

# GMHB EXHIBIT 185

## 2023-09-27 Planning Commission Transcript

0:04

good evening and welcome to the September 27th 2023 Planning Commission meeting the Planning Commission excuse

0:11

me the Planning Commission went into executive session at 6 pm to discuss with legal counsel pending or potential

0:18

litigation pursuant to RCW 42 .30.110 paren one

0:26

print I the executive session is scheduled to conclude at 7 pm thank you

1:01:13

Debra are you able to turn on my camera well I was just looking at that let me see

1:01:21

thank you Chris

1:01:51

thank you you're very welcome

1:01:57

we are recording uh Vice chair Riga and if you would like to start the meeting you can at any time

1:02:04

um okay um I see that one two three four five six all Commissioners are present and

1:02:10

videos are on um so I'll bang the gavel

1:02:15

um good evening and welcome to the September 27th 2023 regular hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Adam

1:02:22

ragab Vice chair tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is being brought to you by Zoom before this

1:02:28

meeting the Planning Commission was an executive session from 6 PM until approximately 6 45 PM during the

1:02:35

executive session we discussed with legal counsel pending or potential litigation pursuant to RCW 4230 110

1:02:42

Section 1 I welcome to all and thank you for joining us tonight

1:02:47

uh Commissioners please have your microphones turned on for the Roll Call Deputy city clerk Deb Estrada please

1:02:54

call the roll thank you Vice chair and a point of

1:03:00

clarification and for the record um although your executive session ended

1:03:06

more or less at 6 45 you did not come out of executive session until seven o'clock when I started your camera so I

1:03:13

just want to make sure that we're clear about that okay so for roll

1:03:19

call commissioner accuse here commissioner batazzo here commissioner

1:03:26

boatsman here commissioner gills here commissioner Rashid

1:03:32

yeah Vice chair Riga here and chair Murphy uh will not be with us

1:03:39

this evening it's my understanding uh okay a quorum is present let the record show that chair Murphy previously

1:03:45

coordinated unexcused absence for this meeting we continue to utilize the zoom platform I will do my best to

1:03:52

recognize you in the order in which hands are raised after being recognized you may then ask your question

1:04:00

our first item of business is public appearances this is the opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about

1:04:06

issues of concern uh Deputy city clerk is there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the

1:04:13

commission thank you we have one individual that's requested to speak uh the name is Tracy

1:04:19

with dollar development and I will Elevate them to um

1:04:26

okay and I have a an if yes script so tonight's agenda will include remote

1:04:32

public appearances via Zoom individuals wishing to address the commission may do so in person or by Zoom or telephone

1:04:38

provided they registered with the deputy city clerk by four o'clock pm today when it is your turn to speak you'll be

1:04:44

called by name remarks must be addressed to the commission as a whole and not to individual Commissioners or staff

1:04:50

please speak audibly and state your name and city of residence for the record you will have three minutes to speak when

1:04:57

your time has ended I will thank you for your comments and move to the next speaker or item of business

1:05:02

staff please promote the first speaker

1:05:08

this is go ahead Tracy I was just going to explain that you're joining us by telephone and that you will not be

1:05:15

participating via video hi Commissioners this is Tracy grambois

1:05:21

I live at 8440 Southeast 82nd Street I apologize that you cannot see me

1:05:26

virtually but I am in a location without Wi-Fi or Internet so I want to thank you all for your time

1:05:33

and dedication to all Islanders as you know the comp plan is a powerful

1:05:39

document it is aspirational but must also be based on reality and facts otherwise it

1:05:46

is just a wish list for rainbows and unicorns the insertion of an entirely new section

1:05:51

is an awesome and once in a lifetime endeavor which will have long-term ramifications

1:05:57

for our community future councils and commissions will look to this document to guide policy

1:06:02

decisions all of you wield much power over the future of our city I know you will take

1:06:09

the responsibility of each word and phrase wisely because it matters

1:06:15

I would first like to address the section concerning the South End commercial Zone which is on page four

1:06:20

lines 15-20 specifically line 17 which states the majority of the commercial

1:06:26

development dates the early 1960s I spoke or emailed with the owner

1:06:33

developer and the QFC in Rite Aid were built in the 1960s but all of their

1:06:38

buildings were constructed in the late 1990s including the storage court and

1:06:43

the newest building in which the Mexican restaurant currently resides was built in 2006.

