

GMHB EXHIBIT 180

2023-07-26 Planning Commission Transcript

0:21

good evening and welcome to the July 26 2023 regular hybrid Planning Commission

0:28

meeting I'm Mike Murphy the chair tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is being brought to you courtesy

0:36

of Zoom welcome to you all and thank you for joining us tonight Commissioners please

0:43

have your microphones turned on for the roll call uh and Adam if you would uh call the

0:50

roll for for us tonight sure uh commissioner accuse here

0:58

uh commissioner batazzo commissioner boatsman here

1:04

uh commissioner gels dear commissioner rashish

1:10

here uh Vice chair here

1:15

and chair Murphy here a quorum is present and let the record

1:20

show that uh commissioner batazzo uh previously requested an excused absence

1:26

and she is not with us tonight for this meeting we continue to utilize the zoom

1:33

platform and I will do my best to recognize you in the order in which your

1:39

virtual hands are raised after being recognized you may then ask your question or make comments our first

1:48

order of business is public appearances this is the opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about issues of

1:54

concern uh Adam is there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to

2:00

address the commission uh no one signed up no

2:05

okay so given that there are no appearances

2:12

we now move to regular business the first item of regular businesses to

2:17

review and consider the June 28th and regular meeting minutes

2:23

Commissioners may have a motion to approve the June 28 minutes so moved

2:29

okay it's been moved by Victor seconded By Carolyn

2:35

um you uh Adam do you want to uh call the

2:40

roll yeah uh commissioner accuse

2:45

aye commissioner batazo's absence uh commissioner votesman

2:52

aye commissioner gills uh uh commissioner rashes all right

3:00

uh Vice chair rock Heaven aye and chair Murphy hi

3:06

motion passes unanimously our second item of regular business is the Planning

3:12

Commission bylaws review um and is Allison going to join us

3:18

tonight Adam or are you filling in for her too uh the city clerk uh Andrea Larson will

3:25

take the presentation here great Andrea take it away

3:31

thank you chair good evening commission for the record I'm city clerk Andrea Larson

3:36

um I don't have a PowerPoint for you this evening but just a few points that

3:43

I wanted to touch on because presentation was virtually going to be the same what Allison and Deb presented

3:49

to you in June um before you tonight is an update of

3:55

the bylaws this update to the bylaws came about um since I was appointed to two city

4:03

clerk's office one of my goals was to bring some consistency to all boards and

4:08

commissions bylaws so that any commissioner on any of our boards and commissions are functioning from a

4:15

similar set of rules that govern their board or Commission

4:22

they all have some slight differences because each board's business is

4:28

slightly different but overall we're looking to gain consistency between between the boards and commissions

4:34

consistency with state law and consistency with the city code and city council rules of procedure

4:41

um as we started to work through incorporating these things what we

4:46

thought could be an easy rewrite you know a few edits to bring

4:54

these things kind of ended up turning into a complete rewrite of the Planning

4:59

Commission they did increase quite a bit from in

5:04

length from the previous bylaws but we felt that that was necessary so that we

5:09

could help you guys include some more governing things to have

5:17

um for the boards and commissions to utilize um we also wanted to just address

5:23

legislative changes that have happened since last changes there were

5:28

legislative changes to the open Public's meeting act that required any meeting

5:33

that has action being taken has a chance for the public to speak I mean

5:40

there is also a requirement that we have to provide a physical location for the

5:45

public to watch the meeting from so both of those have been incorporated into the bylaws

5:52

we also just added some procedural changes that address required training selection of officers

6:00

how agendas are prepared and kind of Planning Commission procedures

6:07

and then also included in the rules in the bylaws that are consistent with the

6:13

city council rules or procedure are some parliamentary rules and motions Planning

6:18

Commission code of conduct Planning Commission staff communication guidelines and how does the city use

6:25

Nextdoor um that's the how and the why we got here um do you guys have any questions

6:34

these similar these similar bylaws are being presented to the other boards and commissions

6:40

um throughout their September and October meetings yeah everyone

6:46

yes um I have some these this look like a great Improvement movement very helpful so I have some

6:52

comments and questions and maybe others have comments and questions too and I wondered if we could get it up on the

6:59

screen and maybe look at it Page by Page

7:05

you have to give me just one second

7:28

where is Granger every program is different

7:47

and what was your question Carolyn okay so on the first page um number 1.2

7:55

uh uh okay yeah right there um it refers to

8:02

quasi-judicial matters if you if you click on that 195010 it it um refers to

8:09

our work with quasi-judicial matters and I I understood that we have

8:15

been removed from that role a few years ago so there aren't any current

8:21

quasi-judicial matters that are before within the purview of the Planning

8:26

Commission you are correct um because that holdover is still in the

8:31

code um our city legal team

8:37

advice still you know we would have to make an amendment to the code too take

8:43

that out of there okay so okay so it's not a problem for us that it mentions us

8:48

doing that kind of work when we don't do it that is correct okay and then also in 1.2 it says that we are the designated

8:55

planning Agency for the city I wondered about that because I I didn't think about ourselves as an agency uh so

9:03

I wondered about that there are a lot of people out there in the you know the the citizens that think that the mount

9:08

Planning Commission is an agency and makes decisions about property um permits and so on but um so what does

9:15

what does that mean God that would be a great question to email in Jerry City

9:20

attorney Bo Parker assistant City attorney Eileen Kiefer um it's an RCW reference that they

9:28

suggested that we have in there well okay I mean um it's if it's not of

9:33

concern to all of you um I guess I'm I'm not that concerned I don't want to hold up business on this

9:39

tonight um 2.5 I don't know if 2.5 is on the same page but maybe other people have

9:46

questions about the first page there

9:54

section one in section two or almost all direct copy and paste directly from the

9:59

members around City Club okay okay well part 2.5

10:05

I just want to point out a typo in there for you um

10:12

scrivener zeros and typos will be picked up as okay all right and you're missing the word training in B receive training

10:19

I think is what you want to say there I don't know if that'll come up or not when you're looking

10:25

um I see other people have their hands up is are you guys on the same page or

10:31

should I finish with my comments and questions what do you think um Michael well uh I think if someone has a comment

10:38

on pages one two or three four and five here let's uh chime in and go through

10:47

the document one time

10:54

go ahead Adam had a quick clarification that I would

11:02

recommend adding to 2.4 uh hopefully this is something we never use but um in

11:08

the previous bylaws it clarified that you know that removal would be you know

11:14

after public hearing um so I see the language for concurrence of the city council but no language for public

11:20

hearing so my recommendation would be let's let's clarify that that would be a

11:25

public hearing of this you know run by you know City Council

11:31

um that was the only comment I had on this part

11:38

I certainly agree with that so anyway maybe I mean maybe that's a Amendment later okay

11:50

Victor do you have something on uh 2.4 2.5

11:55

just a quick note the removal is a direct copy and paste from the city code

12:02

um I do um and this is more of a question for chair Murphy

12:09

I think in the previous meeting or in one of the meetings where we've discussed this you had you had some

12:14

proposed changes around um conflict of interest and I know that 2.5

12:23

has a code of ethics and it just says that we have to go through ethics

12:29

training but it doesn't specifically talk about

12:35

conflict conflicts of interest am I remembering that conversation yeah you're you are remembering it correctly

12:42

I believe what is picked up there in 2.5 a

12:47

is that the code section being referenced mica 2.60

12:55

is the local is our local code that defines conflicts as well as chapter 42

13:04

23 of the RCW but but the but this appears in the

13:09

training section and it just simply says we have to attend the training it

13:16

doesn't say anything about being bound to the code of ethics unless I missed it somewhere else

13:22

um I think it says somewhere further down but actually I actually have a

13:27

question along these lines when we get further down also 2.4 references removal for conflict

13:35

of interest I don't know if that's good enough but it actually doesn't Define the what

13:41

what that is does it it doesn't absolutely it could be better

13:46

yeah I think there and further down I have the same question that they don't

13:54

Define that it's all by implication from 2.5

14:03

in regards to whether a hearing is required for a planning commissioner to

14:08

be dismissed I think that is mentioned in some part of this packet if

14:14

not this first rule maybe later in one of the appendices so as we go down let's let's

14:21

look for it I have a question on 2.5 B

14:30

it requires training and I'm assuming based on past

14:38

experience that that's training that you guys coordinate and schedule so yeah is

14:45

training is coordinated through the city's clerk's office yeah and you're you're not relying on us through this

14:52

document to schedule our own training for that yeah no okay it's just stating

14:57

that it is a requirement yeah okay okay any other comments

15:03

um Chris go ahead sorry you know it seems like an easy fix would be then 2.5 a to Simply have a

15:11

lead sentence that says all board and commission members are bound by the code

15:17

of ethics and they will get training as provided by the attorney's office I mean it seems like it's at the point that it

15:24

doesn't you know nothing says specifically that we're bound it seems like it might be worth adding

15:31

yeah yeah I think that's a good point

15:39

and maybe the section heading in 2.5 could be something I believe that the bound to the code of

15:47

ethics is addressed in later in the rules of procedure and this one really was to address just training requirements okay we'll look we'll look

15:54

for that

15:59

um any comments on the next section three

16:06

Chris is that a new hand or an old hand oh damn sorry okay

16:14

um so Andrea in um 3.1 C on the

16:21

process um we're nominating the chair that looks a

16:27

little different from what we did the last several years is this a change

16:36

so 3.1 C would only apply if there's only one nomination for chair

16:43

okay which is is that the same procedure that we've used I don't remember us

16:49

doing it that way so it's basically saying it's the same procedure that you have done but if

16:56

there's only one nomination for a chair instead of

17:02

having everybody do the vote will do it just as one because there's not two

17:08

nominations for a chair okay so it's just kind of condensing it

17:13

instead of saying we need to work through all of them they can cast a unanimous ballot because

17:20

if that is the will of the commission yeah it may not be the will of the commission if some of the Commissioners

17:26

do not wish to vote even though there's only one nomination for chair okay but

17:32

this this process calls for a second whereas the process that we've used this

17:39

year and the last three years only for C and only if you're wishing to cast a

17:45

unanimous ballot and skip the individual ballots and so it's not mandatory to

17:50

pursue the unanimous ballot correct okay so it's saying if you want to do a

17:56

unanimous ballot it has to be supported by more than one person which is why it requires a second okay and that's

18:02

consistent with the procedure used to elect the mayor and the deputy mayor okay

18:08

okay any other comments on this page

18:16

anything on the next page

18:22

I have a question or comment about something in section four okay I was

18:28

looking for something in the uh meeting guidelines about uh

18:34

commissioner wanting to raise a topic for the good of the order or wherever and wondering where that fits in an

18:41

agenda if you want to propose adding something

18:46

to the agenda I don't know maybe I don't know maybe it'd be considered that or not but let's

18:52

let's say a commissioner wants to to guess something about how we conduct our business for meetings or

18:59

um uh wants to suggest something be added to a future agenda or

19:06

um I don't know could be anything but right here I don't see any place in the

19:11

I don't know maybe it's further down here towards the very end of this section four

19:17

I think there's a discussion of um how the

19:23

uh what the agenda looks like order of regular planning meeting agenda yeah if

19:29

you keep going a little bit further you get to the end there's just no place for

19:35

people to bring up something um you know

19:41

that you know sometimes our chair does say

19:46

that towards the end of our our meetings do we have any suggestions for the good of the order okay so this is a place

19:52

where a commissioner could we can't speak about business that wasn't advertised on the agenda we can make

20:00

proposals for future meetings but we couldn't hold discussion about it okay

20:06

well even that there isn't a place to do that here it wasn't a topic that's typically on

20:13

the blending commission agenda so it wasn't one that would added that would be a great question for Allison

20:19

um and and the thing might be have not something to do that is a um I mean

20:26

I don't know that it would require to be on a public agenda but it might just have to do how we're organizing our

20:33

input for example how we're sharing our input how you know something like that

20:38

um so I don't know if all those things have to be on the agenda but these are my

20:44

this is my question the commission always has the ability to discuss those things throughout the meeting discussing

20:51

how you're going to discussion protocol which isn't something that needs to be on the agenda and the chair could choose

20:57

to hold that discussion at any time okay that's good so Carolyn I think the

21:04

intent of this process is that if if someone wants something to be discussed

21:12

they should suggest that to staff to add to the agenda homework meeting

21:20

and I believe there is a point that addresses that later in the buy loans yeah okay

21:26

alrighty this is just kind of the structure of yeah the meeting

21:34

yeah well I'm okay I'm not sure there it might be something missing but let's

21:40

keep looking and thinking about it you know because the about the closest you could get is if there are

21:46

similar to City Council planning commissioner reports um but that would be a reporting on

21:53

Planning Commission business that the individual Commissioners had been working on it's not really necessarily a

21:59

place for discussion yeah Chris

22:05

um Jeff five is it the section five is all about the agenda setting and I don't

22:10

think it completely is going to satisfy Carolyn because it is written in the passive voice and it's not clear to me

22:16

how topics are set but it seems like that's where we should probably talk about it yeah I probably didn't see it there so

22:22

this probably drew me back to the other

22:29

any other comments on section four at all

22:38

okay moving into five Adam

22:47

you're muted Adam oh okay thanks um on five three the you know with

22:54

dealing with City Hall's closure um this customer service counter uh is that

22:59

something that's is that still available there are multiple customer service counters which is why I went with that

23:06

okay okay um okay

23:12

there are multiple customer service counters throughout the city oh okay

23:18

thank you okay any other comments on five

23:26

okay let's move to section six any comments on six

23:33

yeah I have some questions this is this very interesting section here 6.2 C Carolyn uh Adam had his hand up

23:43

first and then Kate okay I thought we were still just um going spontaneous but

23:48

yes okay Adam no no worries um yeah uh just once

23:55

on six three I guess so maybe it makes sense to discuss commissioner boatsman's

24:00

first um or should I just talk real to six three yeah go ahead

24:07

okay um on G I'm I know I've been guilty of this

24:12

um do not be repetitive in your arguments or discussions sometimes I don't know maybe that's I I would I

24:19

would Advocate perhaps we have softer language like try to not be repetitive in your arguments or discussion

24:24

sometimes sometimes I have to repeat things once you know and maybe the next

24:30

time it goes around say the same thing worded slightly differently so I would I

24:35

would ask for a little leeway on 63g they're also just protocols which are

24:42

guidelines you know that's something to keep in mind here okay yeah nobody gets

24:47

punished if they repeat something okay

24:53

hi um I was wondering if this is an

24:59

appropriate or inappropriate place to talk about the docket and how we

25:08

we had a little bit of a foible last time with differences of opinion about

25:13

what whether we use the criteria the city council uses in the docketing process

25:22

um and I noticed that's next up on the agenda is discussion of the docket um

25:27

I don't know we talked about a potential need to get some clarity

25:36

um yeah I guess it's a question to staff and I guess the chair and the vice

25:41

chairs this is should we clear that up before our next docketing process

25:50

from the city clerk's office perspective that would be a question for a deputy director van gorp who's unfortunately

25:56

sick this evening yeah my recollection Kate is the way we

26:04

left that was yes there was confusion yes the code is

26:12

not a model of clarity um and the chances of getting the

26:20

city council to revise the code and in view if there was

26:27

considerable difference of opinion when within this body um and given the prospect of the

26:35

bandwidth of staff and city council as far as revising the code to clarify that

26:42

we felt that was not or could be kind of a Fool's errand

26:48

um even though I agree that there is a there is a problem there and um

26:55

so I'm not sure if we want to tackle that certainly it's not here

27:00

uh it really goes in the in the code section relating to or code sections

27:07

relating to that process okay so that I think that answers my question that this is not an appropriate

27:14

place um as I go back to what Adam said about that g then and I would say I almost

27:21

want to make that stronger because I was certainly guilty of and I think others were too um

27:26

having a lot of really repetitive arguments and I'm concerned that we really aren't using Robert's Rules of

27:32

orders effectively as a group um and we end up going till midnight a

27:38

lot and it just feels like a lot of that is repeated points um I've tried to get better at it

27:44

I don't know if I have or not um but I would hope that the chair and vice chair would really kind of enforce

