I like the Simplicity and the clarity of our code as it is

3:09:02

um um remodels don't think they add housing

3:09:07

stock by unless I'm misunderstanding there um I do like the clear language that

3:09:14

that Adam has proposed here and it's it's positively stated and you know don't don't put up barriers but you know

3:09:22

it's I think it's good language Victor

3:09:28

hey hey just a quick question from Mike can you can you just a few examples of

3:09:34

the barriers you're talking about um you know there can be barriers about

3:09:42

um you know with respect to impervious

3:09:47

surface uh and things of that nature that are minor uh but there's really no way to

3:09:55

get variances for some of these things that would have no impact uh otherwise

3:10:01

but that really create a burden and a problem uh even you know building in

3:10:09

proximity to underground storm drains can be a problem unless and there's no

3:10:15

variance process for that so I think the the issue of uh variances uh I

3:10:24

understand this notion of having it clear and simple but clear and simple uh

3:10:30

doesn't always work when you're trying to create uh space for people in the

3:10:36

notion uh Carolyn's point about uh I don't agree with her her comment that it

3:10:41

doesn't create new housing stock if you turn in a uh you know an old one-story

3:10:48

uh two-bedroom home into a four bedroom family home you have created new housing

3:10:57

stock in effect and so I think you know this is the type of thing that needs to be uh looked at more closely given the

3:11:06

antipathy on the island to allow uh slightly more density in some of the

3:11:13

residential neighborhoods so so you're you're advocating for basically a

3:11:18

variance process yeah right yeah is that is that what I'm

3:11:23

gonna well I think this is this is a this is a broad policy statement and it would be

3:11:31

to look at these things and look at the code and then identify areas where they

3:11:37

can create opportunities and options to allow people to enhance homes uh to

3:11:45

create longevity and greater capacity got it so I and and if I can uh just add

3:11:54

and I see there's other hands and I'll I'll call you in a sec the I wanted to add to the question you had Victor

3:12:00

around examples um as someone who owns a house from the

3:12:06

mid-1940s um the example I have is if you want to

3:12:12

current regulation say that if you make improvements to your dwelling that are

3:12:19

equal to 50 percent of the value or greater you have to sprinkler your

3:12:25

entire house um the problem is is that a house even

3:12:30

my house today with the values that they are is only worth on paper 150

3:12:37

000 that's the improved value right so when I go to do a bedroom and a bathroom

3:12:43

addition on the side of my house to increase it from 1100 square feet to

3:12:49

1400 square feet um the value exceeded the 75 000

3:12:56

threshold and was going to come into now an additional hundred thousand dollars

3:13:03

or more in having to sprinkle our house that on paper like it sounds like that's

3:13:10

a great idea but at that point I'm spending as much money as it would cost for me to just tear down my house and

3:13:16

build you know invest a little bit more and build more most sane people would not have gone through that exercise

3:13:23

so beyond Mike's pointing and and why I don't like the language that he's

3:13:29

proposed and do like the language that Adam has proposed is beyond proposal proposals of variances there

3:13:38

are actually codes that are on the books that while well intended have the unintended consequence of basically

3:13:46

people saying well it's not worth trying to retrofit my house because of these regulations I might as well just tear it

3:13:54

down and rebuild and so for me I would just make the note that you would I

3:14:01

would potentially even add some language here around not creating unintended

3:14:06

incentives because I don't think that a lot of the languages ever explicit

3:14:13

in causing the situation but I don't think we're giving enough

3:14:18

Credence to the unintended consequence of some of the well um some of the well-intended development

3:14:26

regulations that we do have on the books like they're working against each other

3:14:31

so okay hi yeah um the other insane way to get

3:14:40

around that problem is that you do 100 of the labor yourself which is what we do and it's grueling pain in the neck so

3:14:48

it's it's just really hard I can give another example to our friends um wanted to

3:14:54

expand their house just add a little Crow's Nest master bedroom be to help out a child that was going to be living

3:15:00

at home longer than expected life happens um and they couldn't they just the

3:15:06

process was so arduous and they started running into the sprinkler system thing and um they ended up moving and selling the

3:15:12

house and buying a different house the person who bought it just tore it down and their house was not an

3:15:18

expensive house on Mercer Island standards and now that house is very expensive so if people are just

3:15:23

tearing these things down and rebuilding it works against our affordability goals um so I think the idea that we're

3:15:29

preserving um you know what relatively affordable housing there is by allowing people to

3:15:35

remodel um we have friends on the south end too who their kids wanted to stay close so they um popped up a floor and I

3:15:42

think they did get a variance so they have two families living in one house so they have added housing stock by having

3:15:48

two families so there's a lot of ways that remodeling can um work in our favor both for affordability and for

3:15:55

increasing stock mainly within a family but still it's there

3:16:00

so I think it's a good idea Carolyn yeah so I think Kate just kind of tied a

3:16:07

whole lot of things together that were in my mind um I didn't mean to indicate that

3:16:12

remodels don't have new don't add new housing stock I I just meant to say they

3:16:17

they don't add additional housing stock but Kate has pointed out how in some ways they may

3:16:24

but this um and I thought maybe we're sort of conflating you know a pro remodeling stance with the you know kind

3:16:30

of a some people would like to see greater density and I think this is getting a bit Tangled Up

3:16:36

but um and also more bedrooms don't provide more density people with big houses lots

3:16:44

of bedrooms quite often are not using those at all um but

3:16:49

um anyway um I think I'll just quit right there just a couple of reflections

3:16:57

all right so if I can summarize I'm hearing from enough people that I think the intent of

3:17:04

um Vice chair Murphy's uh policy here which is sort of around

3:17:11

having a better view to um either uh

3:17:18

finding ways to retain or at least understand what policies do exist so

3:17:23

that um we're not unintentionally getting rid of more of our existing

3:17:31

housing stock and I'm paraphrasing Mike so please call me out if I'm misrepresenting