1:06:50

next I would like to address page five lines 13 through 18 and then the same

1:06:57

comments go for page 12 lines 21-23 for your reference on page five line 13

1:07:04

through 18 read less expensive multi-family housing May attract residents in and near the Town

1:07:10

Center who are more likely to choose not to own a car and may be more likely to shop local

1:07:17

than those in detached single-family housing page 12 21-23 residents of this housing

1:07:24

will be located near the commercial area will be less likely to own a car and will be more likely to shop locally

1:07:30

um I want to know if these statements are based on any data and specifically any data specific to Mercer Island has

1:07:38

anyone inquired with local businesses about whom shops and Buys in their stores Glory at Island books Terry Donner at

1:07:45

the boutique Lounge tip zipper having spoken with these owners I know that lines 13 through 18 and 21 to 23 do not

1:07:53

reflect their reality just because we want something really bad doesn't make it so

1:08:00

next I'd like to address page nine lines 37-46

1:08:06

we are an Island by the very definition of an island we cannot create any more

1:08:12

land Dubai notwithstanding as a community we have decided to limit

1:08:17

our commercial multi-family areas to the existing Town Center in order to preserve our residential nature

1:08:23

inclusion of language which invites increasing the size of town center or other smaller commercial areas directly

1:08:30

contradicts existing portions of our comp plan for your reference the lines I'm referring to are if the area available

1:08:36

for commercial development is not large enough to accommodate the projected growth crisis can rise and businesses

1:08:41

can have trouble finding spaces best Supply reduces the city must monitor the size of its commercial areas

1:08:47

to ensure that the supply is develop commercial land is not so restricted that it limits opportunities for development

1:08:54

um I think three minutes um what what should our procedure be here

1:09:00

to stop I will wrap it wrap it up goals

1:09:09

unrealistic and not in line with what our community desires thank you for your time tonight I hope

1:09:15

you have a very productive meeting all right um thank you for your commentary

1:09:21

um uh just confirming with Deb uh this was the only speaker correct that's

1:09:26

correct sir all right if there are no further appearances uh we now move to regular business

1:09:33

uh the first item of regular business is to review and consider approving the July 26th regular meeting minutes uh

1:09:41

Commissioners may have a motion to approve the minutes so moved oh is there a second second

1:09:49

okay um there is a motion by commissioner boatsman seconded by a commissioner

1:09:54

batazzo to approve the minutes um

1:09:59

I guess does anyone wish to speak to those or should we conduct a roll call

1:10:07

seeing No Hands um Deb could you please conduct a roll call vote Commissioners please turn on

1:10:13

your microphones commissioner accutes

1:10:24

sorry got lost on my page um yes

1:10:29

commissioner batazzo aye commissioner boatsman

1:10:35

aye commissioner gills aye commissioner Rashid

1:10:42

aye Vice chair Reagan aye thank you um motion passes uh six to

1:10:51

zero and then our final item of regular

1:10:58

business is the comprehensive Plan update Economic Development element third draft for that I would like to

1:11:05

welcome senior planner Adam Zack

1:11:10

good evening thank you um so I just want to make a quick presentation and then we'll we'll get

1:11:17

started here um as a refresher our purpose tonight is to

1:11:23

continue our review of the economic development element of the comprehensive

1:11:28

plan this is a new element in the comprehensive plan that will be added

1:11:34

during the comprehensive plan periodic review which is currently underway and the economic development element

1:11:41

sets the goals and policies that will guide our Economic Development uh decision making here at the city

1:11:47

throughout the life of the comprehensive plan and it details the projects and programs

1:11:52

that the city will undertake to support the local economy um as it um moves forward into the

1:11:58

future our process so far there was a from

1:12:04

October to June um the the initial draft of this uh develop Economic Development element was

1:12:11

prepared by an economic development work Group which consisted of two members of

1:12:16

the Planning Commission and three members of the city council that initial draft was presented to the

1:12:23

Planning Commission on June 28th and that that initialized kind of the first

1:12:29

public comment period on that first draft and then on July 26th the Planning

1:12:38

Commission reviewed the comments that were submitted on that initial draft and began this review process following that

1:12:45

meeting there were a couple of comments that were provided and there were also

1:12:51

some last minute comments written comments that were received right before the last meeting