27:52

those Roberts rules of orders and discussion protocols so that we can have more um time efficient meetings

28:01

I will try

28:08

Carolyn okay um in 6.2 C

28:15

um this is kind of about similar topics here if I'm not engaged in debate or discussion with any individual but maybe

28:22

recognized by the chair to ask the speaker clarifying questions so this sounds like when we're debating or

28:29

discussing actually deliberating we're and someone States their Viewpoint it's

28:35

appropriate to ask them questions if you don't understand their viewpoint but it's not appropriate to disagree you

28:41

can State your own viewpoint but not to disagree with something that's been said is that correct

28:46

well this is 6.2 is it's regarding 6.2 C

28:52

is regarding public appearances oh it's not Planning Commission debate okay okay I I got confused there sorry about that

28:59

okay um all right um I have something about 6.4 when you get

29:06

there uh we're there okay um

29:12

okay regarding the statement of dissent um it sounds like the statement of dissent

29:18

has to be made during the meeting on the spot is

29:23

that correct or is it allowed to be sent in later

29:30

um that's a good question for Deputy the director vangort um you know the one of the things that

29:36

we're trying to enforce or not enforce it's the wrong word trying to encourage

29:41

with these bylaws is it's the will of the commission it's the

29:47

will the same as it's The Well of the council it's not the individual Commissioners it's the decision of the

29:53

body um and our legal advice that we received from the city attorney assistant City

30:00

attorney was as it's presented in the bylaws

30:10

yeah I think in the past um

30:16

we have allowed or people have been permitted to submit and just because

30:22

it's not in the bylaws doesn't mean that you wouldn't be you couldn't ask to

30:29

submit one um you know so it doesn't

30:35

their guidelines to how you guys are on your meetings um as much as we want to think of every

30:42

little thing and address everything there is still any way it is still the

30:48

will of the commission yeah it and if you look at the last sentence in B it

30:55

talks about no other statement it is proper or will be allowed to be recorded in the minutes of the meeting so I think

31:02

what this is really directed to is what gets recorded as the official action of

31:08

the commission and there's nothing to prevent you from communicating with city

31:15

council about matters that come before us or that that are otherwise

31:22

that is correct Adam I I kind of like the the verbiage here

31:27

of saying that customer commissioner XX verbally stated it because then you know

31:32

for members of the public if they're reviewing this they say oh there was a dissent okay I'll go watch the video I

31:39

think if we or you know I think encouraging us to add a sentence if in those rare

31:45

situations is good um because otherwise if it's a if it's an email to city

31:51

council or an email to staff um that's a lot harder for members of

31:56

the public to access um so I I kind of like I kind of like

32:01

how it is worded you can see some real benefit to doing

32:07

it that way so just wondered how that would work yeah there's nothing to preclude that

32:13

process or follow-on process with the council correct

32:22

okay anything else in six from anyone else Carolyn

32:28

yeah I'm on this no surprises rule um I guess my first concern is that it's is

32:35

the title you know the description of it as a rule um I think that we have in appendix C

32:44

of this of these bylaws uh if we could scroll down and take a look at that first and see the context of that for

32:51

for my comments about this as to whether it's necessary or needed

32:57

um it would be c um seven I believe

33:03

Okay so yeah this one is to me appropriate and

33:09

sufficient uh it's we're being told that we should submit questions for significant information

33:16

that's needed in for a meeting as far as an advance the staff can prepare and I

33:21

think that's a really good idea and it's it's not presented as a rule or you have to do this

33:27

um uh you know you can make some decisions as to what's

33:32

appropriate so I think this statement is sufficient for this and I would not be in favor of of a rule

33:40

um as it's worded we go back up um have some more specific things to say

33:45

about that rule

33:51

Okay so um in general you know I have had enough

33:58

time in the many years I've been doing this to read a packet

34:04

study that packet gather my concerns together come to the meeting be ready to

34:09

communicate it but what I don't have time for is to

34:16

prepare my comments sometimes even two weeks in advance or be required to prepare my comments in

34:22

advance to whatever you know time period is proposed here and to read each read the comments and

34:30

questions of all the other Commissioners it's as if we're starting you know the meeting in advance of the meeting

34:37

and um boy I don't have time in my personal life for all of that but I do have time

34:42

to come to a meeting prepared to um deal with it deal with the packet so

34:49

I don't know I really have some real concerns about this do things in advance things well that's that's a start Adam

34:59

um sorry um yeah I yeah I was finishing some different timing yeah

35:04

um I I completely agree with commissioner boatsman on this um you know while it's it's yeah and I

35:11

mean I I don't don't try to Blindside someone with questions in a meeting but

35:16

I think this is a an unreasonable standard to hold to I do understand

35:22

for city council why they have it they they have a lot more business on each agenda

35:27

um you know they really need to move things along quickly um I've seen mayor niece move meetings

35:32

very fast but I I'm concerned that this would push push a lot of the sausage

35:38

making and decisions and back and forth discourse um into email and out of these meetings

35:45

here and the way I see it is as Commissioners we serve we serve the residents of Mercer Island

35:51

um let's make it as easy as possible for them to just watch the video and see how

35:56

does the commission come to this if we if we have as commissioner boatsman said the meeting before the meeting it's

36:01

gonna be that much harder for them to see how um we came to a decision or recommendation

36:09

or the discussion that ensued so uh yeah I think for for openness to the public I

36:16

I'm very concerned with this 6'5 as worded Victor

36:25

um so to take a contrarian view I I actually support this

36:30

um I think that I I think that there's I think that this is being misread this this doesn't have

36:38

this doesn't shut down questions this doesn't shut down preparation having

36:44

watched the council for nearly a decade I I think I understand uh the Genesis of

36:50

this and this is literally so that there isn't a surprise curve ball that comes

36:57

in at the 11th Hour that City staff is not prepared to address and other

37:04

members of the commission are not prepared to address I think I'll remind everyone that the idea here is to

37:13

um standardize this as much as we can across all the boards and commissions and so

37:20

um we can't have one rule for the commission and other rules for let's say the council and all that so I I'm

37:27

very supportive of this um I don't think it shuts down any sort

37:33

of line of questioning or Preparation it doesn't Force things into a back room

37:38

but at the same time it also does prevent a commission member from from throwing curveballs in uh at the last

37:46

minute Chris

37:51

um yeah no I I don't love the rule but I'm okay with it I mean all three sentences are qualified

37:57

so it's not an absolute bar and because I read emerging issues I'm reading it more like Victor is that this is like a

38:04

whole different thing as opposed to you know something that comes up when you read materials and think huh well this

38:10

is related to that that uh and you know at that point best efforts would still

38:15

allow you to raise it so I don't see that it shuts down it's gonna I don't see that's gonna cause me any concern

38:21

but you know my vast experience is probably not worth a lot so thanks

38:27

yeah I I had a slightly different concern but I I tend to agree with

38:35

Victor and Chris with you um because as we're working through

38:41

uh especially code and like the comp plan issues uh we often make changes in

38:49

real time and we we Craft um

38:55

verbiage uh based on what's been discussed and put forth uh to improve

39:03

things and I I think that's not what this is intended to address

39:09

um I think as Victor pointed out the key language in the second sentence is

39:16

substantial amendments and or revisions to an agenda item the word is

39:23

substantial and if you're trying to make a major change to something that you

39:31

know is being proposed then I do think it's appropriate that that be get the

39:38

staff and the the rest of the commission have a heads up of that that doesn't

39:43

preclude addressing things as they emerge in real time in the course of a discussion

39:52

Andrea yeah the vice chair and commissioner ratio you're exactly right this doesn't

39:58

preclude you from bringing up things in the meeting the intent of 6.5 is to help

40:06

the Planning Commission facilitate productive meetings so that if a

40:11

substantial amendment is being proposed everyone on the commission is aware of

40:17

it beforehand so that you can we're able to think about the amendment that's being proposed and not being asked to

40:23

think on your feet about a substantial Amendment or revision

40:28

um it doesn't preclude anything from being proposed during a meeting it

40:34

really just is to help make sure that staff if you have questions for staff that are substantial in nature they have

40:40

time to prepare answers for those questions so that you get the best answers question best answers to your

40:47

questions possible so that you can have a good productive meeting it's not meant

40:53

to be prohibitive it's meant to help facilitate good discussions Carolyn

40:58

yeah um a couple of words in the paragraph here are are concerning the first part talks

41:05

about we agree not to propose substantial amendments annual revisions unless providing each other 48 Hours

41:12

okay so it sounds like we're free to decide what is substantial okay

41:20

um and then but then the next sentence it says that the Commissioners will use best efforts to provide staff advance

41:27

notice of any questions or concerns they may have regarding agenda item prior to

41:32

the public meeting so um the will word I think is is should

41:38

be changed should um and any questions or concerns I think

41:44

should be again the same language substantial questions or concerns

41:50

um you know I spend for example this day working on this packet and going through

41:55

it again and you know refining my concerns and how I would suggest uh any amendments

42:02

and um you know if I have 30 things on my list of

42:08

things I'd like to say um this is telling me that that all of them have to be sent in advance I don't

42:15

think that's appropriate no it's not saying you have to send them in advance it's just saying you'll make you'll try

42:21

and make an effort to you'll you will make your best effort to send them in and that's the intent of it

42:28

it again this one is a direct copy and paste from city council rules of procedure

42:33

I would also suggest changing the paragraph instead of no surprises rule to Prior notification

42:45

Chris

42:51

stink my hands down oh

42:57

do you have a comment question oh no okay

43:03

Kate um yeah I'm just gonna say that I

43:12

I kind of see both sides of this and I think there's

43:17

I always bring up the equity issue here but you don't see a ton of working moms with kids serving on boards and

43:25

commissions and I think we're generally a population that's underrepresented and because we

43:31

don't we just don't have time you know and so I do I share Carolyn's concern about you know the ability if I get

43:37

something if I get a agenda packet on Thursday and I'm taking care of my kids or we're going somewhere on the weekend

43:44

you know trying to get ready on Wednesday when I'm working and the kids have activities that's tough you know I

43:50

think we should have a representative government and so I appreciate what the um what you're saying Andrea about

43:57

um it's not an absolute I did submit some comments to Adam an hour before this meeting sorry Adam

44:05

um but that's the best I could do so I don't feel bad about that and I'm hoping that that that means I didn't do

44:10

anything terribly wrong it would have been better if I got comments in earlier but it's okay and they're still part of

44:16

the record is that that's exactly it okay thanks it's it's we truly try but life happens too

44:28

Adam um I'd like to see us formalize that try so I'll agree with commissioner boatsman

44:34

on Commissioners suggesting Commissioners should use best efforts and talk about substantial and I'll I'll

44:41

just stop at that yeah I think I think that that point is

44:47

a good one the should be a little more parallel construction because the last

44:53

sentence refers to any questions or concerns and that should also tie back

44:59

to the um substantial test up above in the

45:05

second sentence I'm also trying to just trying to get you the best information possible if you

45:12

have lots of questions so the more time you're able to give staff if you have lots of questions

45:18

if they're questions that staff have to research then they have the time to do the research
that's that's all it's

45:24

trying to say but none of it binds you to it like commissioner accused said when she had the
time was an hour before

45:30

the meeting and that's okay too

45:37

Adam is that an old hand or a new comment a new comment if if I may on a different

45:44

one um I will say on six seven um my high school Latin teacher would want me to make this
comment uh the

45:50

phrase ex parte since it's Latin um I would suggest we italicize that

46:01

true enough so um so 6.6 does address the

46:11

um conduct covered in the um uh RCW and the

46:17

Mercer Island code um and the only comment I would have on 6.7

46:27

um is that again refers to conflict of

46:33

interest and probably there and

46:38

um you know up above where we flagged it there should be a reference to the code

46:45

provisions you know it has defined in those code Provisions to make it clear that there's

46:52

not a sort of nebulous conflict of interest standard

46:58

um which was essentially the core of my complaint two years ago

47:03

um and uh because it it wasn't tied to the

47:10

statutory requirements

47:25

Chris do you have another comment or is your hand still uh stuck still stuck

47:31

it's funny my you know my button that says raise hand and uh so I see what's down now it says lower hand but I guess

47:39

do have a comment I'm just going back to 6.5 I'm not sure where we left things I mean I think the suggestion that you

47:46

made Mike to amend or that Adam made or whoever to amend the uh the last sentence is good I think

47:52

that's better that way and do we is that going to happen automatically or or do we need to do a motion I'm not sure how

47:59

we make that happen any amendments can be proposed at the September meeting any amendments that

48:05

are proposed will need to go the commission can make the proposed amendments and then they will need to go

48:10

before the city attorney's office before they can be approved so Andrea are you keeping track of these

48:18

suggested changes so that we can review them in September um I have a rough keeping track of them

48:25

but the commission the point of making um amendments would be at the September

48:31

meeting I got thrown into presenting today because Deb and Allison were I found out

48:36

at four o'clock I was presenting so okay yeah we'll try not to hold you just to

48:43

it too much and try to keep track of it ourselves but the one thing that you'll

48:48

keep hearing from me is consistency and consistency with city council rules of procedure and consistency with the other

48:54

boards and commissions rules um buy loans so that sounds to me like you're telling

49:01

us that we're not allowed to change anything in there you can propose changes but it will be vetted by the

49:08

city attorney's office um you know because there are slight differences but it's just remembering

49:15

that these are guiding bylaws um most of it you know it's not going to

49:24

say just because there's no surprises rule doesn't mean that a commissioner can't send in all of their questions

49:32

um five minutes before the meeting um there is room to make amendments but

49:38

I just want that in the front of the commission's mind of the purpose of this

49:43

very large rewrite is a sense of consistency so if we had a Parks and

49:48

Recreation commissioner who when they finished their term on Parks and Recreation Commission wanted to come and be a planning commissioner they're not

49:55

having to learn a whole new set of bylaws because they all are advisory boards for the city of Mercer Island

50:03

yeah the only problem I see with that approach is that we're really the only

50:09

body that works on legislation

50:15

consistently occasionally what the other boards do make recommendations to the city council in different ways

50:22

yeah but you know we do probably a lot more sort of drafting on the fly as we work

50:29

through this stuff so I think that some

50:34

um leeway for this body would be appropriate so but we can take that up

50:39

in September and it's also the will of the body you know um it's just the

50:46

that is the purpose behind the bylaws is to in the Golden City Clerk's Office who's in charge of the boards and

50:52

commissions is to just help bring some consistency so that you guys are able to run

50:59

um meetings that you feel are efficient Victor

51:05

one more comment on going back to six five I think

51:11

what we what we should consider is actually splitting this in two I I hear

51:17

the commission kind of focusing on two parts to this there's there is the true

51:24

no surprises portion of this and you know thinking

51:29

back to I think we're the Genesis of this came from which was on the city council

51:35

um you know the example I'll give is on a previous Council after three months of budget discussions and multiple readings

51:44

uh at the final reading at about let's say 11 o'clock at night 11 30 a council

51:52

member came in with a motion to fund an item that had never been discussed before

51:59

um that's a surprise um and that is unfair to both the public it's unfair to the other commission

52:06

members or the council members and it's unfair to the staff and I think that's the original Genesis of this Rule and

52:14

I'm very very supportive of that there's a second part of this which

52:19

is more of a courtesy which is hey we we may have questions we may need

52:26

clarification and that's that's not necessarily a surprise that's part of preparation but as a courtesy to the

52:33

staff there is an ask to say hey ask uh give the staff some advance notice on

52:40

your questions and I think these are two separate issues and I would I would suggest separating them out because we

52:46

as a commission are struggling with both parts of this and and different parts of this commission are focused on different

52:53

parts of this Rule and I think let's just split the two uh split the things so that it's actually clear or take the

53:00

part that's a courtesy and move it up to I can't remember the there was another section that we were reviewing earlier

53:07

that that had a bunch of you shell and you you chant and all that so uh you may

53:13

want to put that up there instead it'll decrease the confusion here

53:21

Maryland there's also another division it's it's

53:26

possibly um you know something different is needed in terms of letting staff know

53:32

about questions about information they might need to bring to the meeting um versus providing your comments to