3:17:37

anything but it seems like there's consensus that this concept is warrants

3:17:43

inclusion and I think it really comes down to the level of um specificity and detail that we have

3:17:51

in here um does anyone have any I I heard a number

3:17:57

of people showing support for the staff version of this

3:18:02

um dude were there for people in favor of sort of that direction versus the other

3:18:08

direction at least for the next round of conversation

3:18:14

if I can see a thumb If you're sort of in favor of the staff's recommendation

3:18:19

so I've got four and then um Mike if you want to come back with some

3:18:26

you know more exacting language beyond that yeah are you comfortable with that yeah

3:18:32

my my only concern is or not my only but one of my concerns with uh with uh

3:18:40

Zach's language is it's not clear if he's only referring to new regulations

3:18:46

or existing regulations and and I and I think what we're talking

3:18:51

about here tonight is both old and new and so I think we

3:18:58

should clarify that as well um and you know

3:19:05

I'll I'll work with that but I think given that clarification I think we can

3:19:11

definitely work with what Zach's done great

3:19:19

well and I I'll concede that I think uh that's probably a good uh clarification

3:19:24

to make so I saw Allison writing a note there good

3:19:31

all right um where else do we need to Go Allison

3:19:40

School 17 um

3:19:46

it's the exception of allowing residential development commercial designations and permitted uses under

3:19:51

current zoning will not change this was a recommendation

3:19:57

I believe this is the one that came from AV lab Amy Lavin of The JCC

3:20:03

um to edit 17.4

3:20:09

um to say that development regulations shall support the desire to modernize

3:20:14

and retain viable and healthy social recreational and educational

3:20:23

I think there's a common missing there Health social recreational educational religious organizations as

3:20:29

Community assets which are essential for the mental physical and spiritual health of Mercer Island

3:20:34

so I think the key phrase there is shall support the desire to modernize and

3:20:40

retain

3:20:46

um any comments Carolyn

3:20:52

yeah um okay I'm in favor of this this change

3:20:58

I think these institutions that throughout our residential area and in

3:21:04

this case in a it's a commercial office Zone

3:21:09

um they're so vital to our community and they do need to be able to modernize and

3:21:15

uh I think seeking that kind of support in the comp plan is is really good

3:21:24

okay I'm Victor I'm

3:21:30

I'm unclear what we're trying to achieve here

3:21:35

um do our develop missions not support that

3:21:41

yeah I'm I'm unclear what so I'm gonna I'm gonna go out on a limb Victor the

3:21:47

only change here is the language around modernized modernizing and then the

3:21:54

change of the should to showering which is more directive and so I can't speak

3:22:00

the shell is pretty powerful yeah and and I take I take exception to the Shell

3:22:07

change but I think the more Salient part of this is

3:22:13

um given the the exercise that we went through in

3:22:20

um the organization that Amy Lavin represents being The JCC and and that

3:22:27

complex of folks um I know they're trying to strive through

3:22:33

this language that basically they're trying to modernize and I think feel

3:22:39

like the code is working against them and so this I think is a way for them to

3:22:45

um codify in policy that maybe our policies need to be changed in order to support

3:22:52

those activities in a more substantive way that's why the shall language and

3:22:57

the modernization language are probably being added again that's my

3:23:03

conjecture and my interpretation of it given the exercise that we went through a couple of years ago with that

3:23:08

organization so I comment on this is

3:23:17

um the the shall language is uh fairly strange and I I like as you

3:23:27

said I I concur with you I take conception to it um it uh it's purely

3:23:36

it's a fairly significant change um and I'm just I'm I'm kind of uh I'm

3:23:43

I'm unclear as to how far do we go with this

3:23:51

any other thoughts Adam um yes systems engineer we deal with should and child statements and yeah

3:23:58

I'll just Echo shall is very powerful should is here's the intent so

3:24:03

um looking at this I would I would push back on the shell but I do understand a

3:24:09

desire to modernize I think that ties into our existing our previous discussion so I would suggest adding the

3:24:15

modernized language but absolutely staying away from the show

3:24:24

any other thoughts commissioner Curry yes I I'm curious about what modernize mean

3:24:30

does modernize mean go bigger within the community or is it just

3:24:36

within the walls that currently exist because if it is nothing prevents them from doing that

3:24:43

I don't think uh but I think there was a big dust up

3:24:48

just recently right within the last year or two about the jcc-12 expand and I wonder if this language right here

3:24:55

is trying to is trying to find a loophole within us so I like we could spend and some of us

3:25:03

spent hundreds of hours uh deliberating the merits of uh of the proposals

3:25:10

related to The JCC so I won't provide any conjecture on their intent

3:25:17

um I think it was interpreted by um some people to to mean one thing and

3:25:25

was was not by others um I I would not interpret modernization as

3:25:33

expansion I think those are two like sort of discrete Concepts

3:25:39

um so I I on the surface don't have an issue with modernization without more

3:25:45

clarity around the definition we don't use it anywhere else in the document to

3:25:51

my knowledge at least in this usage so it would be interesting to know whether

3:25:57

or not we need to define something like that um but I'm hearing I'm hearing General

3:26:03

consensus that the language around Xiao um we shouldn't include

3:26:10

um and then the question I would have so if we have consensus that we do not use the shall language is there at least

3:26:18

enough consensus around modernization that it warrants a further discussion in front of the public

3:26:25

um in sort of proposing this in a public draft that would spur commentary that we

3:26:30

could then um you know take action on further so I

3:26:38

guess that would be my question I see Carolyn has a hand up do you have more to that or

3:26:44

well I was going to say that um in terms of just looking for you know

3:26:51

General support in the community for an organization like a JCC or a club or

3:26:56

churches and so on the way it is worded now is a little bit meaningless it says that it