1:12:58

those were all integrated into a final or not a final a third draft which was

1:13:04

provided to the Planning Commission on August 31st and so that third draft is

1:13:10

what we'll be taking up today there was also a comment Matrix provided

1:13:16

with the August 31st memo that outlined each of the written comments that were received and provided a log number so as

1:13:24

we're going through the document tonight we'll see where those changes have been made and strikeout and underlying format

1:13:31

I've noted where in the uh where those comments came from so that you can refer

1:13:38

back to the Matrix to see who proposed that Amendment and what the what the comment was

1:13:45

um we have received um or the Planning Commission has provided an uh a lot of comments on this

1:13:53

draft we have in the comment Matrix there's 86 different entries

1:13:58

um of comments on different goals and policies and proposed amendments to the

1:14:04

element in addition to what was provided and outlined in that comment Matrix there

1:14:10

were a couple of comments that were received throughout the month of September this includes there were two comments

1:14:18

from Kate accuse from commissioner Hughes um an email from Chris gells outlining a

1:14:25

proposed paragraph in um in the introduction

1:14:31

um that was in response to some of the discussion in July and then uh Vice

1:14:37

chair ragheb uh provided an email comment um earlier this week as well

1:14:45

um when we were reviewing this the comments in July

1:14:51

the through through that review we we managed to get through the introduction

1:14:56

and the first set of policies under goal one

1:15:02

um and so we'll be picking it up from there there were a few more comments on the introduction

1:15:08

um that came in after that July meeting and those have been shown in strikeout and

1:15:13

underlying um in the in the third draft here but I'm proposing that tonight we start at

1:15:19

the goals and policies and then before we we finalize review at the next meeting uh we can we can return to those

1:15:27

comments on the introduction but just in the interest of time I'm proposing that we get uh started with the goals and

1:15:33

policies tonight because that's where I think we'll have the most debate

1:15:39

um another note before we get into the the meat of

1:15:45

um of our meeting here um or is a note on the scheduling constraints that we have

1:15:50

um so after after tonight's meeting the Planning Commission will have one more regularly scheduled meeting

1:15:57

um to complete the work on this Economic Development element

1:16:02

um and that's because in as um as you may know in November

1:16:08

um the annual docket will be coming forward and we expect that'll take up that meeting there so if we if we don't

1:16:17

finish review by the end of the October meeting um that will likely require or will

1:16:23

require us to set um a special meeting before the end of the year just to make sure that our comp

1:16:29

plan update remains on track to to be completed within the planned time

1:16:38

um and with that in mind I think tonight we need to find a way to move through

1:16:44

the the comments a bit faster than we did at the last meeting um

1:16:50

just to try and to make sure that we get to all of those points um and so at this point I would

1:16:57

um I'm I think before we get into reviewing the element maybe the Planning

1:17:02

Commission should find a way to um to get a process ironed out before we

1:17:10

get started to find a way to move through these comments um in in a way that we we address the

1:17:17

the debate needed but keep the process moving forward um I see a hand up

1:17:28

um oh sorry uh commissioner batazzo you're recognized thank you um welcome back Adams I hope you

1:17:35

actually had a vacation um uh could uh Vice chair again could

1:17:41

either uh Adam or deputy director van gorp just remind me or the board the

1:17:50

process for this element and other elements in terms of and very briefly like where we're at my understanding is

1:17:57

we're at a draft phase there will be a public comment phase there will be another draft phase before this goes to

1:18:03

council for review um and I would just like to make sure we clarify that as we help each other set a

1:18:11

structure for tonight um so that's part one could we get confirmation on that yeah thank you for that's a that's a

1:18:19

helpful question to ask um so the we are at a draft phase now

1:18:24

um and this where we're hoping to get out of this or get to with this process

1:18:30

we're in at the moment is to get to what we're calling a public hearing draft and

1:18:36

that's not a that's not a final draft but it is the it is the draft that we will take forward to public hearing and

1:18:43

so it's we will the Planning Commission will have a chance to touch on that

1:18:49

draft even once we've we've finalized this one more well actually twice before

1:18:55

it goes to the city council um so there will be a tune-up meeting following a comprehensive plan workshop

1:19:02

and then where you can fine tune um the drafts before going to a public

1:19:08

hearing and then the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing during which time you can make any final amendments

1:19:14

to address public comments um as you see fit and then you'll make a recommendation of the city council and

1:19:20

the city council will then um take take up the the comprehensive Plan update and then one other note on