53:40

fellow commissioners um the section in attachment C

53:46

you know fully covers you know the courtesy or the the need to notify staff

53:52

for things they'll need to prepare for at the meeting but we have the notifying

53:58

Commissioners mixed up with the staff and I'm not sure that uh the need is the same

54:09

okay anything else

54:18

anything in the uh appendix a

54:27

yeah this one I oh let me get my hand up here

54:33

parallel yeah number nine uh just a motion to postpone to a certain time

54:42

um the question I had is that um

54:48

excuse me here

54:58

okay the the motion is debatable as to the reason for the postponement

55:04

but not to the subject matter of the motion I just don't understand what that means

55:13

are you able to clarify Andrea

55:19

let me read it one second so I can wrap my brain around it

55:27

so basically what it's saying is that if somebody makes a motion to postpone to a

55:32

certain time at that point the debate can no longer be about the topic that is being

55:39

postponed the debate then turns to when is it being postponed to okay okay

55:46

I see it looks like number 10 has a similar

55:52

Clause but it's actually the opposite I think it's not amendable but okay

55:58

whatever I think I think it's that's clear enough not likely to use that one very often

56:04

thank you okay any other comments on appendix a

56:09

okay moving on to B any comments on B

56:16

Carolyn who's done a new hand or won't handle nope nope nope okay

56:21

no comments on B any comments on C

56:33

okay

56:40

any comments about next door

56:47

I'm sure we all have quite a few but um probably not appropriate

56:53

um no official comments on appendix Steve

57:00

okay well I think we have got through that thank you Andrea

57:07

um and really um that's uh very helpful and so I as I

57:13

understand what you're telling us is that if we want specific changes made we

57:20

should come back with those specific changes in September correct okay and um

57:26

the questions that I was unable to ask I think there was one for her that was I said was for the City attorney

57:33

um there might have been one that was still remaining for Allison um I encourage you to email those

57:38

questions into staff so that they can get you those questions before September

57:43

um to think about changes that you would like to propose um yes we're aiming for consistency and

57:49

I don't want it to sound like you can't amend the bylaws because they are the Planning Commission bylaws

57:55

um but I just asked you'd be mindful in those amendments to make sure that

58:00

you're creating guiding principles for the commission now and into the future and not for individuals because it

58:08

should be something that is for the will of the body okay

58:14

thank you very much absolutely thank you chair

58:23

okay

58:30

so I think our next order of business brings us to Adam

58:36

which is the 2024 annual docket presentation

58:42

um Adam or you're handling that I assume right I am yeah um let me share my screen I put together

58:49

some slides um this was another presentation that I got handed today so we'll uh we'll see

58:57

how it goes but um let me just it was up here

59:02

all right so tonight we wanted to give you just a quick overview of the annual docket

59:08

um to get you prepared for when we'll be discussing this uh coming up in the fall

59:14

um there are some key dates coming up and so we wanted to give you a heads up um

59:20

so the first question um mainly for our our new uh new

59:25

Planning Commission members is like what is the annual docket um this is the process by which we

59:32

um the members of the public can propose changes to the comprehensive plan or the

59:37

development code um and then also through this process

59:43

those um those proposals that are of a high priority can be added to the city work

59:50

plan um so those then become projects that we would take up in the next year a good

59:58

example would be the SMP amendment that we just worked on this spring that was a

1:00:03

that was a docket item that was added to our work plan um last year and um it ended up going

1:00:10

through the planning commissions process just a few months ago um the general process is we we open uh

1:00:18

we have a window for application um September 1st through uh October 1st

1:00:24

and we published we published notice that the that we're accepting those applications in in August

1:00:31

um so the public knows that they can submit those uh requests then in October the Planning Commission will review

1:00:38

those requests and make a recommendation to the city council as to which of those proposals should be added to a future

1:00:44

work plan um and then at before the end of the year so in November and December the

1:00:50

city council will adopt the final docket and that adds those projects to the

1:00:56

upcoming work plan the recommendation

1:01:02

um that you make um is goes to the city council and it

1:01:07

basically outlines the the projects or the proposals that um you feel the the

1:01:13

city should take up in the in the coming year um so that those are those are like higher priority things again kind of

1:01:20

returning to that recent SMP Amendment um the Mercer Island Beach Club needed

1:01:26

to repair their facilities and the code needed to be amended to address that and so it was a higher priority item that

1:01:33

was added to our work plan um and really that recommendation is is

1:01:38

more or less a prioritization of of those proposals saying you know these are things that are are a higher

1:01:45

priority um and which which items are maybe a lower priority that's the the essence of the

1:01:52

recommendation um the next steps for the docket process

1:01:57

um as I mentioned um we will post notice um that the application window is

1:02:04

opening in September um we'll do that um in the in about mid August and then through the month of

1:02:10

September um folks can submit their annual docket applications and then staff will make a

1:02:16

recommendation to the Planning Commission on those annual docket applications uh you'll you'll be briefed

1:02:23

on what came in um and that staff recommendation at your

1:02:28

October 25th meeting and then we'll be looking to get your recommendation at that meeting and then before the end of

1:02:34

the year the city council will make their decision on the final docket

1:02:40

um that's that's pretty much it we just wanted to give you kind of a flyover on

1:02:46

um on the docket process so that you know kind of what's coming and what uh it

1:02:54

doesn't just kind of come out of nowhere when we start talking about this stuff in October

1:03:00

um and at this point I'd be happy to answer any questions

1:03:06

hey this uh you want to raise your question now or or

1:03:15

I think it was answered yeah you know the question I guess is do

1:03:23

we as a body want to propose some type of clarification to the

1:03:30

council as a work item um I I think would be the appropriate

1:03:38

way to handle that yes so the Planning Commission can submit docket proposals or individual

1:03:46

planning Commissioners can submit DACA proposals uh during the application

1:03:52

window if you're thinking about applying for a docket application this goes for

1:03:57

any member of the Planning Commission or any member of the public that's that's watching tonight I we recommend that you

1:04:04

reach out to staff ahead of time to make sure that you have enough materials we

1:04:10

have an application form on the city website and we want to make sure that

1:04:16

we're getting enough information we've in the past we've gotten sub proposals that were maybe like a sentence long and

1:04:22

that's not really enough information to evaluate so we encourage anybody interested to reach out to staff about

1:04:30

submitting an application but in terms of the clarification on the decision criteria

1:04:37

you could propose that through the docket process then the council could decide whether or not to assign that to

1:04:43

us Carolyn

1:04:50

well Carolyn you're on mute okay

1:04:55

Adam I think I heard you say that when we're looking at these proposals we should be thinking about

1:05:01

how much the the proposed item is needed versus the merits

1:05:07

um so I was a little puzzled by that because I thought well if the merits of the idea

1:05:12

are really really strong wouldn't that be something that's needed yes yes I guess really quite what you

1:05:19

meant there now what what I meant there is that um when you're evaluating these it's

1:05:26

better to think about the SMP amendment is a another good example I'll keep

1:05:31

going back to it but you know that the proposal there we didn't end up adopting

1:05:37

what was proposed the language that was proposed there and so that the language that was proposed is not really the

1:05:43

thing that we need to we need a recommendation on it's just whether or not we need to amend the SMP so it's

1:05:49

kind of that higher level is is this proposal something that should be moved

1:05:55

forward because it needs to be done or is it rather than the specific language

1:06:01

in The Proposal does that make sense okay yeah um and then another question I had is a

1:06:08

I think this docket process is maybe about five years old now or something something we were the city was taken to

1:06:15

task for not having a docket process so they put one together and we've been doing this for not so many years

1:06:21

but as the years go by what I have seen is it is less and less likely

1:06:27

for a docket request that isn't a paid docket request for example someone

1:06:33

trying to you know do a development proposal to actually go anywhere

1:06:38

um so you know the public is invited by this

1:06:44

process to propose a change in the city code or the comp plan but since the work plan is already

1:06:51

jammed you know as the years go by more and more the council just says no there's no

1:06:57

time to do this but even if they do put it on the work plan

1:07:02

again the work plan is so jam that they don't provide enough of a public process to feel comfortable with making a change

1:07:10

so I really like to question whether this docket process is really um fulfilling the intention for which it

1:07:18

was designed by the state legislature as implemented as implemented by Mercer

1:07:23

Island and what could be done about that

1:07:28

um you know through the docket proposal or process you could propose amendment of that code section that governs the

1:07:35

annual docket um that that's something that could be could be docketed I mean I think the the

1:07:42

problem with this is always the available resources to get a project

1:07:48

done right and that's what the council ultimately decides on sometimes uh with

1:07:54

the docketing too it can be delayed for a year or two if it's not like a super high priority so that but that's at the

1:08:01

discretion of the city council I think for for this process again if you wanted

1:08:07

to propose amendment of that process you could do that through the docket process

1:08:12

so I really appreciate you mentioning holding over um an idea to take up in a subsequent

1:08:19

year or even two years later um when I looked in at many other cities

1:08:24

and how they were handling these same things um some are very clear about doing that if they get a good idea but they can't

1:08:31

do it this year they hold it over but our criteria say if there isn't enough

1:08:36

you know resources to do this this year that's a reason for denying it and it usually is denied so what I would

1:08:43

suggest is you know a kind of a Consciousness raising of our

1:08:48

um officials commission the council that you can hold these over it allows you

1:08:53

you're allowed to hold them over and um that might create a feeling like this

1:09:00

is a process that really works for the public um and also regarding using the docket

1:09:07

process to request a change in the docket process that was that was tried last year the

1:09:13

council rejected it so just just to throw that out there

1:09:26

any other questions or comments

1:09:32

oh I do have one more all right go ahead Carolyn yeah

1:09:39

um in regards to whatever criteria it is that we're going to be asked to use as a

1:09:44

commission to look at proposals um the criteria we've used in the past are

1:09:51

pretty dense you know they take some research to figure out if the criteria is met could we ask or you know I guess I am

1:09:59

asking would it be possible for staff to come to this docket decision meeting

1:10:05

with the information whether or not the proposal meets the

1:10:11

criteria for example one of the criteria says it meets the provisions of the comprehensive plan which is a you know

1:10:17

200-page document as far as I know so it would be super if we knew in

1:10:23

advance that a proposal meets the comp plan or doesn't meets a comp plan you

1:10:28

know but we can't figure that out sitting in a meeting or or even do it on our own it's too much you know so one of

1:10:35

the items on the application form that we recently added um is we ask applicants to do some of

1:10:43

that analysis ahead of time um so provide some of that information and then I think the staff

1:10:50

recommendation can can look at that a little bit further I'll I'll make I'll get your comment to Allison

1:10:57

um when she's back and yeah thank you yeah I think you know reading the staff

1:11:06

memo on this um and going through the process the last couple of years

1:11:13

um I think those of us have been around for a few years are realizing that the

1:11:18

choke point is resources and time and there is with with rare exception

1:11:27

anything that passes through that eye of the needle

1:11:34

and gets recommended by staff to counsel and Council does not seem to second

1:11:42

guess the recommendation of Staff regarding

1:11:48

resources or how much time would be needed nor do they dig into it very

1:11:53

deeply as far as I could tell by watching especially last year's um council meeting on it so

1:12:01

um you know I think I think the point of um

1:12:07

you know trying to get some type of carryover process

1:12:13

um or something along those lines might be a useful exercise

1:12:19

um so the things that get proposed that are evaluated have Merit but simply

1:12:26

cannot get through that eye of that particular needle

1:12:31

um you know don't get lost forever um so that alone might be of benefit to

1:12:39

the process and might make the public think that they're actually you know

1:12:45

contributing to the to the uh legislative process

1:12:58

okay I think we're done with that Adam thank you very much um

1:13:05

and I move on to our last item this one I assume is going to take some

1:13:12

time um so why don't we take a 10 minute break and uh then come back and we'll start in

1:13:20

on the comp plan update Economic Development element

1:23:35

so we're still breaking foreign

1:23:49

and I think that's it Chris you're traveling somewhere aren't

1:23:55

you where are you yeah I'm in uh keto right now

1:24:01

where you know in Ecuador excellent yeah

1:24:07

it's wild times been looking forward to this the whole

1:24:12

time thinking oh boy I can break up this vacation with a three-hour plenty commission meeting

1:24:19

oh dear oh it's fine it's not so good I'm just fascinated by three hours we're

1:24:25

gonna cut this at three hours I was being optimistic bless your heart

1:24:33

actually the good news for me the place I'm at I can't plug in anywhere so I

1:24:38

just may run out of power at some point and then not just be gone all right we'll know what happened then right if I

1:24:44

disappear that's what happened I didn't give up I just ran out of power what is the weather like there

1:24:50

uh just had a huge hail storm but keto's up at uh like 9 000 feet or something yeah

1:24:57

so it's been uh it's been it's been Pleasant actually cool but uh but Pleasant

1:25:03

okay I think we're all here So Adam uh we're our final item regular

1:25:11

business is the comp plan update Economic Development element second

1:25:16

draft welcome Adam uh and uh we're interested

1:25:22

in hearing your presentation thank you um yeah so tonight we'll be taking a

1:25:27

look at the economic development element um the second draft that was provided last week we received quite a few

1:25:35

comments on it so we'll start uh taking a look at those and uh give you an

1:25:40

overview of where we're heading with this um so our

1:25:46

um just as a refresher the economic development element is a new element of

1:25:51

the comprehensive plan and this element will set the goals and policies that will guide our Economic Development

1:25:58

decision making at the city um for the coming years it details the

1:26:03

element details the projects and programs that the city will undertake to support its local economy as we seek to

1:26:10

grow the local economy here questions um we received uh several comments

1:26:17

um I think five planning Commissioners by my account this afternoon have submitted comments on the first draft so

1:26:24

we'll take a look at uh some of those um four of the comments uh four comments

1:26:31

were received um prior to the staff report and then

1:26:36

the fifth comment as Kate mentioned earlier came in um just this afternoon so I haven't had

1:26:41

a chance to look at it yet two of the comments uh Chris Kells comment and Adam

1:26:47

ragheb's comments came in prior to the comment period ending and then we

1:26:54

received two comments after the comment period so those those first two that the

1:26:59

reason that those are included in the Matrix is because they I received them in time the other two

1:27:06

um I just didn't have time to get them into the comment Matrix uh prior to getting the staff report out last week

1:27:14

we also received two public comments on the first draft and those were included

1:27:19

in attachment C of the staff memo and the the complete comments are provided

1:27:25

in that attachment as well as a summary in that Matrix the comment Matrix

1:27:33

um though those comments that we that I received uh prior to July 12th were on

1:27:38

July 12th um our um categorized in the comment Matrix

1:27:44

um and then I also went through and where edits were proposed I showed those edits in
strikeout and underline

1:27:52

um and then I also on the goals and policies where those uh strikeout and

1:27:58

underlines appear I tried to include the comment uh log number so the number from

1:28:03

the comment Matrix so you can see where that edit had come from in the draft

1:28:09

um those those comments that came in after July 12th as I mentioned I didn't have a

1:28:16

chance to get those into the Matrix and they haven't been incorporated into the draft in the
same way that the other

1:28:22

comments were um I'm planning to do the same kind of categorization and get them
inserted

1:28:29

into the draft after this meeting tonight and get those to you sometime in

1:28:34

August so that you have some time to consider those um because there's there's quite a bit

1:28:40

of we received a lot of comments and so there's a there's a lot to get through and we want to give you uh plenty of

1:28:46

time with those comments to consider them all together in the in the staff memo I categorize

1:28:54

the comments into three different buckets um there were quite a few comments that

1:29:00

fell into these simple amendments category and those are like minor amendments that don't really change the

1:29:06

policy Direction so like for for example the um a lot of the comments on the

1:29:12

introduction of the element um those were just kind of simple wording changes that don't don't change

1:29:19

the overall meaning of the documents um in terms of like what it's telling us to do

1:29:24

um so I grouped those in with the simple amendments the next the next bucket is the deliberation needed category and

1:29:32

these are like smaller text changes um that also affect the policy Direction

1:29:38

so most of most of the the comments that are categorized this way

1:29:45

um really only needed a decision whether or not to make those changes um I mean we can
um as we're going