3:27:04

should reflect this desire to retain I mean retain is kind of like you know

3:27:10

what what does that mean for a city but to support modernizing okay that says something

3:27:18

that says we we'd like to see you in our community we'd like to see you uh work

3:27:23

into the future so you can be here and so I mean it seems to say something so I'm all in favor of the modernizing

3:27:29

world word so I see Allison has updated the first

3:27:35

version of 17.4 the second sentence which reads development regulation

3:27:41

regulation should support the desire to modernize and retain viable and healthy

3:27:46

social recreational educational cetera Etc

3:27:53

is there I think this reflects the direction that the conversation's been going is there a consensus that this is

3:27:59

an okay direction or do we need more discussion

3:28:04

okay I see five

3:28:10

and again we're gonna have a lot more time to dig into the details of this when we actually take a vote and all

3:28:16

that stuff so and I suspect we'll probably hear some public comment on this issue so I can't imagine

3:28:23

a Victor did you have that question yeah uh just a request I mean it would

3:28:28

be good if we could just get well and again not tonight but when we have the next reading it would be great to just

3:28:34

uh get a little bit more clarity to um uh on around term modernize and and what

3:28:43

we actually mean by that I think uh commissioner Murray brought up the issue so like I'd like to better understand

3:28:50

what that means okay

3:28:58

yeah I just um I think it's interesting because the the original language that

3:29:03

says retained viable I'd be more concerned I I don't necessarily agree

3:29:09

that it's problematic but um I think modernized is is less

3:29:15

problematic for the reason being stated that like the fear of expansion then retained viable I mean to remain

3:29:22

economically viable a lot of programs need to expand and change and shift so

3:29:29

I don't know this viable have a definition economically viable as it's changing

3:29:36

pretty rapidly I don't have a problem with modernize is what I'm saying I think if you're gonna

3:29:42

pick apart the language uh viables a little more problematic not that I think it is

3:29:49

I can I can point you back to some uh meetings that we had a few years ago where that was discussed uh at length

3:30:00

um and I'm not sure we have any greater Clarity I think Mike you were a part of the process at the time I know Carolyn

3:30:06

was so um yeah you're not wrong

3:30:12

um okay um just looking at the clock Allison if we want to keep moving forward

3:30:18

yep teen here is about natural environment

3:30:29

2.1 there was this edition of the word

3:30:34

natural for natural water courses

3:30:39

I believe this was a recommendation from commissioner Murphy and it's actually the same suggestion

3:30:46

down here on 18.4 again adding the word natural before water courses

3:30:52

so this is one I think getting to the comment about definitions Allison I mean we have pretty

3:30:59

discrete definitions around water courses and Hazard areas and slopes and

3:31:04

shorelines how does introducing this language change that at all do we make a

3:31:12

distinction in any of our definitions around like I I wouldn't even know what an unnatural Watercourse is yeah than

3:31:19

maybe a culvert but I mean I'm guessing that commissioner Murphy was trying to distinguish between piped water courses

3:31:25

and unpiped water courses but maybe he could speak to that more specifically yeah

3:31:31

so um this section is the natural environment

3:31:36

policies we are the only city in the state as far

3:31:41

as I can tell or at least the only city in the region that has created this category called pipes water courses

3:31:50

and we have natural and piped watercourses pipe watercourses are simply storm

3:31:57

grains because the way they've been designated in the city virtually every

3:32:03

storm drain is a piped Watercourse and they have no natural function uh or

3:32:12

ecological function other than convey storm water away from streets and

3:32:17

buildings and so they don't belong under this section of the code

3:32:24

and they don't need to be protected as environmentally sensitive areas as in

3:32:32

18.1 nor do they have an environmental ecological function to be protected

3:32:40

under 18.4 so I wanted to just make it clear that this

3:32:47

the goals here are dealing with our natural water forces not our storm

3:32:53

grains Allison do we have in our definitions do

3:32:58

we break out natural watercourses and piped water courses are they there are

3:33:03

just four types there's piped water courses and then there's four other types of water courses that are

3:33:09

daylighted um so there's different extreme bed characteristics that are defined in the

3:33:15

code um and I will say that there are water courses in Mercer Island that

3:33:22

have portions where it's piped in portions where it's not piped

3:33:30

foreign so I get what um Vice chair Murphy is saying I'm just

3:33:37

wondering if this language is correct um to get to where he's going

3:33:46

um and so I'll take Carolyn's comment and then I'm going to suggest uh

3:33:52

an approach go ahead Carolyn um is it not the case that some hyped water

3:34:01

courses contain natural flows many do

3:34:07

and the other thing I would be concerned about is any change in this category it's a it's a very scientific

3:34:14

consideration and it's it's very complicated I I would like to see

3:34:21

greater explanation by staff uh before considering any sort of change

3:34:28

like this well there's there are very little

3:34:35

science involved in storm brains running off of streets uh other than

3:34:42

the flow rate and the size of the pipe um what we're dealing with here is

3:34:48

natural environment policies and

3:34:54

that we need to focus on that and not be using this as a means of restricting

3:35:03

um activities that may come near um pipe water courses

3:35:10

in other words storm breaks

3:35:17

eight I think we have a significant amount of

3:35:24

storm water that goes into pipes and then out to Lake Washington and it's

3:35:30

part of just our flow of water it's almost

3:35:36

a bit of an existential debate our humans part of nature are not a part of nature

3:35:42

um but I I would be very concerned that this might impact protections to water

3:35:49

that's going into those pipes we know that brake dust and lots of other things are extremely harmful to some audits

3:35:55

that visit our shorelines in the rearing phase um

3:36:01

this language makes me nervous all the water going into these pipes ends up

3:36:07

going out to the ocean at some point so um if it would in any way limit protections