1:19:28

process and scheduling there is a a state mandated uh deadline for

1:19:34

completing this periodic review which is December 31st of 2024. we have a we have

1:19:40

a timeline that we are working on where we're trying to get it done before that but that is the that's the date that we

1:19:47

have to get it finished by so about one year from now thank you Adam and then just uh Vice

1:19:55

chair again can I just make one comment or question about our process great

1:20:01

um if we're talking about how do we get through tonight's materials so that we

1:20:07

can move through this process if I might just offer

1:20:12

um I I am not attached to going line by line through my comments

1:20:19

um as someone who's had to write these plans Implement these plans and now make a living elsewhere holding cities

1:20:26

accountable to following through these plans um recognizing there's more of a process that everything is going to go through

1:20:33

before we get to a final draft um I I'm committed tonight to making sure we're addressing the big the big

1:20:39

media issues and letting some of the smaller stuff whether it's editorial or organizational the things that just are

1:20:47

not going to inform the plan in a meaningful way I'm willing to let go I

1:20:52

do want to say um you know I think we've been debating or talking about or commenting on some big

1:20:58

pieces um I think to the extent that airing out those conversations so that those

1:21:04

perspectives are ripe for the public to consider when they provide feedback on a draft that will get fine-tuned after

1:21:12

that would be important but I do just want to say I I'm not attached to nor do I need to go line by line I just want to

1:21:19

make sure I have an opportunity to share here's some big perspectives I'd like us to consider and I'd like the public to

1:21:25

consider as we move forward and then we move forward okay uh yeah understood um

1:21:34

I think the one concern there is I think we were we discussed this at length in the last meeting um that you know what's

1:21:40

an editorial to one person could be a larger issue to someone else and we found that and that that was one of the

1:21:46

reasons why one paragraph was taken offline um so what I think I'll try to do is exactly what

1:21:52

um chair Murphy did is or I'll recommend and let's let's do a thumbs up thumbs

1:21:58

down on it um if we were to in my understanding of or how my verbalization of what chair

1:22:04

Murphy led us with last time was we'll go through the the document line by line

1:22:11

um kind of look for a thumbs up thumbs down consensus on edits

1:22:16

um and try to go as rapidly as possible if we don't have consensus then we'll try to identify two or three

1:22:23

um members to kind of take that offline and discuss and then yeah I mean if there's a big one I think I think

1:22:29

everyone I think we can articulate that we have a big topic and then there we could take a formal roll call

1:22:36

um that that's my understanding or recollection or description of what we did two months ago

1:22:42

um just just to yeah just that that's my thinking

1:22:47

um I guess I'll I think I do see three hands up um are you

1:22:53

is that a reasonable response but not like edict uh to your question

1:23:02

that's a reasonable response yes okay okay all right um uh commissioner

1:23:08

boatsman you know um I think your description of

1:23:15

how we did it last time is accurate um this time I have had more time to

1:23:21

really study over the uh the draft and I've been able to see which

1:23:27

recommendations have been um entered into the draft as a simple

1:23:33

amendment by the staff and I of all the things which I read which looked like simple amendments that staff just made a

1:23:40

little text Amendment I've been comfortable with those so myself I would not need to look at those anymore but if

1:23:48

anyone had a particular simple amendment that they saw that they didn't think was simple I would be you know more than

1:23:55

happy to participate in discussion about that particular Amendment and then of course all of the more major things yeah

1:24:02

we need to look at thank you all right um commissioner accuse

1:24:11

hi thank you for um I I like what Caroline's address did a lot

1:24:18

I think um if we take a look at every simple Amendment we are not going to have time

1:24:24

to tackle the big one so I would maybe modify that proposal just a little

1:24:30

bit to say what if we tackled the simple amendments in our

1:24:37

next meeting and people have the opportunity to go through and see which ones of those you know they might want to say aren't

1:24:44

aren't so simple because I think there are so many media issues on the table

1:24:51

um that it might be it might be better to try to tackle those big ones in case we have to revisit them again

1:24:57

um at the next meeting I also wanted to offer that um on reflection and on learning that

1:25:05

we would be able to revisit this plan after we tackle the housing item issues

1:25:13

um I'm all but one or two of the comments I made about housing I'm very happy to

1:25:18

table those until we visit the housing issue and debate it in that more appropriate form