1:29:51

through them we can you know you can propose you know slight changes to the wording if
you'd like but in general

1:29:58

these were kind of um just slight changes to the policy but

1:30:04

we need the Planning Commission to weigh in on then the third bucket is the deliberation
and Direction needed and

1:30:10

these are comments where A Change Is proposed that would change the direction

1:30:16

of the policy in the draft but then also there was like some room for debate and

1:30:22

discussion and if we're going to go forward with those amendments uh staff will need some
direction on drafting new

1:30:30

policy language or um you know some kind of direction as to where we're going to go with
that

1:30:35

Amendment so those are the three categories and like I said Kate Angie and Carolyn's

1:30:42

comments will get cation categorized um for the for the next draft that we send out

1:30:48

um the next version of this so that you can see those um and they'll also get inserted into
the into the text

1:30:56

our review process for tonight what I'm proposing is that we can look at these

1:31:02

simple amendments and agree to those by consensus um and then over the next month and a

1:31:08

half while we have the recess um I propose that um that the Planning Commission consider

1:31:14

those other more substantive uh substantial amendments to the policy language

1:31:21

um kind of on their own and then come back at the September 27th meeting and we can go through those more substant

1:31:27

substantial uh amendments and those needing direction we can go through

1:31:32

those as a group but we wanted to give everybody a chance to review those and

1:31:38

then also because we got a couple we got three comments uh comment letters in

1:31:43

after I had finished the staff report um wanted to get a chance for everybody

1:31:49

to see those as well um and consider them together so tonight I'm I'm expecting that we'll just get through

1:31:56

those simple amendments and then we can come back to the more substantial ones

1:32:03

I mean so Anna Adam uh thank you very much for for all the work you put in on

1:32:10

this there's uh uh pretty pretty massive undertake with all the comments

1:32:17

um and I thought it tied together quite well um you know you had to kind of go back

1:32:24

and forth between the draft and the and the Matrix but once you got that Rhythm down it uh was able to see work through

1:32:32

it and to understand it quite well so I applaud you for your your effort it was

1:32:38

uh very well done thanks yeah 40 47 different proposed amendments and was

1:32:46

quite a bit to try and manage and now we've got we've got some more so yeah I I thought the I thought the idea of a

1:32:52

matrix was quite appropriate

1:32:58

um Kate I see your hands here yeah I just wanted to say that um I only

1:33:04

have seven and they're all substantive and required deliberation so look at

1:33:11

punch until next time anyway I'm I'm not gonna word Smith stuff documents typically

1:33:17

right um Adam

1:33:22

um I I came prepared to discuss all of the comments put forth here and

1:33:28

especially knowing that we have three more um sets of comments coming at us for the

1:33:35

next meeting I would I would propose we we try to at least get through as much

1:33:41

as possible um independent of the level of depth of discussion

1:33:50

um anticipated so would your thought Adam B that we just worked through the document and go

1:33:56

as far as we are it carries us tonight or how do you view

1:34:02

that happening organically that that that's what I I as I said I came

1:34:08

prepared to um discuss what the information that was put in front of us and it seems like

1:34:14

there's a large amount of information that's going to be added to the next one so

1:34:20

um just just my opinion that that's all it is um given the staff memo I'm a little

1:34:26

concerned that everyone doesn't necessarily have the same level of prep

1:34:33

um so unless there's a consensus to go that route and just work as far as

1:34:40

we're comfortable um I think I think it'd be I feel more comfortable

1:34:46

following Adam's lead and focusing more on the the the

1:34:53

larger Group which are mostly editorial changes but some of which have some

1:34:58

meaning so what's the consensus of the group Kate

1:35:07

um I was going to say that I have read all the materials and I'm prepared to discuss them and I was

1:35:13

actually going to propose a bulka bulk motion to just accept all the those

1:35:20

first category documents because I didn't see anything there that um you know I agree with Adam's

1:35:26

assessment that they're not you know they're editorial there's something a technical editor would do they're not they're not really changing

1:35:33

the content I think you did a really good job of parsing those so I think we could get through it faster if we didn't

1:35:39

look at every instance of and of instead of an in or and

1:35:44

Carolyn oh you're on mute

1:35:52

I'm I'm prepared to go through the document tonight you know Page by Page and you know look at something you know

1:35:59

um whether it's simple trying to categorize it categorize it as to being simple or not simple or you know needing

1:36:06

discussion or not needing discussion I would just soon just go through the document um I have my old comments organized you

1:36:14

know by page number and I can share them with people uh and they may have comments about the same

1:36:20

concern or may have been sent in already or may not have been sent in already

1:36:25

um so I'm ready to go through the document Chris

1:36:31

yeah I could see sort of uh going through the document and if it turns

1:36:37

out to be an easy discussion you know I mean maybe you spend a minute or two are common and if it's easy discussion

1:36:43

that we agree one way or the other then we can take it off out of off the you know the play for next time and on the

1:36:50

other hand if it gets a little bit you know some clear differences or a situation where it may depend on creating some wording for next time we

1:36:57

can identify those as the ones that need to you know be held over to September but something kind of a light and breezy

1:37:04

cut through the whole document Adam

1:37:11

um I'll just say I think Details Matter I would be opposed to a blanket approval of basic comments and I can

1:37:17

appreciate uh the desire to perhaps trim the level of deliberation today and I

1:37:24

think given our prior discussions about staff wanting to have ample time to prepare and get direction I think if

1:37:30

we're going to discuss something today let's let's discuss the deliberation and Direction needed ones

1:37:35

um just my thoughts Victor do you have an opinion on this

1:37:43

or my my vote would be to do what uh what the staff came prepared to do and

1:37:49

to accept kind of the staff Direction on this well we don't have a real clear

1:37:55

consensus on what to do uh we can do the staff route we can go Page by Page

1:38:04

um you know I I I hesitate to or we can do a bulk approval

1:38:12

um can I withdraw bulk approval and um just

1:38:20

because I I can understand why we might not want to do that but can we do a process where it's a thumbs up thumbs

1:38:26

down going through the small ones at least just to have something slightly more efficient

1:38:32

does that work um for others and then at least we're looking at all of them and if it if if

1:38:38

there is a need of debate we can do the debate yeah okay you were kind of going where I

1:38:45

was going um to simplify this so that we don't have discussion about things that we

1:38:52

don't have to have discussion about um Chris

1:39:02

sorry I should be down but I guess I'm not Adam

1:39:09

I'd I would like to make a motion to go through the comments Page by Page and

1:39:15

re-evaluate if we wish to continue at 9 45 PM uh Pacific time

1:39:22

I will second that

1:39:29

so would that incorporate a sort of a quick thumbs up thumbs down on the

1:39:36

simple ones as we go okay okay

1:39:41

if it's on all in favor

1:39:46

okay looks like that's what we're gonna do

1:39:52

okay well let me share my screen um maybe a clarifying I think it would

1:39:58

be the best use of our time if we focused on the goals and policies um because again like that introductory

1:40:05

text is maybe less important I think where we need the most direction is is

1:40:10

in the goals and policies is that

1:40:16

yeah on the other hand the introductory text should be pretty fast because most

1:40:22

of those are just quick thumbs up

1:40:32

Carolyn yeah I I think that um you know from from my perspective

1:40:39

the introductory text you know kind of sets up the reason for proposing a goal

1:40:44

or a policy later so I would love to have a chance to you know speak about that a little bit

1:40:52

okay well I'll start at the beginning then

1:40:58

let me share my screen got the document up here

1:41:09

right Adam would it be appropriate given I sent this so late for me to send it to other

1:41:16

Commissioners or is that something I'm thinking about our rules of operation

1:41:22

and I don't send it to everyone yeah I can I can forward your written comments to the to the group and then if

1:41:28

as we're going through here if you if there's something yeah yeah thank you so much

1:41:36

um so the the first uh proposed change is on page one in the first

1:41:43

um the first paragraph uh changing in the center of King County to between Bellevue and Seattle

1:41:48

um and striking that um from the last sentence I see two thumbs up

1:41:54

[Music] um commissioner gills proposed this one

1:41:59

so I assume his thumbs up yeah we can assume that his or a thumbs up

1:42:08

um so the next proposal was striking this line from the table and there was also a comment on the format of the

1:42:14

table I think you actually missed something oh did I

1:42:20

um thought I saw another one uh yeah right so there's line 11 12 too

1:42:28

oh I yeah I grouped that in kind of quick but okay yeah

1:42:33

we're all right um so there was a comment on the table proposing striking these lines

1:42:40

um where there's a zero percent um and then also on the format of the table um I agree that the format could be

1:42:47

improved um our our four table formatting and everything will get fixed when we put

1:42:53

this through our design that we're going to have for the overall comp plan

1:42:59

see you two thumbs up right

1:43:06

then finally at the bottom of page two um in this final

1:43:11

um paragraph there's some uh minor edits to the wording of the paragraph about

1:43:17

education so Carolyn uh Adam or Carolyn first

1:43:30

on this one um I am wondering what is meant by the

1:43:36

education level as described for King County when it says have at least earned an associate's degree and why that is

1:43:44

stated differently from the education level of residents of Mercer Island um

1:43:49

I'm not sure I put that question very clearly but um if not I'll try again um are you asking on line eight why it

1:43:56

doesn't say at least earned yeah yeah one of them says 25 over the age of 25

1:44:02

have earned an associate's degree or higher but for King County it says

1:44:07

20 over 25 have at least earned an associate degree what is the difference what is the reason there it sounds a

1:44:13

little odd I I don't I don't think there's a meaningful difference because one saying

1:44:19

earned an associate's degree or higher and the other's saying at least an associate's degree I think yeah could

1:44:26

you word the same because somehow it sounds to my ear a little less

1:44:31

complementary to the King County population so I think the wording should be exactly the same for those two

1:44:38

um earned and earned a degree or higher I think is a better way to put it no I

1:44:43

would get the word at least out of there as my suggestions at least yeah

1:44:50

that's my suggestion and why are we going away from a college

1:44:55

degree uh well no we actually well yeah yeah

1:45:03

and Associated or higher yeah

1:45:11

yes I was gonna say I would like us to keep the high educational attainment of whatever the rest of line 11 because as

1:45:19

commissioner boatsman said intro sets up the policies and goal five says Mercer Island has skilled Workforce so this

1:45:25

sets the this sets the tone for goal five so I think that ought to stay

1:45:31

yeah I'm good with that too I didn't even think about that sorry

1:45:40

so what's the consensus of the group that we keep that sentence in

1:45:46

it seems like there's consensus doesn't go back to the original so let's just do that

1:45:55

okay I had my hand raised for a comment on

1:46:01

this and I don't know who actually proposed the um the change but I think part of the idea

1:46:09

was that there are a lot of extremely skilled

1:46:15

people that don't have college degrees whether they're Artisans or chefs or whatnot

1:46:23

um this is kind of an elitist statement to say that having a college degree is what makes you highly skilled makes you

1:46:29

highly paid usually I mean

1:46:34

I don't know I mean I think whoever proposed it might have had that in mind or maybe I'm wrong

1:46:41

no you're not wrong I mean I I didn't like the statement I saw that I thought it was elitist so I wanted to take it out for just the reason she said

1:46:56

so the choice here uh Victor no I still have the question and I don't

1:47:01

know whether that was the answer to it why are we removing college degree

1:47:08

that's in line eight yep uh because it's redundant with earning

1:47:16

an associate's degree or higher you know associate's degree is different than well

1:47:22

or higher educational attainment a college degree and an associate degree

1:47:28

are not the same thing so but the the higher educational attainment is would include a college

1:47:35

degree a PhD any of the other higher educational attainments I mean that's why I took it

1:47:41

out I thought it was redundant but you know people I I couldn't care less you could leave it as it was

1:47:54

well for the for this draft because this isn't the final draft we'll keep this the same return to the original and then

1:48:01

we can uh we can make it further edits if

1:48:08

needed um later in the process here

1:48:16

was that okay uh yeah let's let's proceed on

1:48:21

okay Carolyn unless you're moving on to something else um

1:48:27

I think we're tabling this for now well I mean I I had my hand up and I did

1:48:33

want to say something I'm not quite sure why why that can't be said okay well say it if it's quick well I I

1:48:40

just you know I'm gonna say something it's completely appropriate to the length of comments that anyone else has

1:48:45

been making so I just want to say I concur with Chris and Kate that the one statement is someone elitist it's

1:48:52

probably not needed and you know I also agree with Chris's comment that an associate's degree or higher educational

1:48:58

attainment that says it all so I think that's really good language

1:49:05

okay we'll deal with that next time

1:49:11

the next proposed change is on the page three under Mercer Island commercial areas

1:49:17

um and these are really just kind of an order of ideas amendments to the

1:49:22

paragraph um some slight editorial here um doesn't I don't think this

1:49:28

significantly changes the meaning so you can thumbs around okay

1:49:36

there's a there's a typo in uh outside in the last sentence

1:49:43

good catch um and then in

1:49:49

um Town Center um just this paragraph there was a

1:49:54

proposal to include parking with residential uses on the upper floors

1:50:03

Victor the question a clarifying question the

1:50:10

underlines are what they're additions they are yeah anything I think we missed

1:50:16

line 24 and 25 and so we're just and again I I'm fine with it but

1:50:23

I'm just unclear as to what we're stopping on oh sorry I I just gave an overview of the paragraph

1:50:30

in total I didn't um specify along

1:50:39

Marissa do you have another comment

1:50:44

I did not thank you okay bye two on page four

1:50:52

point two on page four here

1:50:58

I see you in the Sun four thumbs I think we're good on that

1:51:04

one yeah um order of words on line eight of page

1:51:10

four uh see two thumbs

1:51:15

four thumbs

1:51:21

um all right and then there's some substantial changes or some there's a

1:51:26

lot of struck strikeout on this paragraph under land use connection here

1:51:31

um it just kind of tightens up the language makes it a little more concise

1:51:43

uh Adam I I liked the detail in the original so

1:51:48

I would I would Advocate um yeah for the original

1:51:53

at least you know not removing the lines in the middle and replacing them with that sentence line 25 26.

1:52:02

Victor

1:52:07

all right old hand of Caroline uh typo line uh 30.