3:36:16

to that water um particularly the water quality I'd be very concerned

3:36:23

uh I don't think it would affect water quality in any way because any of the

3:36:29

portions that are natural water horses would continue to be protected

3:36:34

all your storm water runoff from the streets from the houses from everywhere on the

3:36:42

island literally ends up in Lake Washington in one way or another and so

3:36:49

it doesn't really matter what does matter is the treatment of piped

3:36:56

watercourses has somehow or has stormed rains as part

3:37:03

of the environment area that must be protected

3:37:09

it it has created a real problem in the code and impacted the ability of people

3:37:16

to to do as simple work on a driveway because there's a

3:37:23

storm drain that runs underneath uh it's it's a the code is is problematic and

3:37:31

this is essential to lay the foundation to clarify that we are the goal here is

3:37:38

to protect the natural watercourses whether they're in a system that's partially piped or

3:37:46

not but not but we're not protecting the environment of an underground stormbreak

3:37:52

we're protecting the water in that because that comes in natural

3:37:59

watercourses throughout the island but you know I've looked at the storm

3:38:05

water system very extensively and right now the the current system

3:38:12

of Regulation is really screwed up to be to be uh specific

3:38:19

and and this is the uh uh I think an

3:38:25

important step to rationalize that uh system right of Regulation

3:38:33

I I agree necessarily with the construct The

3:38:38

Logical construct um I would want to know I would prefer to

3:38:44

understand better maybe staff can help out with this next time um

3:38:50

what the what the consequences of this language change would be it just seems

3:38:56

very disconcerting to me any water that's making its way to Lake Washington needs to be protected

3:39:03

I don't care what kind of pipe it's in or Open Water conveyance

3:39:09

yeah the issue is not protecting the water it is allowing

3:39:15

uses like in in the vicinity of underground storm lines

3:39:22

not even this would not affect uh activities that would be in the vicinity

3:39:29

of um Open Water courses I this would ensure that the continued

3:39:39

sensitivity and protection of that so I it just for the sake of time since

3:39:45

we're like just short of 10 o'clock um but I might just do is get a sense of

3:39:53

um I I haven't done the research that Mike has done on this but I'm not sure there's a problem here that needs to be

3:40:00

resolved um and so I I guess would posit the

3:40:05

question here like do enough people feel like the change in language that um

3:40:11

commissioner Murphy is suggest suggesting warrants moving this to a

3:40:17

public conversation during the public hearing uh and the next draft of this

3:40:22

um and clearly there's dialogue um being had so if you think it warrants

3:40:30

that we need to continue the conversation then you know raise your thumb and we'll include it so that we

3:40:36

can continue the conversation and if you don't think it warrants the conversation then

3:40:42

um we'll we'll take it out so I've got three in favor of retaining

3:40:49

it to move forward to discussion um is that to indicate that the other

3:40:54

members say no

3:41:00

I'm gathering okay so I guess I don't understand the difference between there's some things

3:41:05

that we've decided that staff's going to take another crack at this seems like a completely different category of moving

3:41:12

it to the public conversation all of this is about you know what we're

3:41:19

what we're moving forward and some of these things were just about hey we need staff to just work in principle in

3:41:26

agreeance with the direction and staff just needs to work on the exacting language versus here like I get the

3:41:33

sense that um that we need to just have like to me

3:41:39

this sounds like a really big change and I'm not sure it serves any purpose like

3:41:47

I get that Mike sees that there is but like I'm not

3:41:53

convinced like it's a one-word change that I think is going to end up it's you

3:41:59

know already turned into a longer conversation than I thought it was going to be um

3:42:06

um and I think potentially has the potential to be a huge policy shift

3:42:14

um for us and so uh you know if people feel like it

3:42:21

warrants that there's enough there that it warrants that we need to have staff go and do some of the work to bring to

3:42:26

us the questions that you've asked Kate and others have said like hey we need more

3:42:33

information about like what the actual impact of a single wording change like this would have like it's going to

3:42:39

consume some resources from the staff if we feel like it's important enough for all that work to be done then let's

3:42:46

ask the staff to do that work meaning let's move it forward to the public comment period but if we don't think

3:42:53

okay I thought you're saying bring this issue in front of the public well that's what I mean is that it's going to go into the public hearings

3:43:00

no no no sorry 10 o'clock and I'm not being as precise with my language as possible

3:43:06

um when I said that I meant like do we move this forward to a public hearing for our next discussion and conversation

3:43:14

so was that you uh in agreeance with moving it like doing that work

3:43:21

s that was me saying oh [Laughter]

3:43:29

heroin is your hand um uh that that was up for remaining

3:43:35

discussion but looks like the discussion is over and we're trying to decide if this is how many thumbs you have up to

3:43:41

move this forward I'm not clear yeah like I like I don't want to solve this really just like do enough people feel

3:43:47

like we need to continue this conversation to ask the staff to do the work to answer a bunch of the questions here

3:43:54

because we're not voting on it tonight it's just do we want to include this in the

3:44:00

in the draft that goes to the public hearing

3:44:06

so I I had one two Victor you had your thumb up I believe yes move this forward

3:44:14

Adam Carolyn Kate do you not agree with the language and don't want to move it forward

3:44:22

okay I'm I'm not a fan of it um so again Mike this is one if you want

3:44:30

to engage additional conversation with the staff to understand this more and propose something

3:44:35

um you're you're at liberty to do that

3:44:41

Allison are you okay with that I'm okay with that

3:44:47

and I would say that applies to 18.4 as well yeah I'm grouping 18 1 and 18 4

3:44:54

together here because it's essentially the same edit

3:45:00

and I would just say like if you can come back with a better definition um Mike of how the city