1:25:24

and then or say discuss it in that more appropriate Forum

1:25:29

um but I want I want some kind of reassurance that that they can be Revisited in this plan and I understand from staff that that is possible so in

1:25:38

terms of process and setting up our process um how do we how do we create a parking lot for those

1:25:45

items so that when we do return to the economic plan later um

1:25:50

we haven't lost those threads that's kind of a question for staff I guess

1:25:56

all right I heard two questions there so first there was a question about uh

1:26:02

revisiting the the element after doing housing and there's there will be an

1:26:08

internal consistency review included in our process because all of our comprehensive plan elements have to be

1:26:15

internally consistent with each other so after we go through the housing element

1:26:20

um and that that work with the housing work group will have to make sure that this element is consistent with that

1:26:26

that element and so that that's part that's built into our schedule and our

1:26:31

process so that that's question one and then question two

1:26:37

um concerning um a parking lot um as we're going through these

1:26:44

um as we're going through the different proposals the different comments we can we can just flag those for

1:26:51

um for a parking lot and I it probably would be best if we have you know uh

1:26:58

I don't know if we need a motion but some way to just enter that into the record um

1:27:03

that we're adding comment number x to the parking lot and then we can just come back to it that'd be the easiest

1:27:10

way to do it thank you

1:27:16

um Deb would is that would that be a reasonable procedural

1:27:22

way if if a motion to create a parking lot to be entered into the record

1:27:28

um would that be a reasonable way to address that well I want to I want if we're just

1:27:34

simply talking about setting setting something aside to discuss uh later

1:27:40

I don't believe that that requires emotion on behalf of the commission but if if

1:27:47

for process purposes it feels like it would be a cleaner way to set something aside

1:27:52

um I'm okay with that I'm just trying not to add to your

1:27:58

process okay understood um I think sorry just to interject

1:28:05

um on the process part I think if there's if there's just consensus to add X number X comment number to the parking

1:28:13

lot that's all the more we we need and we can we can decide that by uh like a thumbs up yes thank you thank

1:28:21

you Adam for that clarification okay yeah let's I guess let's let's look

1:28:27

to that for a thumbs up at the end of this I might would like to recognize commissioner rashish

1:28:34

yeah I have a question and I'm not sure whether this is directed at by shiraga

1:28:40

or um Adam um are we going to time box tonight's

1:28:45

conversation or is there a certain amount that we have to uh get through kind of

1:28:51

regardless of how long it takes um I'm just I'm just cognizant of how

1:28:57

long it's taken in the past and I've well I was going to propose that

1:29:04

um the that before we get started that'd be another thing that we are now is is how late do we want to go with this and

1:29:10

my my recommendation is that we ask that that we look at that at about 9

1:29:17

30 because it seems like 9 30 is about when we start uh running out of steam

1:29:24

um and so that seems like a good time to check in on that but I would leave it up to the

1:29:29

commission um is there any Motion in regards to

1:29:36

that or a parking lot I guess on how to proceed

1:29:43

uh Sue moved on the 9 30. stop

1:29:48

okay is there a second to stopping at 9 30

1:29:53

the motion I'll second all right um all in favor of the oh so motion made

1:30:01

by commissioner rashish uh seconded by commissioner accuse um I guess all in favor of that motion

1:30:08

let's put a hand Gab oh um sorry

1:30:14

um commissioner batazzo are you recognized quick discussion on the motion

1:30:20

um happy to support this motion as long as we as a commissioner committed to getting as much as if not the whole

1:30:27

thing done so however we have to show up in order to really work through this

1:30:33

um I really I'm happy to support it as long as we're working together to try

1:30:39

and get this done I just feel like this is a really important piece that the city needs to continue to move on and

1:30:44

give the public an opportunity to comment as I feel like we heard today in the comments so happy to SEC happy to

1:30:50

support it as long as okay all right um commissioner accuse uh

1:30:57

you're recognized see a hand or old thank you um uh just wondering if we should make this

1:31:03

one single motion that we end at 9 30 tackle the simple amendments at our next

1:31:11

meeting um and commit commit or create a parking lot

1:31:17

for comments that we elect to table until

1:31:22

after the housing would it would it be make sense to have that just be one motion

1:31:29

I'll defer to Deb if the commission would like to

1:31:35

formalize all of this an emotion that's fine what I would need is for uh commissioner Rashid and commissioner