1:52:15

Adam and also on page four line 45 a couple of typos there just that's all I want to mention
okay

1:52:24

Chris sending comment [Music] um no okay

1:52:30

so um it sounds like uh is there a consensus to going back to the original

1:52:36

or okay there's one

1:52:42

two

1:52:49

Carolyn do you have a new comment

1:52:54

no okay so there's only two in favor of the original uh I assumed as the rest

1:53:01

like the change okay okay

1:53:06

so it changes um the next paragraph here from lines 34

1:53:12

to 42 there are some other uh just slight changes to the text here

1:53:27

Victor for the change is that line 34

1:53:33

the way you had it originally I think was the proper grammar each of the three areas are

1:53:40

not is Aries is plural

1:53:46

hey I think this is right though because I

1:53:53

think each is singular but I I will uh

1:53:58

Adam

1:54:10

um I I'm okay with everything but I'm not I would be opposed to the at Edition

1:54:15

in 41 so absent rezoning most because that's kind of suggesting hey I think

1:54:22

that's making a suggestion we should rezone um so

1:54:35

uh Carolyn

1:54:40

no comment so um any discussion about this Adam's

1:54:48

thought about the absent rezoning language

1:54:54

[Music] I mean I actually take the opposite

1:54:59

perspective I guess that unless you you know that absent rezoning I mean I think

1:55:04

it's correct and if you don't have it in there you preclude the possibility of

1:55:10

expanding the areas in which commercial the development could happen you know

1:55:15

has laid out in one of the public comments that you know there are ideas out there that I think are worth

1:55:21

considering in in the long term I don't think we should foreclose you know

1:55:26

possibilities that we haven't considered Kate

1:55:31

I agree with commissioner girls um and in part because we're facing the

1:55:37

and part of this has to do a comment I have for page nine um you know with the housing

1:55:44

work in front of us and with I think what is a a false

1:55:50

um statement on page nine that it's it's how it's it's multi-family housing's

1:55:58

fault that there's no commercial space it's really like you know 95 of the

1:56:03

island is in single family residential that's the donut and we're focusing on the whole

1:56:09

um so you know I don't know how we're going to deal with this new state housing law but

1:56:15

I'm assuming that some things are going to have to shift if we're gonna even come remotely close to meeting our

1:56:21

requirement so I agree with the edit or Victor

1:56:29

I support uh Adam's comment

1:56:35

well for this one because there's a lack of consensus

1:56:40

um we'll leave it in there I'll highlight that as uh needing kind of some additional consideration

1:56:48

um but I think there's there's a lack of consensus here and so we can we can

1:56:53

hold off on making a determination there one way or the other

1:56:59

just know

1:57:06

what my highlight means when I come back to this um okay so the next uh proposed

1:57:12

amendment is on page five uh the paragraph beginning on line seven uh

1:57:18

relationship to other comprehensive plan elements I just realized my line numbers will be slightly different than your

1:57:23

draft but it's what's highlighted on the screen here um uh Adam there were two small changes

1:57:31

in lines 44 and 46 on page

1:57:36

yeah I missed those um sorry the next uh that paragraph at the bottom of page four uh go leading to

1:57:44

page five um there's a slight change to the wording here highlighted

1:57:55

you've also got a grammar problem and takes place

1:58:00

well the S is struck it's just hard to see oh God

1:58:07

um I see two thumbs the thumbs around okay

1:58:13

now moving to page five under relationship to other comprehensive planned elements

1:58:19

um this is just a trim up of uh of the paragraph um leading into the other pieces there

1:58:28

Adam I like the original it tells me what I'm going to see before I see it like a

1:58:35

persuasive essay Carolyn

1:58:44

oh your mood I like the change um I I think that

1:58:49

they're going to tell us everything we need to know in the subsequent paragraphs but I do have a proposed change to this paragraph when you get

1:58:56

done talking about what you already have there so what's the

1:59:01

um The View on keeping who what's our

1:59:07

thumbs up to keep the change or not

1:59:15

who's opposed to it so we've got okay so lack of consensus here that's

1:59:22

another spot all a flag um so there's a couple of these there are

1:59:30

several a few of these in here um

1:59:35

and I understand the point about trying to point us in the direction of where

1:59:40

it's going but from the standpoint of a document that is

1:59:46

sort of brief and you know gets to the heart of the matter um I think that

1:59:53

change those changes are valuable in terms of you know dealing with a with a lengthy

2:00:01

document so I'll just leave it at that and we can point point where Mr chair

2:00:06

point of order um I'm seeing some inconsistency and how

2:00:12

we're saying no consensus like we've had a couple of two two four votes here and some we've

2:00:20

said okay like it it's gonna go forward and then in this one we're saying there's no

2:00:27

consensus even though we have four thumbs up so I'm just before we move forward can we get consistent like

2:00:33

are we looking for a majority are we looking for unanimous

2:00:38

well that's a good question so typically with these uh a way to address that

2:00:44

would be to ask if anyone would block consensus so if you have one member that doesn't agree with the consensus it's

2:00:51

essentially unanimous but because we're going through this kind of informally we

2:00:57

could just say would anyone block consensus and then if a commissioner didn't want to make the change they could block consensus and then we could

2:01:03

come back to it for further discussion um that'd be a clean way to do it

2:01:11

right well we'll uh we'll ask that moving forward okay wait so for this one

2:01:17

can we do an example on this one because we just did it so we had four people say keep the edit and two leave the edit so

2:01:24

would you then ask what anyone blocked consensus on this

2:01:29

yes you would ask that's the question

2:01:34

can you ask the question would anyone block consensus on making this change

2:01:43

all right no one blocks consensus so we would then make the change without them without that being blocked

2:01:53

good good clarifying point I yeah um

2:01:58

so the next uh the next set of amendments is to the paragraph on housing here

2:02:04

um on the housing element itself um uh again here it's it's kind of just

2:02:10

some some clarification um amendments

2:02:17

Caroline

2:02:23

um I had a a question and a proposed amendment for

2:02:29

starting up in the previous paragraph um that I wanted to run by people if that's all right

2:02:38

let's hear it okay so this um section talks about the relationship of

2:02:46

this Economic Development element to other plan elements but one thing I'm thinking about is that there are a

2:02:53

number of functional plans that are already adopted some of them are

2:02:59

appendices to the comp plan some of them probably should be appendices to the comp plan but that for

2:03:05

some reason hasn't been done yet so for example um we have an Arts and Cultural

2:03:11

comprehensive Arts and Cultural plan which was adopted only in 2018 we have um

2:03:18

um climate action plan we have a bike in pedestrian plan we have a Parks plan I

2:03:26

don't know if that pertains but um so

2:03:31

some of those plans would have a really important should have an important impact on how this element is put

2:03:39

together so I'm just wondering staff about referencing more than other comp plan

2:03:45

elements but also referencing functional plans any thoughts on that

2:03:50

so we we could insert some text here doing that but the

2:03:56

um most of those functional plans I can't say with 100 certainty that all of

2:04:01

them are this way but most of them are adopted by reference in their relevant

2:04:06

um their relevant elements so the the bike and pedestrian plan for example is

2:04:12

is adopted by reference in an established under the auspices of the transportation element

2:04:19

um and so by saying that this is related to the transportation element that it's create or it's stating that link too by

2:04:26

inference it's not explicitly spelled out here but like I said if if you

2:04:31

wanted to propose that we we could add that here I was particularly thank you I was

2:04:37

particularly interested and initially thought of the Arts and Cultural comprehensive plan that the commission

2:04:43

adopted or recommended for adoption just a few years ago in which the council adopted and it is an appendix to the

2:04:50

comp plan and so I was suggesting um including

2:04:55

um saying

2:05:00

in the Housing section here um wait excuse me in this paragraph

2:05:06

right under the heading the housing Transportation utilities Capital facilities and Shoreline master program

2:05:13

elements as well as the comprehensive arts and culture plan all interact with the local economy in unique ways so that

2:05:20

that was um what I was proposing and then another sentence later in the

2:05:26

in the paragraph as well sorry as well as the Arts and Cultural web comprehensive arts and culture plan

2:05:41

and before I go further um well okay I'll give you the other sentence and then we then we can I can

2:05:46

ask the other Commissioners what they think of this um following the word Shoreline bounding the city

2:05:54

it would have a sentence and this is presuming we don't delete all this stuff

2:05:59

well I guess actually my next sentence is irrelevant if you're deleting all of

2:06:05

this other texts so I'll just leave that out of it for now anyway I'm just wondering what do other Commissioners

2:06:10

how do they feel about these other important planning documents which tend to be adopted and I don't know I

2:06:18

don't hear them being referenced in our uh in our further efforts

2:06:23

a lot of people worked really hard on that one I know that

2:06:33

uh can I be recognized share yes go ahead I was waiting for Adam to respond

2:06:38

but um I was just gonna say that um I had a

2:06:44

similar thought about the climate action plan which I think is tied to the economy as well so

2:06:52

I don't know what the full list of adopted plans are unfortunately um I suspect that most of them would

2:06:58

tie in um maybe there's a way to do that globally in the or maybe this is the global place to do

2:07:05

it but I I agree with Carolyn that it's worth um noting them

2:07:10

just that as people are thinking about Economic Development they're thinking about uh all the things it impacts

2:07:19

um what what I might propose as a way to do this is after the list of elements

2:07:26

here um I maybe I can insert a functional plans

2:07:33

list that maybe in a sentence or two explains the relationship between those things

2:07:40

that that might be a way to get at it um without calling out only one plan or

2:07:46

leaving a couple out I could I could draft something up for the next review

2:07:52

um so let me just add that in here

2:08:11

is there consensus on that I saw some thumbs but okay

2:08:18

um Carolyn if it's okay with you can I drop this interjection here and

2:08:24

sure sure um I did have something else I wanted to add though okay so you know we're a lot

2:08:32

of this paragraph is deleted but I think the sort of thing that I would be looking for is this kind of statement

2:08:38

the arts and culture plan directs the provision of artistic and cultural infrastructure that draw both residents

2:08:45

and Shoppers to commercial areas so if there's a rather limited list of these types of functional plans and you

2:08:52

can can make a statement a sentence for each one that says why is this important to

2:08:57

an economic development plan and you know if there are functional plans that don't have anything to do with an

2:09:02

economic development plan they probably don't need to be mentioned but that's what I would suggest in that paragraph

2:09:08

that you're working on okay and you you sent me that in your comment

2:09:14

um probably but I'm going to send you an amended one okay okay following this meeting or perhaps during

2:09:22

okay

2:09:28

well I'll make sure to get that in there thank you I like what you're doing with it

2:09:35

great um all right so moving now to the paragraph

2:09:42

on housing the housing element um there are some changes here

2:09:49

um again not not significant mostly just reordering the order of ideas in the paragraph

2:10:00

I'm seeing three thumbs four thumbs

2:10:06

can you tell us what page we're on I'm not seeing the page and I apologize my

2:10:11

line numbers are getting are getting off because of our but we're on page five

2:10:17

okay um let's see the next change is to the

2:10:24

paragraph on utilities the utilities elements um this again is just a minor

2:10:31

clarification edit Carolyn yeah

2:10:37

um I have a uh something to propose for the housing paragraph Okay aside from the minor

2:10:45

changes that were already made so in my View housing indirectly impacts the

2:10:51

local economy in not just these two ways but in several ways

2:10:56

and what I would add to what you already have right there is

2:11:01

um let's see here keep the conversely higher cost housing

2:11:08

um can attract higher income residents and customers for local business but add

2:11:15

a comment there and say though higher cost housing may

2:11:20

not translate into more disposable income or a propensity to spend that income at the types of businesses at

2:11:27

Island commercial areas I'm just going to read this to you and I can help you with the exact

2:11:33

language in a minute and then what I'm proposing to add is that less expensive multi-family housing

2:11:40

May attract residents in and near the Town Center who are more likely to choose not to own a car

2:11:48

and may be more likely to shop local than those in detached single-family housing the quantity of multi-family

2:11:55

housing available May correlate with the market for the basics of everyday living and experiences such as dining out

2:12:02

so this is an amendment that I'm proposing to this this paragraph because I think we're a little too focused on

2:12:08

how beneficial it is for housing costs to be high when we're not recognizing

2:12:13

that lower cost housing and housing that is in and near the Town Center

2:12:19

with people that have no car that's going to really be that's really a benefit to the to the town center

2:12:25

so I mean I can send you that that language or you know um that would that would be helpful uh

2:12:33

if if we end up doing this but I'm wondering if people how they feel about

2:12:38

that concept Chris Chris yeah I mean I'm on board with the

2:12:46

concept and I agree I personally don't like the focus on higher income

2:12:51

you know housing being somehow better for the business Community with on Mercer Island I'm not

2:12:57

sure I see that connection but I guess my thought is just as a matter of function I mean we have another draft

2:13:02

he's going to send out and some of the comments you know maybe it makes sense just to include them in the next draft

2:13:07

and we can look at them ahead of time I think it's just hard to doing new edits

2:13:12

up on a slide but I'm very sympathetic to the idea I'm just not sure we can do that here yeah but I mean I guess I

2:13:19

defer to you Mike no I I agree with that Anna I like I like commissioner boatsman's

2:13:26

first sentence on hey it may not translate um but all this stuff about multi-family housing that that becomes too many Maze

2:13:33

for me so I would I would support her first sentence but not the others after it okay well we'll have a chance to deal

2:13:41

with that Kate yeah I could say someone who used to

2:13:46

live downtown that I used to spend a heck of a lot more money on Mercer Island than I do now so I wholeheartedly

2:13:52

agree with Carolyn's comment and more people generally means uh broader

2:13:58

customer base and people who you know live in I mean with the real estate has a

2:14:06

walk score for a reason and that walk score is there because people are going out and spending money because there's

2:14:12

places to go spend money um I don't think that's a controversial statement at all so I'm I think Carolyn

2:14:19

did I think didn't you already forward Carolyn's comments Adam they're in the agenda packet so we can um those are

2:14:25

older what what I would propose here is I'll for the next draft I'll include this and

2:14:33

we'll flag it and so that everybody can see it in line with the text um again this is hardly our last bite at

2:14:41

the Apple so we'll have uh we'll have the opportunity to look at that in context I think before making a

2:14:49

final call yeah this process is a slow-moving train

2:14:57

um so I'll flag that there and then when uh when I get the chance to get Carolyn's comment in there we can look

2:15:03

at it then anything else on housing before we

2:15:08

keep rolling seeing shaking heads so moving to utilities

2:15:14

um again this is uh minor Amendment to the order of ideas here

2:15:20

see three thumbs four thumbs five thumbs and yeah I

2:15:27

assume that's good um and then Capital facilities the that

2:15:32

paragraph is is also the same uh just some some minor amendments

2:15:38

to them I'll I'll do a point of order I know we had five thumbs up but but let's

2:15:44

for fairness see if anyone's opposed to it or well I thought everybody's thumb was up oh okay I only heard five so

2:15:51

apologies was there was there anybody who was thumbs down on that last one

2:15:59

hearing none well and you'll have to bear with me I can only see four of you at a time so

2:16:07

um and then yeah so the capitol facilities paragraph were there any comments here are we

2:16:12

um okay with the Amendments as shown

2:16:20

Victor are you a naysayer on this oh please thumbs up okay

2:16:27

okay didn't realize we were voting on that uh sorry

2:16:33

all right and then we'll look at the functional plans next um is the uh very minor Amendment on

2:16:40

page six here um relating to um

2:16:46

current employment and our growth Target

2:16:52

okay that looks good uh an amendment to the paragraph on

2:16:59

strengths at the bottom of page six

2:17:05

Adam uh this is economic field we're talking about so I would say Prosperity

2:17:10

ought to be at the front of the list

2:17:17

um

2:17:24

Carolyn well there's a few places in this doctor where we're kind of having some

2:17:31

consideration about whether to change the order of things or not but I don't know I I think that it's not necessary

2:17:37

to be concerned about what order we put these things in because you know it's a

2:17:42

list of several things and they're all important so that would be my suggest rather than

2:17:47

um pursuing that

2:17:53

so do we have consensus then on this change as as shown on the screen

2:18:03

okay that looks good um there's a really minor change of just

2:18:09

striking the list of strengths uh prior to getting into each of those strengths

2:18:16

seeing thumbs up okay

2:18:23

um here in the high quality of life paragraph This is uh at the top of page

2:18:29

seven um there were two comments we had a comment from commissioner girls and uh

2:18:36

commissioner rehab um I've shown those as Alternatives here

2:18:42

um so it's either this top part or this

2:18:47

bottom part here sorry it's that's as good as I could get on showing the differences there

2:18:59

and that's for for this sentence here

2:19:12

um Adam do you have a just a typo in in my line 10 third word uh should be life

2:19:19

instead of live yeah third word

2:19:31

um so I suppose do we have um

2:19:37

Carolyn yeah I'm afraid of a big views am I looking

2:19:42

again where does one option start and the other one end and so on and so forth yeah yeah

2:19:48

um so they are in sorry this is confusing

2:19:54

there's only so much notation so there it's within the brackets there's sentence one

2:20:02

and then sentence two it's a in either or just give me a chance to read that

2:20:07

before you highlight the other one sure I've made sir

2:20:15

hey do you have a comment

2:20:33

I didn't really see this as an either or I saw the first one uh it's just moving

2:20:40

to that it's moving that part up to the first sentence

2:20:47

and the second part the second one is adding safe and walkable neighborhoods

2:20:54

and so I don't I don't see that really as an either

2:21:00

or I think it could be both and I think both are fine I just don't like the last sentence

2:21:14

um yeah the way I'm reading it is the first one is saying quality of life

2:21:19

may draw off Island visitors here and the other one is quality of life

2:21:25

does draw off Island visitors and they may spend money here that's that's how

2:21:31

I'm reading the subtle difference

2:21:36

Carolyn you also don't have safe and walkable

2:21:42

neighborhoods in the first one maybe that's obvious but I haven't heard anyone say that so you know the second