3:45:07

classifies these things in a way that makes sense then it might make

3:45:13

a more compelling case

3:45:22

um okay Allison 18.5 18.5

3:45:27

um so this is just another suggested edit to remove this

3:45:34

um eight year timeline here so this is the existing language said

3:45:41

the regulations would be updated periodically to incorporate information minimum every eight years required by

3:45:48

the growth management Act oh and I'm just reading Adam's little note here the actual

3:45:56

change here I had that wrong is just removing the s from critical area

3:46:03

to have more correct grammar so minor typo that was all it was yeah does

3:46:08

anyone have an objection to that I think that's a simple one okay

3:46:17

okay I can't remember if there's anything else down here I just have to scroll through

3:46:24

yes here we go okay so we're in parks and open space policies now and the goal is continue to

3:46:32

maintain the Island's unique quality of life through open space preservation Park and trail development and well-designed public facilities

3:46:39

um the proposed change here is to strike um

3:46:45

20.12 pursue a trail lease agreement from the Washington State Department of Transportation to allow for the

3:46:51

development of an I-90 connector Trail to establish a pedestrian connection between Luther Burbank and Town Center

3:46:57

I believe that this has already been pursued if I'm correct

3:47:04

and I don't I've lost my page here with the comments I need to find that back

3:47:10

Dude Looks Like it goes to one of mine so probably my question was was this

3:47:15

something that was done last time this was updated in this sentence I know Adam

3:47:21

checked into this with our parks department um I remember I recall that this was added to the comp plan at some point

3:47:27

several years ago to support a grant that the parks department was applying

3:47:32

for from the state to actually do this connection I believe that it was

3:47:38

completed and that's the reason why Adam went ahead and instructions that's that that was the nature of it nothing

3:47:44

nothing opposed to the actual you know Trail right right I think I think the

3:47:51

actual connection has been made and so we no longer need to keep this language here

3:47:57

cool

3:48:12

I think going fast I think that might have been it I just want to make sure there's

3:48:18

nothing hanging out down here in the very bottom yeah that was the last one I think okay

3:48:23

so two additional ones from um yeah I know Carolyn has some other things did I cover everything from that

3:48:31

existing set of comments from Mike Murphy and Adam Reagan

3:48:41

okay let's see Carolyn did you want me to pull yours up yes please

3:48:48

okay one second let me find it here

3:48:57

come on over to this screen

3:49:03

let's skip the part under climate change I'll just call you and ask you about that one Allison
okay okay

3:49:10

land use policies Town Center 2.2 um

3:49:15

this one I felt that the um existing phrase was incorrect

3:49:24

um we're not actually preserving the existing quantity of commercial square

3:49:30

footage in the Town Center as new development occurs

3:49:35

we're only promoting a minimum standard in new

3:49:41

development and we're preserving the existing quantity in recently developed

3:49:48

properties so I checked this with Jeff Thomas today

3:49:55

and he did think it needed to be changed so this is what I'm proposing to be more

3:50:02

accurate as to the actual outcome of the Town Center work that was done

3:50:08

last winter there's still being done

3:50:14

I think that um sounds consistent with the whether the exact language is perfect

3:50:22

um but it does sound like what was there before definitely was inconsistent with what we were just doing with the Town

3:50:30

Center update um and if Jeff reviewed this

3:50:37

um review this language but the concept I ran the concept by him and he said

3:50:43

yeah it needs to be changed yeah anybody have um an issue with just

3:50:49

updating 2.2 to be more reflective of the Town Center code changes that were

3:50:55

just passed okay now if you go down to 14.10 which

3:51:04

basically kind of says the same thing I just add a note here to my way of

3:51:09

thinking the easiest thing to do would just be to put the same policy you have in 2.2 in 14.10

3:51:17

is saying the same thing basically in two different places

3:51:27

Curry um I'm a little confused so if you're building new development and you say the

3:51:34

existing footage was uh 1500 square feet you can't build more than 1500 it has to

3:51:41

be 1500 exactly or you're saying it can't be anything less than 1500 but it can be more than that

3:51:47

yeah you can put in more uh commercial space I guess if you want to but

3:51:54

um this is this is directed towards preserving a minimum amount of

3:52:00

commercial space and in buildings that don't already meet the minimum

3:52:06

they would have to add more in in a Redevelopment

3:52:15

and this is that um commissioner Curry is uh

3:52:20

um something that the council adopted uh that's the the issue we talked about in

3:52:25

the beginning that takes effect December 1st um and so they've already done that I

3:52:33

think this is just about how do we bring these policies into congruency with the updated

3:52:40

um the updated code that they've um recently adopted

3:52:49

um Alice and I without seeing the context of 1410 are you in agreeance that likely we would need to update that

3:52:56

language as well yeah I'll take a look at these and you

3:53:01

know make sure everything looks okay and maybe Wordsmith a tiny bit but I think you

3:53:06

know in general I'm in agreement with these changes okay so on on that uh premise do I have four

3:53:13

people in agreeance with uh with updating the language of these to

3:53:19

reflect the updated Town Center code

3:53:27

okay I've got at least five so

3:53:32

foreign 15.1

3:53:37

okay um this one I

3:53:43

just felt that it was too severe the way it was originally

3:53:49

worded preserving the existing conditions in the single-family residential zones

3:53:56

um in the in the comp plan we usually talk about preserving the character I

3:54:01

mean existing conditions is is very very specific in minute so that's just a

3:54:07

proposal I'm putting out there for you to consider

3:54:12

any comments Adam uh preserve the existing character in

3:54:18

The Single family residential zones oh yeah I forgot to well maybe I meant to say existing character and forgot to put

3:54:24

the yeah yeah the character makes sense to make conditions to character yeah but

3:54:30

I like the I like retaining existing yeah okay

3:54:36

observe the existing character of the single family

3:54:41

residential zones that's probably what I should have said

3:54:46

okay I think that's congruent with um the way we refer to this in other

3:54:51

places in the code so um by four people in agreeance that that's

3:54:57

an okay change great uh 16.1 this looks like a pretty

3:55:04

um simple scrivener's error if something like I know we've changed housing the dwelling