1:31:43

keys to um withdraw their original motion and

1:31:48

restate it okay motion is withdrawn

1:31:54

commissioner accuse okay

1:32:01

thank you um I'd like to recognize commissioner boatsman oh maybe this is an apropos time to say

1:32:08

what I wanted to say um I don't think these sorts of things we're doing right now need emotion and a vote I mean I I

1:32:16

really think they're just kind of like hey you know let's let's check into each other at 9 30 and you know let's take

1:32:21

these you know simple things and put them off to the next meeting and let's get to the meat of the issue and you

1:32:26

know I think I think well I think we could just proceed that's my thought

1:32:32

is correct you don't need emotion but if there's a desire by the commission to make a motion in a second

1:32:39

to record those things for the record that's okay

1:32:45

I just I made the motion because I believe Vice chair asked for emotion so or someone asked for emotions right then

1:32:53

I'll I'll step in in the name of in the in the spirit of trying to get things going um is if there's any opposition to us

1:32:59

continuing till 9 30 and then taking taking a and evaluating whether

1:33:05

we should continue or stop um please speak up now

1:33:11

okay um then I guess I'll hand it off to um senior planner Adam Zach and let's

1:33:17

let's start chugging okay I will say so Kate you had proposed addressing the

1:33:24

simple amendments at a later meeting that's one that we couldn't do by consensus so if we want to do that

1:33:31

before we get into going through this because we didn't really land on a process if we were going to go line by

1:33:38

line or or not okay I'd like to propose a motion that we tackle simple amendments by saving

1:33:44

them for the next meeting and create a parking lot for items related to housing until after the housing element is

1:33:50

drafted second that right motion by commissioner Accused

1:33:55

seconded by commissioner boatsman um I guess I will uh sorry Deb you take

1:34:02

role yes but before I do that um I'm going to ask the commissioner keys please

1:34:07

restator motion it was it was faster than I was typing so

1:34:13

and I'm not sure the word tackle is appropriate um I would like to propose a motion that

1:34:19

the Planning Commission address simple amendments as marked by staff at

1:34:26

our next Planning Commission meeting

1:34:33

okay and that

1:34:38

at this meeting we create a parking lot for comments that we will not

1:34:46

address tonight but instead revisit after the housing element has been

1:34:51

drafted and again I second that

1:34:56

thank you Carol sure all right I'll guess I'll pan to Deb for roll call on that motion

1:35:04

so I'd like to repeat the emotion to sure to be to ensure that I've captured it correctly

1:35:10

I have a motion by commissioner Q's a second by boatsman that the Planning

1:35:15

Commission addressed simple amendments as marked by staff at the next Planning Commission meeting

1:35:21

and that at tonight's meeting we create a parking lot for comments

1:35:29

we will that we will not address tonight and instead address

1:35:37

after the housing element has been drafted thank you thank you so much that was a lot of

1:35:42

words sorry yeah and with that I'm comfortable with

1:35:49

moving forward with a vote okay so

1:35:55

um Vice chair

1:36:01

aye commissioner gills I commissioner boatsman

1:36:08

aye commissioner accuse aye commissioner vitazo

1:36:14

aye and commissioner Rashid all right thank you

1:36:23

um motion passes so back to senior planner Adam Zach right

1:36:28

um now let me let me share my screen and we'll get um we'll start diving into the draft

1:36:33

here um

1:36:44

all right so the first um the first comment that

1:36:49

um needs some additional consideration or deliberation and

1:36:55

discussion we didn't we didn't reach a consensus on was policy 1.2 and this is the policy

1:37:03

directed at establishing a local business liaison position and where we got in July was essentially we should

1:37:10

either keep this policy as is or strike it entirely

1:37:16

um there was some discussion about maybe amending this a bit

1:37:22

um and we haven't really landed on on a proposal there um the original comment was proposed by

1:37:29

commissioner gills

1:37:37

all right I see commissioner gel's hand you're recognized proposed that we strike it I think that

1:37:44

uh the council every council member should represent everyone

1:37:49

um completely objectively I think that uh no other constituency on the island

1:37:54

has a liaison um there are Liaisons but they're for things like Arts Council disability

1:38:00

board open space Conservancy Parks and Rec and Utility Board they're not for homeowners or Shoppers or anybody else

1:38:08

um the well-studied phenomenon of regulatory capture where someone who works with a group to formulate a plan