2:21:47

the second option I think adds that that's I think the main difference right

2:21:52

am I missing something that is the primary difference yeah I'm good with the sentence I think I'm

2:21:59

safe and walkable

2:22:05

I guess I'm not well let's see um neighborhoods um I don't know if that draws people to

2:22:11

the business area but I don't it's okay do you have a comment

2:22:17

oh you know I I guess I'm not as sold on the Nexus between quality of life and I

2:22:23

think we all love the quality of life of Mercer Island but how much I see that as part of the the strength and focus of

2:22:29

the business document but I I don't feel strongly about it and I'm perfectly happy with anything I I agree with Kate

2:22:36

I don't love the last sentence because I say I I see it as a little more tangential than I think uh some others

2:22:44

might Victor

2:22:51

um unfortunate to hear commissioner gills back off of his uh original comment

2:22:57

because I was going to say I agree with um his assertion that there's not really

2:23:04

any proof to any of this around quality of life I know we discussed this in the economic development subcommittee

2:23:09

there's not it's not really proof of it we kind of speculate so yeah I mean being absolute and saying it does draw

2:23:16

to me is is is simply not true um and and I think that's fundamentally

2:23:22

the difference between these two it's not calling out safe and walkable neighborhoods and reiterating all of the

2:23:29

things that contribute to Quality of Life the difference to me between these two is quality of life may versus

2:23:37

quality of life does or factors and so I I actually like the first comment better

2:23:44

foreign just to clarify I don't think I really backed off I prefer the may but uh it's

2:23:50

not the hill I plan to die on I have some other bills I'm in trouble on Adam

2:23:57

I'd I'd support um commissioner goes with the addition of safe and walkable neighborhoods

2:24:05

um so the second one is commissioner gels and the first one is who proposed that

2:24:10

one quick comment number one Chris gals proposed this first sentence

2:24:17

and Adam proposed the second oh okay okay because I'm hearing people kind of

2:24:22

not sure who's who's proposing one so what I'm hearing is that we could we

2:24:27

could drop this this sentence all together and then add

2:24:35

safe and walkable

2:24:43

up here and that would do it that would get us

2:24:49

and then we can tackle this last sentence

2:24:54

so I I would make one minor comment in a couple places here we refer to good

2:25:01

Public Schools I would say the island has more than just good Public Schools

2:25:09

um I don't know if we want to say excellent but high quality might be appropriate uh something along those

2:25:15

lines frankly that's why I moved here in 1992

2:25:21

um so you know we we might beef that up where

2:25:26

we reference it

2:25:33

so do we have consensus on on this paragraph Sans the lessons we'll get

2:25:38

that in a second okay um and then on the last sentence a

2:25:44

couple of you had some concerns about that

2:25:50

yes

2:25:59

are you looking for comment yes okay um yeah I just think I think it's a

2:26:07

tangential this is about that's a public safety comment and it almost sounds like

2:26:13

a to me it reads like a little bit of a political slogan

2:26:19

um because we're not talking about protecting quality of I don't know it just it

2:26:28

that's it I believe we did that Adam

2:26:33

um I'm I'm fine with clarifying that it's not referring to Public Safety but

2:26:39

I mean this is cons this is identified as a considerable strength I don't think we should compromise or allow a

2:26:47

considerable strength to be degraded for the sole purpose of bringing in a few more

2:26:53

potential customers um people move here and are

2:26:59

our responsibility is to our residents first um so I you know I didn't say it's a

2:27:06

considerable strength but I mean that that someone else's wording but yeah I I let's I'm I would support clarifying

2:27:13

that this is not just a public safety thing this is making sure our parks are open space our schools our neighborhoods

2:27:20

and cultural amenities are all protected um like not Paving over a part of park

2:27:27

for a parking lot stuff like that um not just police it's interesting

2:27:33

yeah I guess that's helpful because I was I was wondering like protected from what because that's that's what makes this

2:27:39

sentence sort of um questionable to me is because it doesn't

2:27:44

say what you're protecting it from I'm like

2:27:49

so I I think there's a consensus that there is not consensus on the last

2:27:55

sentence so let's um table that um and move on I would really like to

2:28:03

make my comment um okay so okay

2:28:11

um we've already made a reference to this unwalkable neighborhoods in the first uh sentence so you know we've got

2:28:17

to the safety part of things but I think in a list of strengths which I think this is this is oh I don't think we're

2:28:24

talking about worrying about losing our strengths we're just describing what our strengths are so I find this the

2:28:29

statement to be a little bit extra and a little bit frightening sounding um so I

2:28:35

would prefer not to have it there okay

2:28:42

um we will keep it in there for now and we can uh strike it if or or maybe it may be

2:28:49

that preserved is a better uh word than protected um but I actually think this paragraph

2:28:57

needs to be reworked a little bit I mean it starts out with the public the high quality of life

2:29:03

says it helps attract businesses and workers alike and now as I understand Adam's last sentence which I didn't get

2:29:10

before it's a more of a constraint on business to say look it's not it's not

2:29:15

the attracting we're talking about it's just when we do this plan we want to make sure that we don't throughout the baby with the bath water and if that's

2:29:21

the case then I'm I'm happy enough with the concept but I don't think it reads

2:29:26

that way so I think if that's where it's going I think it needs to the whole thing needs to be reworked a little bit

2:29:38

um so what I think we should do um is we'll we'll keep this as is and

2:29:44

then at the next round um we'll flag this to come back to this

2:29:49

um I've got got the no consensus on there and so we'll know to come back to it when we're in the next next round of

2:29:56

review well if people want or interested I would be willing to try to rewrite it in a way that captures both those thoughts

2:30:03

but you know if we come back to it I think we're going to run into the same problem um and or I can work with Adam to

2:30:09

rewrite it or something but uh you know otherwise you know otherwise fine we can just move on and I'm happy

2:30:15

to move on um is there consensus to have

2:30:21

commissioner girls uh provide some language for consideration at our next

2:30:28

um our next review I can work with him on that yeah

2:30:36

I think if if I understood the comment correctly I think he was offer offering

2:30:41

to work with uh Vice chair Roger I thought I that's that's the way I read

2:30:48

it but otherwise first name problems yeah

2:30:55

oh right sorry laughs so you're right Victor

2:31:03

you know I can do it by myself too I'm fine exactly

2:31:12

um all right so we'll we'll come back to high quality of life at the next draft um

2:31:17

well I think I think we should go ahead and let Chris draft something maybe run

2:31:22

it by um the other Adam Adam and uh then give it to you and it'll

2:31:30

come into the next draft that sounds great yeah okay

2:31:40

um the next proposed change is to the paragraph about high income residents uh

2:31:47

proposing a an additional sentence at the end of the paragraph

2:31:54

Adam uh just a clarification it's the percent like Gap it's the percentage Gap is

2:32:01

closing based on uh the data that was given to us last

2:32:07

year so that I just wanted to make sure it's it's not the absolute Gap but it's the percentage

2:32:13

Gap um what is that telling us that's

2:32:19

relevant here go ahead I would just say that you know

2:32:26

we're I would say our median incomes our normalizing closer to the King County

2:32:32

average and I think that's a very significant piece of data to

2:32:38

uh articulate because that could be that may not be the outside perception

2:32:48

Carolyn yeah you know so um make the case that we could expect

2:32:54

customers coming from other places in the future there might not be that much difference I mean if the Gap is closing

2:33:01

but it seems like a relevant comment

2:33:07

so do we have consensus on the on the addition of this sentence here

2:33:13

yeah I have a comment I have my hand raised go ahead um

2:33:18

I I agree that it's interesting and worth noting I would say if we're going to note that that it should be backed up

2:33:24

by data and that perhaps we should have a Mercer Island and King County column

2:33:33

um in that table four to make it clear because of the table backs it up then

2:33:40

you know I don't think I think people will have a hard time believing it frankly and um if it's true then let's

2:33:46

document that with data and then the other um comment I wanted to make here was that um

2:33:53

and maybe I need to Workshop this for the next draft is um there's a very large difference

2:34:00

between the um mean and median incomes of people who

2:34:06

live in downtown Mercer Island versus the south end and the middle of the island being somewhere in between we're

2:34:13

talking like an average of a hundred thousand dollars on the North End a buck

2:34:19

50 in the middle and 250 on the south end and I think that's very significant and I

2:34:26

think that's worth reporting and I think it actually gets to the point and maybe supports the point that

2:34:33

um commissioner boatsman was making earlier that you know it's not just a

2:34:39

lot of money that makes people spend money on Mercer Island the people on the North End who are walking around and

2:34:45

shopping there actually make less money and um they're spending a considerable portion of it on Mercer Island so you

2:34:53

know I think we're missing something here in talking about Mercer Island as a single economic entity it's not and

2:35:00

we're we're different by geography Marissa do you have a comment uh I did

2:35:08

not sorry Adam um other Adam if it helps the data that

2:35:15

I am referencing which I did double check I'm not making them up um are on page nine exhibit five of the

2:35:23

comprehensive plan economic update that was delivered to the Commission in August 2022 by the consultant

2:35:32

um yeah if that helps just saving you the the effort of having to dig them up and

2:35:39

I do want to clear I do want to reiterate the it's the percent Gap I did

2:35:44

not check the you know absolute Delta yeah okay thank you

2:35:50

Carolyn yeah I I as I read this plan I had in the back of my mind that

2:35:56

something about where do the people that make a lot of money shop and I just

2:36:02

really appreciate Kate has skillfully teased out what I was thinking about you

2:36:08

know um what do we know about the incomes of various

2:36:13

neighborhoods on Mercer Island and how's that going to affect the um success of the commercial Enterprises

2:36:20

so thank you Kate

2:36:27

hey did you have a new comment or is that

2:36:40

okay yeah uh do we have consensus on how Adam is to handle this

2:36:51

Adam sorry it's it's page nine exhibit five

2:36:57

sorry oh exhibit five yeah exhibit five sorry don't want you to yeah thanks

2:37:10

um I get it seems to me the question we have is

2:37:16

Kate and Carolyn have introduced a few new Concepts here uh and do we have consensus on whether

2:37:23

we want to try to expand the data here uh whether we have that data is

2:37:32

maybe another question but do we want Adam to try and dig into that and expand

2:37:39

that information um or are we just talking about you know

2:37:45

on average for for this purposes um

2:37:51

I I think for the table here this this direction to add the King County column

2:37:58

makes a lot of sense to so we can see that in line the

2:38:04

question about like Geographic dispersal of income is a little bit uh dispersal

2:38:11

wasn't the right word anyway the distribution of income um that's a little trickier I could

2:38:17

probably if if we need to add it in I could probably find it by census block group

2:38:23

that may not give us a ton of Clarity I guess there's two block groups

2:38:30

at the north of the island and two at the South and so that might kind of get up what your uh what you're pointing at

2:38:36

I I can I can see about finding that um I don't know if it goes in the element here I'll provide it in the staff report

2:38:42

and then we can decide whether or not we want to add it in um

2:38:50

the American Community survey will give you the information you need and my intern just wrote a python code to pull

2:38:56

that data so uh by block group if you need it I'll pass it on Adam

2:39:02

I would I would argue against this we always hear lots of comments you know staff is time you know time limited I

2:39:10

mean we're already con we're already comparing a small city of twenty five thousand to an entire County why do we

2:39:16

need to start breaking up the city into smaller pieces um we're we're creating planning

2:39:23

policies for the city as a whole um not subsections of the city

2:39:30

um you know we're already looking at median household income instead of mean which is the right way to look at it so

2:39:37

I I would say let's keep City to City to County not this part of the city this

2:39:43

part of the city to the county my opinion yeah well I I think there's a

2:39:50

legitimate question as to whether that data does anything for our planning purposes

2:39:56

uh it's it's pretty illuminating in one respect uh whether it guides any

2:40:04

planning or not uh let's let's get it and see if it tells us something

2:40:11

okay yeah

2:40:17

Carolyn yeah I tend to agree with Adam uh commissioner ragheb on this um I mean

2:40:24

are useful to it'll be useful to see that data but you know I think

2:40:29

that it's just important that the concept of housing that doesn't cost quite as much

2:40:37

being valuable to the commercial areas is enough I I don't think

2:40:43

we need to go into tables of data comparing Mercer Island residents so

2:40:48

that would be my thought useful information but probably not yeah we'll

2:40:54

discuss that in September um okay

2:41:00

all right then the um there's a minor amendment to strike

2:41:05

one sentence from the paragraph following the table um here at the bottom of page seven

2:41:11

I see one thumb two thumbs three thumbs four thumbs

2:41:19

um would anyone block consensus on making

2:41:25

this amendment okay keep rolling

2:41:33

um again some minor changes here to the paragraph on location of the city as a

2:41:38

strength um

2:41:48

I see one thumb

2:41:54

Adam I do like the mention of Public Safety um it's been demonstrated by downtown

2:42:01

Seattle that without Public Safety businesses hurt so I'm not opposed to the removal of this

2:42:07

but I would with the caveat that we see Public Safety somewhere and that term

2:42:13

not not safe and walkable because that's referring more to commissioner boatsman's past concerns

2:42:20

about you know walking and not getting hit by cars so I'm fine with it as long as we see Public Safety somewhere

2:42:30

okay so I think do we have would anyone block consensus on making the change to

2:42:36

the paragraph here on location of the city okay

2:42:44

um next we have the paragraph on weaknesses um again here these are just some minor

2:42:52

uh amendments to the paragraph

2:43:00

see one thumb two thumbs three thumbs four thumbs I can't see

2:43:06

Mike and I can't see Kate my thumb is up okay

2:43:14

okay we've got we've got thumbs on that one um unanimous thumbs no no blocking

2:43:21

consensus all right so the next uh proposed change is to the paragraph on

2:43:27

permitting and Regulatory environment um there's a couple of changes to the

2:43:32

paragraph here um

2:43:42

see one thumb up Carolyn yeah I'm I'm comfortable with

2:43:49

the minor changes in this paragraph but I had another change to propose so I'll go thumbs up with what's already

2:43:55

proposed and then I will tell you what I'm proposing okay Adam

2:44:02

okay Carolyn what's your change okay um the sentence starting

2:44:11

um another challenging Factor related to permitting is the additional cost that

2:44:17

fees and delays in permitting can add to starting a new business I would just recommend deleting that

2:44:23

sentence I think the construction is kind of unwieldy

2:44:28

and the meaning is repetitive to sentences that follow

2:44:33

and the tone is somewhat negative um for example the time it takes for

2:44:40

permitting is called a delay well when you when the economic

2:44:45

development plan is implemented they will do some investigation and find out if it's a delay or something negative

2:44:52

that should be fixed um or and then the phrase additional cost is a little bit

2:44:58

um confusing so I would suggest deleting that sentence for those reasons

2:45:07

I I see one thumb for that idea

2:45:25

um so would we would anyone block consensus on making that change of removing that sentence

2:45:33

I would I would too okay

2:45:43

um I think Karen can submit it as a comment for the next draft yeah thanks

2:45:51

um okay so then do we have consensus on the rest of the paragraph as as proposed here

2:46:00

looks like Victor are you on board um I don't I don't like the first

2:46:06

strikeout

2:46:18

um let's see yeah Victor I read that as being just redundant with the second

2:46:25

sentence um

2:46:31

uh between the two sentences I like the first one better

2:46:37

if I had to choose between the two I I I saw the same thing

2:46:45

but I think the first one is is the second sentence is very roundabout says

2:46:51

the same thing in a very roundabout way permitting's an issue it's a significant

2:46:57

issue on their own yeah it is that's true

2:47:04

so that would look like this it's great I I you know it was just a

2:47:11

redundancy issue so either one's fun okay wait would anyone block consensus on

2:47:18

making that change well I think the second sentence

2:47:24

captures some other ideas including expanding a business

2:47:29

and the first one is only adversely affecting business formation which I I

2:47:36

view is different Fair Point peer point if we could somehow mash the two

2:47:42

together and yeah that should be easy enough

2:47:48

yeah I agree with mashing and I mean

2:47:55

we have we have to have permitting and I don't think it's constructive to say

2:48:00

in our own document that kind of a blanket statement that permittings

2:48:06

yucky even though we all have to do it and it does feel yucky sometimes I think it's a completely Fair statement to make