3:55:10

yeah broadly across it looks like maybe it got missed here

3:55:16

um Allison are you aware of any um specific reason why that language

3:55:21

might have been different here just an oversight I think this is a good catch

3:55:28

or I'm not used to the term single-family District so I just dead zones but I'm not sure zones just

3:55:35

survive word either I think zones is probably more consistent with how it's okay presented

3:55:41

in other areas yeah

3:55:48

if you could call it goal 17 well yeah goal 17 wait never mind you don't need

3:55:56

to go to your document okay it's like you've got it there is that way yeah I guess I copied it in so

3:56:09

I I just couldn't figure out what what is that goal uh what what is this about

3:56:16

understand it

3:56:23

um I think it's trying to say that the commercial areas

3:56:31

the zoning of the commercial areas should not change other than

3:56:37

you could allow residential development there did I did I mistakenly not copy in a

3:56:44

policy number or is this actually text that's attached to a goal because that's unusual

3:56:51

this here is that what you mean yeah and I think that's the actual goal oh okay

3:56:57

okay I agree that that wording is cumbersome awkward if you might be able

3:57:05

to I would propose rewording it so it's very clearly and easy to understand whatever it means

3:57:17

Victor so on this one I'm confused

3:57:23

uh because to me the way it reads is um

3:57:29

make changes unless we make changes

3:57:36

well I don't know Allison what is the title of 17 like the section title yeah

3:57:44

let me that'll probably give us more context to the statement

3:57:50

like there's a there's a modifier in there that's not being spelled out but it's certainly

3:58:05

there it is I mean it's talking about the commercial zones and what you can do in them so I

3:58:12

think it's trying to say that the permitted uses

3:58:17

in the commercial areas should not change if you could get the back end of this

3:58:23

sentence move to the front and the front end of this sentence move to the back maybe it would be easier to understand

3:58:37

yeah we can we can take a crack at rewording that for more clarity okay

3:58:43

yeah if you guys can do the research and understand sort of what the intent of the whole section is yeah I mean I don't

3:58:49

know if we can figure out what the intent was when it was drafted but we can read all the policies and then try to figure out what would be the actual

3:58:56

goal that represents that yeah I yeah I think everyone's in agreeance that that doesn't make a whole lot of

3:59:03

sense the way it's written okay that's good okay I'm gonna call out

3:59:10

were there any others on that do you have anything else here Carolina yeah um just the 17.4 this is the policy we were

3:59:17

talking about in relation to JCC and I just added a y to the end of healthy but

3:59:23

I think you've already I caught that when we were talking about it yeah okay that's fixed already and then um the

3:59:30

last one here oh well two things um under the parks and open space policies

3:59:36

it says that the pros plan and the head bicycle plan will be updated

3:59:43

periodically but um just this last year the council adopted a policy that says that the bike

3:59:50

facility plan should be updated every eight years so for so far I don't see that in the comp plan anywhere and if

3:59:56

it's supposed to be a comp plan Amendment it needs to be in here somewhere is this the place it should be or should

4:00:02

it be in that other thing we were talking about under transportation I think it belongs there rather than here yeah I think anything about the timeline

4:00:09

the number of years should go in the implementation strategy but if the council did adopt

4:00:18

every eight years as a compliment Amendment it should be in the comp plan somewhere

4:00:27

wait you're saying the council adopted that as a compliment Amendment yeah I was in the docket you know and and it

4:00:34

was brought to the to the council it was in the docket but I don't think

4:00:40

it was docketed oh it was it was docketed the the updating the pet bicycle plan to every

4:00:47

eight years and to be responsive to the arrival of Light Rail was the phrase and

4:00:54

it was docketed and I think the council adopted it so I mean you all would have reviewed

4:01:02

that if it was docketed yeah we would have brought you a code Amendment or a compliant Amendment okay so I my

4:01:09

understanding is that was not added to the final docket because the council felt that it could be addressed through

4:01:15

the process of updating the comp plan which we were already planning to do okay well then since we're already updating the comp plan and that's where

4:01:22

they thought we should deal with it maybe we should deal with it right here except for put it in the transportation element instead of in the Parks and open

4:01:28

space helmet so I the only comment I have there is I

4:01:35

think the statement that staff made in the beginning is we're trying to remove the

4:01:40

um specificity of timelines in the comp plan but rather give direction to at

4:01:48

least that's what I understood correct me if I'm wrong Allison that's correct

4:01:53

so how do we deal with the situation now the the bike Community here on the island is you know it's been said to me

4:02:00

many times that the pet bicycle facility plan is is outdated and how do we get this

4:02:09

I mean how do we prevent that from happening I don't know um I mean I've got a lot of thoughts

4:02:15

about this topic I mean I agree with you that the pet bike plan is outdated and

4:02:20

needs to be updated um I think the tricky part about this is that really becomes a budget issue and

4:02:27

putting a number like eight years in a policy document

4:02:33

it doesn't really have teeth and it doesn't really get us anything it just will kind of look bad once time has

4:02:41

passed and maybe we haven't done what we said we were going to do um but I think you know having an

4:02:46

implementation strategy with specific timelines that can then be used to inform a budget

4:02:53

process is a bit more useful but where the rubber meets the road is a biennial

4:02:58

budget every two years and so if folks are wanting to advocate for things to happen that is the place that it should

4:03:04

be happening okay I will talk to those folks about it because they're they're just this year opened up

4:03:11

this flood of money for Grants we're doing stuff for bicycle facilities and but you have an

4:03:20

outdated a very outdated bike ped plan to even be designing what you know to

4:03:25

seek those Grant funds in fact maybe they might not even give you the grant funds if your bike ped plan is 10 years

4:03:31

old so yeah I'll suggest to those folks that they got a Lobby for you know maybe

4:03:37

getting that plan updated sooner than 2026. you know if that's possible

4:03:43

okay so the last thing I had here was um

4:03:50

should the arts and culture plan be adopted here by reference I'm a little puzzled because there's a whole section

4:03:56

on arts and culture but it doesn't mention to adopt the plan by reference where do you do that

4:04:06

I thought that it was adopted by reference so I'm going to need to look at that in

4:04:12

more detail um I agree that it is a good idea

4:04:19

and I guess that might be consistent for all sorts of plans that are adopted by reference would seem that there should

4:04:26

be some consistent place where you would see that yeah I mean what we've been trying to

4:04:31

move to with this update is that kind of the bottom of the section that's

4:04:37

relevant to that plan it'll say you know the arts and culture plan is hereby

4:04:42

adopted by reference I saw that in one place um so

4:04:49

yeah because in the past like in the last couple years when I go to the comp plan and I think I'm going to find all

4:04:55

of those plans that are adopted by reference I don't find them you know they're often some other another world

4:05:02

yeah I think it would be a really good Improvement to have them actually be on yeah the website as a part of yeah you

4:05:09

know there'll be a link to it there maybe you can find a resolution that the council did adopt it but you never you

4:05:16

don't find it in the comp plan that says it was adopted so okay so awesome maybe

4:05:21

hey just make sure that it has been added I know that was the intent like in

4:05:26

whatever that section is and then another thing to consider is do we create an index or a reference section

4:05:34

at the end that um is just a catalog of all of the documents that have been

4:05:42

um referenced um um and that way there's just a like a

4:05:48

single catalog of like here are all the references this is the page number or the section number that they're

4:05:54

referenced in or from and then the link to the to the reference itself that way there's

4:06:02

a single place where someone could go and look at all the reference documents but then they can also be tagged in

4:06:07

individual way to make that more user friendly for

4:06:13

sure I think at a minimum the place where the comp plan lives on our website

4:06:20

um there's this Muni dog there's a a web system that allows us to have like

4:06:28

a document Library essentially as a part of that and so I think we should be able

4:06:33

to build links to all of those documents that would be easy to find on the website but I recommend having the table

4:06:39

of contents perhaps if this is possible for the comp plan include those you know

4:06:46

parts of the comp plan possible um commissioner Curry I said you had

4:06:52

your hand up did you have uh uh it was just my own uh lack of

4:06:58

knowledge around the phrase adopted here by reference that's also and I think you did a I think I I caught on to what it

4:07:04

is based on your explanation thank you very much

4:07:11

yeah I mean the good thing I'll just add the good thing about adopting a plan by reference is that it's a dynamic

4:07:18

reference so that if the bike and ped plan is updated every eight years or

4:07:23

however often we don't need to amend the comp plan to refer to it it will just always refer to the most recent version

4:07:33

cool good heroin was that all the um that's it things here

4:07:39

um I'll just open it up does anybody else have anything that was missed or that they want to bring back

4:07:45

um to the table related to the land use stuff

4:07:52

okay um thank you everyone we'll definitely get another crack at this Alice it

4:07:58

sounds like you may bring this back for at least one more go through before yeah it sounds like we need another at least

4:08:05

kind of brief go through of a few of these um I'm gonna have to take a look at kind of the schedule and everything we've got

4:08:12

coming up including how long I think the docket conversation will take to decide if

4:08:17

we I think it's likely we'll need to wait until November to bring this back to you all just so we have adequate time

4:08:24

for the docket in October but we'll get that sorted and and let you guys know what the how the agendas Shape Up

4:08:31

and if if we're going to end up bringing the land use element back before we go to the public hearing draft you know I

4:08:38

might suggest I know there was a lot of discussion around the the natural water

4:08:43

courses language that Mike was proposing so I don't know um

4:08:49

Mike if you want to get together with the staff and just I think there was some question around the clarity of the

4:08:57

like what that what the impact of that would be and whatnot and uh maybe if there's

4:09:05

if you guys come to some better way of articulating all of that we can bring it back for discussion at

4:09:12

that meeting before we go to the public hearing happy to talk offline

4:09:17

cool um good all right well with that um we're on to our last few things

4:09:24

um Allison do you have anything for the deputy director's report I do I'll try to keep it as quick as I

4:09:30

can um first exciting news um the city is going to be moving to

4:09:36

doing true hybrid meetings for boards and commissions so for our October

4:09:41

meeting we will be offering an in-person option for Commissioners to attend at City Hall it's going to work similar to

4:09:48

How the City Council meetings have been running the last several months if you've if you've watched them

4:09:53

um the folks that want to participate in person will be in the council chambers at City Hall and we'll have the fancy

4:10:00

video cameras capturing everyone you'll also still have the option to join via Zoom I think the staff will be kind of a

4:10:08

mix we'll have one or two people at City Hall and one or two people joining online

4:10:13

and then the public could join in either location as well so I think

4:10:19

maybe I don't know if folks know right away but if you're interested in joining a person if you could give me

4:10:25

some indication that would be helpful just so we know how many people to plan for

4:10:30

and feel free to email me too that's fine

4:10:36

um and I are gonna order pizza we'll be hanging out some

4:10:42

make it a big pizza [Laughter]

4:10:53

November and December meeting regular meeting dates fall very very close to a

4:10:59

couple of holidays and I would like to suggest that we consider rescheduling

4:11:04

those meetings um looking at a couple different options we have we kind of set the second

4:11:11

Wednesday as an alternate date for to our regular meetings if we ever needed to schedule additional meetings or

4:11:18

reschedule so that would leave us with um November 9th or December 14th for

4:11:26

potential dates I think we could also look at um if our schedule would allow us to

4:11:32

maybe cancel one of those and consolidate down to one meeting I noticed there's also a fifth Wednesday

4:11:37

in November November 30th so I'm kind of looking at those three dates November 9 November 30 and December 14.