2:48:13

permitting is yucky and it needs to be fixed I like I like the specificity of the

2:48:20

second sentence so I appreciate the uh compromise

2:48:26

So Adam your your mission is to mash those two together

2:48:31

I'll do my best okay there's consensus that that should be

2:48:37

done okay

2:48:45

all right we'll keep rolling um so the next uh paragraph is

2:48:54

um let's see what is this on page nine about affordable affordability and availability of commercial space uh the

2:49:01

first paragraph here

2:49:11

um I I think commissioner excuse has raised her hand oh sorry yeah hey

2:49:18

yeah this is um my written comments will go into the next draft but I just have a fundamental

2:49:24

problem with this entire section because we have a

2:49:29

land use code that is extremely restrictive and many people agree that

2:49:36

it should be um but I feel like this whole setup here in these two paragraphs pits two groups

2:49:43

that are struggling against each other you're pitting multi-family housing which is our lowest

2:49:48

income residence and uh the need the desperate and Regional need for more affordable housing against small

2:49:56

businesses which are also struggling um and when I said earlier you know we're looking at the whole instead of

2:50:02

the donut the fact is that something like 90 something percent of the land on our island is single family housing so

2:50:10

that restricts anything else you can do so I feel like the tone of these

2:50:16

paragraphs is really blaming multi-family housing for not

2:50:22

having enough commercial space or enough affordable commercial space but really it's just that we've chosen to be a

2:50:27

single family housing community for the most part um and the impact of single-family

2:50:33

housing on available commercial space is significantly greater than the impact of

2:50:39

multi-family housing so I don't think it's fair I just you know that's I'm

2:50:44

trying to figure out how to I offered some proposed language

2:50:51

um I might try to fine-tune that again Adam before the next draft

2:50:58

yeah Kate I think your point is well taken um the you know there does seem to be this

2:51:06

seeming conflict between multi-family um and Retail but the reality is that

2:51:16

our city has chosen over the years to focus all the additional residential

2:51:24

growth in the central in the Town Center

2:51:29

which by necessity requires multi-family so that it can avoid expanding or or

2:51:38

allowing any businesses or or you know I'll say

2:51:43

smaller scale multi-family outside the city center so I I think it's I think it's a good

2:51:51

point you're raising and I think it is something that we should work into this

2:51:57

next draft at least present an alternative perspective on that

2:52:03

Adam I disagree with the tone I think we're we're looking at data and stating facts

2:52:09

uh that sentence that Adam Zack moved to the end I mean that's those are that's

2:52:16

that's data right um I think yeah this the city

2:52:21

I would word the observation differently it's like in the Town Center area where

2:52:27

we have that mixed use the city has chosen to prioritize multi-family over

2:52:32

commercial space and that's that's the data we're just narrating the current

2:52:37

state of Our Town Center so I'm I'm not a poster I don't see a

2:52:42

tone here um so I I support the changes and the

2:52:47

existing paragraphs that Adam and the group he worked with put here

2:52:52

well my suggestion is that there's data missing because we're saying that

2:52:59

um the city's not pitting anyone against anyone it's it's it's the economic

2:53:06

pressure um it's the fact that if you limit certain uses to a tiny little square and

2:53:15

everything else doesn't move you know it's like you're saying commercials

2:53:20

reduce multi-families increase but we're not talking about single family at all so let's what I'm saying is let's put

2:53:27

that data in there and show the full picture um and I don't disagree that you know if

2:53:34

if these two uses commercial and multi-family are only allowed in this

2:53:40

small square it's economic reality in in most of our business owners have

2:53:45

expressed this that um you know people make more money off housing than they do off business so

2:53:50

that's what they're going to go for but that's not that's not multi-family housing's fault

2:53:57

right that's not the fault of people who can't afford homes that's not the fault

2:54:03

of um you know it's not the fault of multi-family housing it's how we choose as a whole to

2:54:09

use all of our land in our community and the fact that these two uses have been restricted to the exact same spot and

2:54:16

only that spot um of course multi-family is going to win because they make more money off it

2:54:23

Chris yeah no I I'm I really very interested

2:54:28

in Kate's point about tone and you know I I would love to see another draft that

2:54:35

sort of she's more comfortable with for the next round I just don't think we can do this in the abstract though

2:54:42

Adam I'm yeah I'm curious to see the data that Adam can bring to us but I will push back on the word constrict and

2:54:49

I would suggest we say influence uh constrict as a a loaded word I

2:54:55

believe wordsmithing my notes

2:55:01

[Laughter] I can put some of that information together it sounds like though there's

2:55:08

there's maybe a lack of consensus about this section um generally about the affordability and

2:55:15

availability piece and so I think we can take Kate's comments into because

2:55:21

she's provided some written comments too um and maybe we'll provide more uh I

2:55:27

want to word Smith your wordsmithing it's it it doesn't it doesn't might

2:55:32

influence it dictates sure

2:55:39

okay we know we need some information about housing ER about zoning and how

2:55:44

that influences are our commercial areas um and and I think we can uh we can come

2:55:51

back when we have a maybe some additions to make to this to this

2:55:57

section um but we don't necessarily need to go through the rest of it because it sounds like there's kind of no consensus about

2:56:04

the changes as proposed and so in the interest of time we can keep rolling I

2:56:10

think does that does that sound good to the group okay

2:56:18

great uh the next proposed change just striking this

2:56:25

um this section here the list um to be consistent with the other changes we've made

2:56:31

um and then let's see um the next change is to this section on

2:56:39

Transportation connections um striking the word improve from the

2:56:45

title and calling it additional Transportation connections and then some minor changes to

2:56:51

um to the paragraph

2:56:57

Adam I would suggest I'll I'll Advocate again for my proposed reordering I understand

2:57:04

um earlier a comment was made that you know the order doesn't really matter they're all equally important but when I

2:57:10

read when I read a document that the first and what comes first scene is inferred

2:57:18

by me to be the most important and I think I remember we discussed this a year ago same topic different context I

2:57:27

mean we know there's more Islanders working from home we're very close to

2:57:33

knowing seeing that arrival of the large employer and these additional Transportation connections I mean

2:57:40

we keep seeing more and more delays so I would suggest reordering them uh per my

2:57:45

comment because this is it's not here yet and we don't know if there will be

2:57:51

more delays there may be more Victor

2:57:57

uh generally agree with Adam's comment

2:58:02

um also um aren't persons typically known as people

2:58:11

sometimes okay

2:58:23

um okay so there's is there consensus to change the paragraph as proposed as

2:58:29

shown on the screen here

2:58:38

hey did you have a comment yeah it just seems like a I don't know

2:58:45

if it's non-sequitur is the right word leveraging the rely arrival of Light Rail where requires some active steps to

2:58:52

ensure this opportunity is maximized and then it goes into um negatives

2:58:58

so it's just weird it just sounds really weird to me like I think if you were trying to maximize an opportunity you'd

2:59:04

be looking at things like improving the welcoming nature of the

2:59:10

corridor between Light Rail and the downtown core whereas this just says

2:59:15

um you know we're worried about Public Safety um and I'm not saying that that doesn't belong in this paragraph

2:59:23

um but I think that sentence is not

2:59:29

I think it switches the purpose of the beginning of the sentence um

2:59:45

looks like Adam Adam has its hand up I'll I'll let commotion or boats and

2:59:51

then speak first since I already spoke to this

2:59:56

you're on I agree with Kate's comment there I think that this is a rather glaring

3:00:03

segue that just doesn't seem to fit um I would suggest deleting that

3:00:11

and I'm I would support keeping it um I'm not opposed to softening the

3:00:20

change but I mean you know if if there is a public safety concern perhaps 10 of

3:00:27

potential people are willing to overlook that and if we want to maximize the amount of
people willing to use public

3:00:33

transport you know if we address that Public Safety concern perhaps we can capture a
higher percentage of those and

3:00:40

I think that is inherently necessary to maximizing this potential opportunity

3:00:48

Chris I think is a great point and I'd love to see any proposed alternative in

3:00:55

September well I think there's consensus on this

3:01:02

language so that sentence is subject to to reconsideration

3:01:10

okay um is there's consensus on the rest of

3:01:15

the paragraph though I think I saw that okay

3:01:23

um very minor change on what's now line 11 adding planned arrival of light rail

3:01:32

foreign do you have a new comment or is that yes

3:01:37

uh just a clarification on the which which atom got the action to provide

3:01:43

um revised text for your lines okay just wanted to clarify thank you

3:01:49

thank you

3:01:57

um so there's consent is there consensus on the edition of the word planned here

3:02:06

okay and then there are some changes to the

3:02:12

the paragraph on more Islanders working from home

3:02:22

see three thumbs

3:02:33

uh I don't see Victor Kate or Chris but that's because my zoom I'm sure that's Chris Christmas

3:02:40

thumbs up okay so I just have a question we're striking that second sentence

3:02:46

because it's redundant is that is that the thinking here I believe so yeah

3:02:54

sure okay Carolyn do you have a question

3:03:03

um I have a comment um I'm going to send comments regarding adding something to this list which is

3:03:11

more housing priced in the middle range would be an opportunity so I'll send that along to you

3:03:22

all right so I think we have consensus on more Islanders working from home on that paragraph

3:03:29

um and then I'm going to assume consensus on removing this list um because we've done it elsewhere

3:03:36

um let's see the next change is to the first paragraph of affordability in the

3:03:43

region here on page on page 13.

3:03:58

page 13. I do not see that where is that okay let's see

3:04:03

all right page 12. um

3:04:10

I

3:04:20

I was not clear what was meant to end to a lesser degree housing

3:04:27

has the potential to slow economic growth

3:04:33

Chris was that you or Adam's comments I don't remember if it was me but you

3:04:40

know looking at I do feel like we're a little schizophrenic that some places we seem to say we want our houses to be super expensive because

3:04:47

people have a ton of money that have to buy them and then they're going to spend more in the town center and here we seem

3:04:52

to be saying that you know to you know housing gets too expensive and that

3:04:57

could be a drag on on the business and you know I think in both cases we don't really know the answer to that so you

3:05:04

know if we're going to take the with what we've said so far I would agree that maybe that should come out

3:05:10

okay Adam I was the one who made the comment

3:05:15

and I think it yeah we're the way I read it was we're talking about you know business growth in the Town Center

3:05:23

um but we talk about housing before commercial affordability so I think the I think

3:05:29

listing commercial space ability affordability is I think more directly

3:05:35

tied to a business's cost than the housing costs so that was the rationale

3:05:40

behind that comment um

3:05:46

yeah I just I just don't see where that comes from

3:06:03

my concern about this statement is that we're we already have businesses complaining

3:06:10

that they can't get employees um so I do think that affordability of

3:06:17

housing especially considering um our analysis showed we're basically

3:06:22

paying poverty wages through a lot of our workers I think that's definitely

3:06:28

relevant I mean and and maybe that that type of comment that I'm making

3:06:35

just now is more appropriate in the sustainability of the workforce section um but I disagree with

3:06:42

maybe commercial could go first on this list but I certainly wouldn't say to a lesser degree housing if

3:06:49

you know people can't afford to live where they work uh our employee crisis is just going to get worse

3:06:56

considering most of the jobs in our community are um or at least

3:07:01

fill in home health care

3:07:08

okay everyone I agree with switching the order of

3:07:14

commercial housing because the first paragraph does talk about commercial and

3:07:19

the second paragraph talks about housing but I would also not be comfortable with the phrase and to a lesser degree

3:07:26

housing because the affordability of commercial space and housing are such

3:07:31

different topics that I would disagree with trying to state which is more significant in this

3:07:36

sentence

3:07:42

Adam I I respect commissioner boatsman's uh

3:07:47

view there um I would be willing to support just the reordering um I'll still Advocate on the lesser

3:07:53

degree part because I think the data we've been shown say only 13 percent of

3:07:58

people actually live on the island and with this planned um additional public transit options

3:08:06

um that should reduce the impact of you know maybe find a cheaper apartment in

3:08:12

downtown Bellevue then you have at some time in the to be determined future you

3:08:18

have that Rail Link that can bring you to your job here so it's 13 of the workforce

3:08:24

um potentially lots of options for um for Transit so that's that's my

3:08:30

rationale behind lesser um but I'm not gonna I'm not gonna die on that Hill

3:08:40

all right so is there a consensus then to amend this first sentence uh as shown

3:08:45

on the screen here no no

3:08:52

wait I'm sorry what was the question again please so is there consensus to

3:08:58

amend the first sentence as shown on the screen here striking to a lesser degree oh okay

3:09:08

see three thumbs I can't see Mike yeah thumbs up okay

3:09:16

so just use your magic phrase would anyone block consensus to affecting this

3:09:23

great um all right so the next change is to the next sentence uh or the next

3:09:29

paragraph just changing into on um

3:09:35

um I see thumbs on that one Adam do you

3:09:41

have a comment or is that it was on the table coming next sorry I got too excited

3:09:48

it is exciting

3:09:53

um okay so it looks like we're good within on um and now

3:09:59

we're two table five if you wanna there's a comment no

3:10:04

Carolyn oh I'm good I am going to suggest adding to the

3:10:10

threat list climate change so I will send some text regarding that and a paragraph for your consideration

3:10:18

okay great

3:10:24

um all right um all right Adam we're two Table Six if you have a comment here yeah all right

3:10:30

yeah um I liked Kate's idea earlier of getting the King County data side by

3:10:35

side with our city data so I I'm assuming King County data would be

3:10:42

available also through the census website so I would I would propose we show these data side

3:10:49

by side with those of King County

3:10:57

um just on in terms of the earning earning range here yeah I mean I'm assuming those are

3:11:04

Buck I assume those are buckets from the from the American Community survey so

3:11:12

I'm not trying to make it more granular sure

3:11:22

okay yeah I did have a question about this table generally though

3:11:30

um I'm curious as to why it stops

3:11:36

at 3300 especially if we are going to bring the county

3:11:41

data in um because if we're talk I I feel like it should be consistent with

3:11:49

um where's the table of our workers table four

3:11:59

um so table four has ranges of ten thousand

3:12:07

to fifteen thousand fifty thousand to seventy five it goes up to 200 000 or more so I think it would be useful to

3:12:14

um even if you have to make them you know

3:12:20

condense those a little more it just it's weird to me that this stops at forty thousand dollars because I know we

3:12:26

have doctors and lawyers and stuff that practice on the island and it will certainly be a percentage

3:12:31

so the the reason these are divided that way is this data comes from the uh the

3:12:38

census bureaus on the map uh tool that they provide that shows the

3:12:44

inflow and outflow of workers and so it was to be comparing Apples to Apples in table

3:12:51

five rather than table four so they they provide them in these buckets

3:12:57

um at this at this breakdown um on on the map so that was you don't

3:13:05

have the higher income brackets right they just okay thank you all right yeah okay as long as it's consistent I'm

3:13:11

happy okay

3:13:17

um I will add in the King County it'd be easy enough to pull King County from that on the map there

3:13:23

um the next change is um on page 14 here

3:13:29

um to the paragraph on displacement during Redevelopment um just uh some minor changes to the

3:13:36

construction of the paragraph

3:13:48

so uh Adam it was not clear to me why that sentence

3:13:54

Redevelopment is often driven by constrained supply of vacant developable

3:13:59

land blah blah why that was stricken who whose comment was that

3:14:06

um I believe that came from Chris Gill's comments oh boy

3:14:12

uh-huh yeah I think I thought I thought it was just I

3:14:21

didn't see that it had a necessarily point to the paragraph but you know if people wanted let's keep it

3:14:28

so if you go back to the original draft what was the basis for that statement

3:14:40

the the basis for that statement is that it's just that I think that's a

3:14:46

statement that can be that is true there isn't necessarily like a data point backing that up

3:15:06

I think this gets to the point that many have made about affordable housing I mean it's there's a corollary between

3:15:12

you know saying some of our older uh housing single-family houses are little Ramblers

3:15:19

or some of the only affordable housing for young families

3:15:24

um you know when things get redeveloped they're more expensive new constructions always more expensive than