4:11:45

um if anyone is aware of a major conflict for one of those dates right now please let me know

4:11:51

otherwise maybe we'll look at kind of what we need to get through the rest of this year and make a decision on whether

4:11:57

we need one or two meetings and then I can send out a poll or something just to save time now

4:12:03

possibly my brain is too scrambled to get what I'm hearing but did you say we were talking about a meeting on November

4:12:09

9th and November 30th and December something I think we would have one or

4:12:16

two meetings on some combination of those nights we

4:12:21

would not have three meetings oh what was the December one December 14th 14th

4:12:26

and when's our October meeting um October 26th October 26th okay okay

4:12:34

and so I do not have any conflicts I was just gonna say in the the main

4:12:40

conflict here is our regularly scheduled November meeting would be the Wednesday before Thanksgiving so like Thanksgiving

4:12:47

Eve and then yeah the regular December meeting would be the 28th if I remember

4:12:53

which is like only a couple days after Christmas if you celebrate that or a

4:12:58

couple of days before New Year's either way like it that week generally is just not great for people with vacation so

4:13:04

yeah I know everybody's kids are out of school and a lot of people travel so

4:13:09

the dates that you mentioned for me so far are pretty good but the sooner you

4:13:15

tell me which ones they are the better okay thank you

4:13:21

all right well well Adam's gonna be back on Tuesday we'll put our heads together and figure out what we think makes the

4:13:28

most sense for the remaining things we need to get through this year and we'll let you guys know as soon as we can

4:13:35

um the final thing I was going to mention I think I already said that the docket is wrapping the the open period

4:13:42

for the docket submissions is wrapping up the last days to submit items for the docket is Saturday October 1st

4:13:49

and then we will be bringing back all the submittals for the planning commission's review at the October 26th

4:13:55

meeting um I know of one so far coming in from the public I don't know there might be a few

4:14:01

others sneaking in at the last minute um and we've got several coming from the staff as well

4:14:07

so we'll be consolidating those all together into a big summary and

4:14:12

I don't know our past couple of years we've had very long detailed conversations about them so looking

4:14:18

forward to that um when did the when and where was the docket open announced I I missed it I I

4:14:26

didn't I didn't even see it um it goes in the newspaper it goes on our website

4:14:32

um we actually created a let's talk page for it this year to make all the materials a little easier to see find

4:14:38

access but not in like city news for example

4:14:46

um yeah I don't I don't know if it went out in my weekly because last year yeah

4:15:00

this may be a newbie question but can you can you explain to me what this what the docket is good question good

4:15:07

question I was gonna get there after she uh went through all the

4:15:12

because it's like um it probably surmise that it's kind of a big deal um so the docket is the annual

4:15:19

opportunity for people to suggest or apply for

4:15:25

um amendments to the comprehensive plan or the development code so anyone in the

4:15:31

public can bring forward ideas or specific applications to amend the code

4:15:38

or the comp plan um you know these can be anything from something like specific to a property or

4:15:45

a project that someone is looking to do or something more city-wide like

4:15:50

you know one last year Carolyn brought forward was we should do something about

4:15:56

noisy leaf blowers so you know it's really a mix from

4:16:02

really specific things to really broad things and the the process there Adam just to

4:16:09

go click deeper we'll do a first review there's a certain criteria that have to be met and

4:16:16

evaluated as to whether or not it actually qualifies for consideration and

4:16:21

then from that we'll look at resourcing like how much time do we have to

4:16:27

how much time do we have available to cover what like what do we think we could cover and then we suggest a slate

4:16:34

of items to the council um that says you know of if 20 things are submitted we say all the other

4:16:41

things have been considered these are the eight that we think should be um should be considered and time should

4:16:47

be spent on the council will then review that usually they'll go and look at the ones that we've potentially not included

4:16:55

on that list and then they actually have the final determination we'll send it

4:17:00

back to us the finalized list which impacts Staffing and the work that they

4:17:07

have to do in our schedule and all of that so it's a big part of defining what

4:17:12

our work plan for next year will be okay thank you for clarifying that yeah

4:17:17

so every Amendment that's decided we are required to review and the review includes

4:17:24

Planning Commission meeting public hearing you make a recommendation then the city council also

4:17:30

um has at least two readings on any ordinances that go forward so pretty extensive review process

4:17:37

um in in every every item that's docketed goes through the same process

4:17:44

it's October 1st which is a Saturday

4:17:49

and Adam this is just for your um additional knowledge like it's worth noting especially if there are people

4:17:55

from the public that are listening to this like this is a statutory process and requirement that the state mandates

4:18:03

so that's that's why there's some formality to it

4:18:08

okay cool thank you

4:18:13

cool uh thank you Allison any other updates on that end that was it for me

4:18:20

thank you um so we just talked about future meetings absences Allison it sounds like

4:18:25

you're going to send out a list of the proposed dates based on this how much

4:18:31

time staff needs for some of the preparations and Etc so if you can just reply to that

4:18:37

um with what your um potential absences might be an availability

4:18:44

um beyond that does anyone else have any announcements or Communications to share

4:18:49

with the group all right hearing none thank you all

4:18:55

very much this was a great discussion I look forward to uh bringing this all back again uh here in the next couple of

4:19:01

months to finalize a few pieces before we take this to a public hearing

4:19:07

um and with that our next meeting as it stands is scheduled for October the 26th

4:19:13

I think it's what you said Allison that's correct and uh so with that if

4:19:18

there's nothing else for the good of the order um if you could please stay online until

4:19:24

uh Deb uh turns off the meeting and with that the

4:19:29

meeting is adjourned thank you very much bye guys