3:15:31

what was there before so I think it's legitimate to say that it's I think somewhere else we say that it's it's

3:15:38

higher cost per square foot when you have a new development as opposed to an old one but Victor can correct me on

3:15:44

that if I'm mistaken

3:15:57

good Victor we'll say uh that first change reads funding

3:16:03

um this causes most new commercial development on the island will occur through Redevelopment

3:16:18

right that's sort of clearly a type of some sort yeah this was I think this was

3:16:24

supposed to be struck and this should not be

3:16:49

um is there a consensus to amend the paragraph as shown on the screen here

3:16:55

um or

3:17:02

I see two thumbs my thumbs up okay

3:17:07

Chris is up and Victor's up

3:17:15

not knowledgeable enough on this to offer an opinion or object okay so you wouldn't block consensus

3:17:23

then okay great well that concludes the

3:17:29

introduction to the element um

3:17:35

all right we've we've been at this for about two hours now do we want to keep rolling

3:17:41

well let's uh take a short break and uh I think we keep rolling

3:17:48

unless uh people don't don't want to well we had said that we were going to do a time check in 25 minutes

3:17:55

so we're going to take a break and then buy Adam's motion we're

3:18:01

going to take another check uh 15 minutes after coming back

3:18:08

well let's go 15 minutes okay or yeah all right

3:18:15

um well we're at uh policy 1.2 is the next proposed change this is one of the

3:18:22

uh changes that was marked for deliberation and Direction um The Proposal here is to change the

3:18:30

the policy here um from essentially from this local

3:18:35

business liaison position being a city council physician so one of the council members filling it to being a local

3:18:43

business liaison um selected not from the city council but um that would report to the city

3:18:50

council um this is uh a proposal that the reason that I marked

3:18:57

this out for deliberation and direction is that if we if the Planning Commission decides to go with this amendment

3:19:05

um we would need to add some further detail um at some point maybe it would be another

3:19:12

policy but kind of outlining who this local business liaison would be it's

3:19:18

also worth noting that we don't have a current process for selecting such a

3:19:23

position um so we would need to kind of think about and and have some kind of

3:19:29

Direction regarding that um uh kind of on a bigger scale yeah

3:19:39

and this one was proposed by Chris so he might be able to provide some more commentary

3:19:46

you know as I as I said in the notes I mean I am I my my reading and my

3:19:53

experience there is this issue of of regulatory captures somebody who's in Joins another tribe

3:20:00

and is still part of the first I mean I'm just very concerned about it creating a a bias that's going to

3:20:09

um the uh a problem the um

3:20:15

and I guess in some ways I'm not sure the city I would love to see the business Community select the liaison

3:20:20

that they send to Council meetings and keeps up to date you know I'm not sure that that we would

3:20:25

have to bless that person for them to do that and as I as they say there's a lot of other things we're doing

3:20:31

to you know reach out more to the business community and I'm just not sure we need to take this step

3:20:38

um and I I feel pretty strongly about it but if no one else has the concerns I

3:20:43

have then so be it okay

3:20:49

I think Caroline was before me oh okay Carolyn

3:20:56

I think we might be talking about two different things here

3:21:02

um I don't know if the local business Community will want to have one person

3:21:07

to represent their points of view with the city council and that would be a decision for them to make but I do feel

3:21:14

quite confident that the city council will want to have someone one of their members be a

3:21:21

liaison to the business district so I would be in favor of leaving it the way it was

3:21:30

great okay thanks um I agree with Chris's proposed edit um

3:21:37

I think it's problematic to have an elected official serve in that role

3:21:44

um it would seem more appropriate to be a staff person or

3:21:51

um even a commissioner on one of the commissions um

3:21:57

because the commissions are appointed by the full Council as opposed to one council member

3:22:02

um that at least removes like one degree of politicization away from the position

3:22:11

um the other question I would have though would be we don't this economic element is new

3:22:18

um we have commissions for all these activities we don't have an economic

3:22:24

development commission I'm curious if it's kind of a non-sequitur I guess but it's something like that coming or where

3:22:31

would where does the economic element business Fully live in the Planning Commission

3:22:37

that doesn't seem you know I'm curious like where how would you if not counsel who it seems

3:22:43

like via their staff or commissioner and if it's staff I don't think that's at

3:22:48

our discretion Victor

3:22:55

so I think what's being described here is actually the Chamber of Commerce which we already have in place

3:23:02

um Chamber of Commerce typically acts as a liaison between the business community

3:23:08

and [Music] the rest of the community including uh

3:23:13

the city council uh I am not supportive of

3:23:19

having a business person or some sort of liaison uh the city has a rich history

3:23:25

of people who say they stand for the business community and then not representing the uh the needs of the

3:23:32

business community so uh this is this is a die on the hill type of thing for me

3:23:38

um yeah I think the the city council could use a little bit of immersion into

3:23:43

the needs of the business community and so I'm supportive of it as written

3:23:51

as originally written yes okay

3:23:59

as one as one more clarification um I suppose or a little bit more

3:24:05

context because I think the the original vision for this liaison position was to

3:24:10

be more like a conduit of information to have a single uh it says in here too a

3:24:16

single point of contact on the city council for the business Community it was intended to be kind of that point

3:24:24

person on the council for that um they would be selected from among the

3:24:31

um existing uh City Council Members um if we were to go with the

3:24:37

the original policy um yeah just first position and just just so that I'm clear what

3:24:45

Adam is is describing is what I'm supporting which is a city council member who acts as a business liaison to

3:24:51

the business community is that is that that's what it was originally written right yeah do we need

3:24:58

to clarify then that they're a liaison to the Chamber of Commerce or is in general no they're a liaison to the

3:25:05

business Community what my my comment about the Chamber of Commerce is this idea of having a business person

3:25:13

interacting with the the the council is

3:25:19

already in place it's called the Chamber of Commerce so there's no there's no need to

3:25:24

recreate that

3:25:29

Kristen do you have another comment I do I mean I you know I hadn't really

3:25:34

thought through the fact that the business Community would be disparate enough that a single liaison wouldn't

3:25:40

work and I think you know Adam Zach raises good concerns about the complexities you know so my I guess I

3:25:46

would suggest instead of to change to 1.2 the strike 1.2 and you know essentially give their their point

3:25:52

person is 1.3 dedicated one staff position to coordinate and implementing the economic development element and you

3:25:59

know we haven't had that before I think if at the end of some period of time that turns out not to be sufficient or

3:26:05

not be working then maybe look at other Solutions but I think doing both these things at once is uh maybe Overkill and

3:26:12

they say I have I have serious concerns about a council member being designated a business days on

3:26:25

So Adam I think there is oh Carolyn

3:26:31

just add that um it's very common for the city council to do this the mayor

3:26:36

and the and the deputy mayor they appoint council members to be the point person

3:26:43

with various organizations throughout King County um various emerging issues on Mercer

3:26:49

Island uh these things are sort of they sometimes they come and go they might be ad hoc or they might be a long-standing

3:26:57

relationship that might change who's in the position for you know as the years go by but it's just very it's a very

3:27:04

common thing um so anyway um just want to add that

3:27:10

okay I um I agree with

3:27:17

um Chris's suggestion to strike 1.2 I think there's a big difference between a liaison

3:27:23

between the business Community mainly because of our ethics rules um you know when you're talking about

3:27:30

money and business and friends and you know it's just rape for corruption and

3:27:38

you know we have like they do have appointments all sorts of things but the last person that was appointed a salmon

3:27:43

Recovery Council didn't go to I don't think a single meeting so you know I

3:27:49

don't think that appointing someone to be the lay zone is necessarily uh effective it certainly wasn't for the

3:27:55

salmon Recovery Council um from Mercer Island uh I think if a staff person is going to

3:28:01

have a mandate in their work program then they have to do the work and they're meant to do it in an unbiased

3:28:09

way that doesn't benefit them or their friends financially

3:28:20

um so we've been through through this process we've been agreeing to changes by consensus

3:28:28

um with this we've got a couple of different ideas and if the account if the commission wants

3:28:35

we can hold off on doing this uh making a decision until September or we it

3:28:40

might be useful to use like a motion um regarding policy 1.2 those might be

3:28:46

certain tools in our tool bed belt to address this

3:28:52

can I make a motion to ask staff to consult with our City

3:28:58

attorney on um ethical issues related to having a council member be a liaison to the

3:29:06

business community

3:29:11

um you could you could make a motion I would I would say or make that motion I I would say that it might be

3:29:18

more useful for us to pin down whether or not this is an idea that the commission's interested in and then the

3:29:24

City attorney will review this element before it moves forward in the process

3:29:30

after the Planning Commission um so it might be more useful to pin

3:29:36

down whether or not we want to do this and then we can consult with Bo um as needed

3:29:48

Chris has had a new hand or old new hand new hand go ahead you know I would maybe

3:29:55

it seems to me there's I think no one's supporting 1.2 as amended right now so maybe the Alternatives seem to be the

3:30:03

original or to strike 1.2 and and maybe we just cue those up for discussion in

3:30:09

September or for a decision into September when we're going to try to Ram through this thing yeah

3:30:22

all right looks like we have consensus

3:30:31

all right moving to the next um we had a couple of or we had a comment on policy 1.8

3:30:39

um proposing some amendments here um this one policy

3:30:47

um we don't need additional Direction necessarily just it's a it's a pretty

3:30:54

substantial change to the the wording of the policy

3:31:04

yes yeah I think for me it just felt like it

3:31:12

was uh too granular for this document you know if others disagree fine I don't I don't

3:31:17

have a big problem with the list I just thought that it seemed like we're getting into getting our getting it out ahead of ourselves in terms of you know

3:31:24

doing the work of the people that are going to be doing the work under this plan

3:31:29

Adam um I don't support removing it but I would support saying the city could

3:31:36

focus softening it a bit I think that helps

3:31:42

yeah or possibly they could focus on the these and other things

3:31:49

not be restrictive that's not the point

3:31:58

among the things the city the City should focus on are maybe something

3:32:03

yeah something along those lines

3:32:08

you could probably tighten it up and not make it big pull-up points either

3:32:13

get the key phrases up in a list including but not limited to yeah

3:32:29

non-exclusive Maybe yeah do you want to work on something good yeah Adam you you get the drift of

3:32:38

what we're saying I think there's certainly consensus on that

3:32:57

yeah I'll take a look on that okay next draft

3:33:04

and then the next uh proposed amendment is the addition of a new policy 1.9 to

3:33:11

encourage the planting of trees by businesses in the city's business districts

3:33:17

Maryland I am all in favor of this of course but I uh think that these sorts of policies

3:33:26

are better in goal number four which deals with environment I will send along

3:33:32

um some language for goal number four that includes this concept but is also

3:33:40

um written with more consistency to what it exactly says in the climate action plan so

3:33:46

um I'll send that along to you

3:33:54

okay I just wanted to comment that as an

3:33:59

urban forestry student at UW Kathy wolf presented to us she's a

3:34:05

social scientist that businesses with trees in front of them actually make more money than
businesses without trees

3:34:11

in front of them so I think it's perfectly suited here not just for climate purposes

3:34:16

okay Adam I like it um I I think uh commissioner boatswain

3:34:22

raised a good point of them perhaps a more appropriate location and I think the word
encourage is soft enough we're

3:34:28

not trying to create a city program or you know lots of committing overhead so

3:34:35

I think yeah encourages soft um so thumbs up yes

3:34:42

oh nothing more I think yeah I don't care where it is I just want it in there I mean you know this broader point I

3:34:48

think goals one four eight nine ten it's they're they're pretty there's a lot there's a lot of overlap right so

3:34:56

um but yeah if it goes in four grade Victor

3:35:01

so um I love trees um my question is so in addition to

3:35:10

having people run their business we're now gonna also say that they should be

3:35:15

planting trees am I understanding that correctly I don't think so I think it's encouraged

3:35:22

and it could be somebody you know tax incentive it could be and where exactly

3:35:27

are we going to be planting the trees because like in front of our business the city came and cut trees down

3:35:33

so I'm I'm unclear as to where exactly these trees are going to go

3:35:40

I I would Envision this as something like a right-of-way program where there is a planting strip

3:35:46

and there's appropriate room so

3:35:53

maybe and and this has what to do with economic development this is this is doing what for

3:35:59

businesses people spend more time in business districts where there's trees

3:36:04

in shade and you know familiar with your walk there's not a

3:36:10

lot of room for that and I wouldn't want a poor little tree to be planted there but I think where there's room and it's

3:36:15

appropriate you know it's uh they're planting the trees and they're

3:36:21

responsible for their maintenance because it's in the right of way okay so and so where is that room I forget in

3:36:27

front of our business I'm thinking of the Town Center there's a lot of places where there are

3:36:33

trees and they have the big uh exact structural steel yeah exactly there are trees there already

3:36:40

uh I think this is Redevelopment just do it there too okay

3:36:45

yeah it can't be done they can't be done

3:36:51

but um the tree planting encouragement is more towards commercial property

3:36:57

owners than businesses because a lot of businesses lease space in buildings so I

3:37:03

um in the draft of some comments that I'm putting together I focus more on

3:37:09

property owners than businesses that's a good point

3:37:17

yeah if we could add businesses and rights of way I think it would make it easier to understand

3:37:28

sorry Kate I didn't understand that is that are you proposing a change

3:37:33

to what's on the screen here

3:37:42

yeah I I think businesses is not necessarily the the correct

3:37:47

phrase there uh yeah I'm agreeing with what Carolyn and Victor both said it would be more

3:37:54

commercial property owners and the city right the city and rights away in the

3:38:00

commercial in uh commercial areas

3:38:05

so something like this encourage the planning of trees by

3:38:10

commercial property owners um

3:38:17

and the city in commercial areas

3:38:23

something like that

3:38:38

something like that you might you might take out right away

3:38:45

because it's not just but it's just saying it's not the business it's the business owner isn't

3:38:51

carrying the burden of doing it is the point

3:39:04

and I'm

3:39:11

of was I recognized yes your hands up oh okay I'm sorry sorry I just heard about

3:39:19

um I'm kind of concerned now um we're getting I think a little too detailed here and a comment

3:39:26

um by commissioner goals about oh tax credits or something why don't we just leave it at encourage

3:39:33

the planting of trees in commercial areas and leave it at that by who

3:39:39

let's not worry about that because I think if we start talking oh Property Owners then people may start to jump to

3:39:45

oh property tax credit and uh that's that's a road I don't think we I would

3:39:52

not want to go down because that may change my opinion on this

3:39:58

Carolyn there's very specific policy language regarding this matter in the climate

3:40:06

action plan so I think whatever we put in here should really be reiterating what we read in there

3:40:27

so is there consensus to keep the policy but make it Con consistent with the climate action plan

3:40:35

and I I can pull the I can pull that for the next draft

3:40:42

we also wanted to strike by businesses yeah

3:40:52

I think the point is we want to encourage the planting of trees in commercial areas in consistent with the

3:41:01

climate action plan

3:41:08

okay so I'm at one percent power so can we

3:41:13

take our break and I'm going to try to switch over to my iPad well it's it's 9 45 now this

3:41:25

is so the question is do we take a break and push on for a while or do we call it

3:41:30

quits and reconvene I would say call it quits I think it's

3:41:38

going to take too long to finish really second third

3:41:44

fourth yes okay

3:41:50

well we've uh covered a fair amount of ground and gotten through a lot of the tougher stuff so that's good

3:42:06

okay So Adam

3:42:11

and I'm exact that is yeah thank you for that yes and uh you've been left with a

3:42:18

few things to do before next time I assume there's no deputy director report

3:42:25

no just I think just a reminder that we have August off and we'll be coming back in September okay

3:42:32

uh are there any planned absences for September or thereafter

3:42:49

maybe December I don't know what our date in December is though yeah that's a

3:42:56

long ways away okay I didn't know how much past September you were going with that question well

3:43:03

I didn't intend to go to December but thank you okay uh anything else

3:43:10

Chris is that a hand up or not no sorry okay no worries okay there being no

3:43:17

other business to come before the Planning Commission the time is now 9 46 p.m and the meeting is adjourned as a

3:43:25

reminder to Commissioners please stay online until staff has terminated to