1:38:14

uh becomes uh sort of um hard to keep an unbiased view after that

1:38:21

and you know I think the the the element is already um very responsive to the perception

1:38:28

that we the city hasn't done enough for business including creating a staff position and a lot of

1:38:33

um other items that are very pro-business I don't think we need it so I would propose striking it

1:38:41

all right um commissioner boatsman you know I think um following on what

1:38:47

Chris just said I I was wondering I'm aware that the council has liaison too official boards and commissions you know

1:38:54

what the city but this business liaison or this business um

1:39:00

what what is the name of the Business Council that this refers to is it going

1:39:07

to be a commission for example with the city I presume not

1:39:13

um and does this entity have a name this this group of people working together if

1:39:18

not is there other are there other examples for which the city council has a liaison position for a rather

1:39:25

unofficial group so that's a question for staff

1:39:31

um so this is a little bit different than like Liaisons to our boards and commissions the the intent of this would

1:39:39

be to create essentially like a single point of contact UM for the business community in general

1:39:47

um it's not necessarily for a specific group um as as drafted okay thank you

1:39:56

all right um I do not see any other hands up on

1:40:01

this topic um does anyone else wish to speak to this topic

1:40:09

um then I guess I'll I'll look for a thumbs up thumbs down um to commissioner goals suggestion that

1:40:17

we strike 1.2 um oh sorry I see a hand by Deb so probably

1:40:25

a procedural problem I just want to let uh Adam know that his navigation screen

1:40:32

is visible um which reduces how much we can see of the actual document

1:40:38

yeah well I that's impartially intentional so I'll just okay I just want to make sure you

1:40:45

knew that thank you yeah

1:40:50

um all right so let's do a thumbs up thumbs down on striking 1.2

1:40:57

looking for uh consensus here one two three four five I see all thumbs

1:41:06

up so um I guess counts are commissions guidance is let's strike 1.2

1:41:12

okay now

1:41:18

let's see next deliberation and discussion is policy well it was marked out for policy

1:41:28

1.4 that comment but that comment has since been withdrawn um so the next deliberation would be on

1:41:35

policy 1.8 so let me scroll down here

1:41:41

um so at the meeting um in July

1:41:46

um you asked me to draft um uh policy or an amendment to 1.8

1:41:54

um to based on the input there that's what's shown on the screen here basically we just need consensus that

1:42:01

that kind of captures where the Planning Commission wants to go um uh Deb I see your hand is that an old

1:42:08

hand that's an old hand my apologies all right

1:42:13

um would anyone wish to speak or they'll give their suggestions on one eight d uh

1:42:19

commissioner rashif sheef

1:42:28

it's more of a question um can you hear me now yes it's more of

1:42:33

a question as to how this is worded the the goal or the the

1:42:38

language says partner with Community organizations such as the chamber to mark good Mercer Island but it then

1:42:46

says the city or city could focus on marketing materials on the following

1:42:51

nautics was the list so it's unclear who is who's doing the marketing here the

1:42:57

community organizations that are being pointed to or the city

1:43:05

yeah good point um a way to to address that might just be

1:43:11

uh to drop that first thing and just say focused marketing materials on and then

1:43:16

that would give direction to whoever undertakes the task correct I think yeah if you drop if you drop the words the

1:43:22

city could um and then change Focus to focusing marketing materials on the following

1:43:31

okay commissioner batazzo see your hand

1:43:36

thank you I think I want to just make a comment about this particular piece and

1:43:42

the goals in general first of all I because I wasn't here in July I will take this opportunity to commend the

1:43:49

staff and all the people who have put this plan together this is a huge and Meaty plan it's the first time Mercer

1:43:55

Islanders actually had an economic development plan so just from my perspective I have to

1:44:02

say I think it's big and meaty and very ambitious I do also think there's some places

1:44:08

where uh the ambition

1:44:14

um might we might be overly defining it um or stretching some in some places and

1:44:20

debating some things that um might be better actually left to the

1:44:25

city getting their feet on the ground and growing into this role um I have some reluctance about this one

1:44:31

in the first place as defined I think we could probably function pretty well without it but if we did have it

1:44:37

um I actually I would propose just striking the last sentence entirely and eliminating any conversation about

1:44:43

marketing is I think it needs to be better fleshed out about how this city actually does marketing versus how other

1:44:51

organizations related to business do marketing um and I suppose

1:44:56

I would offer that I'm not sure we actually need 1.8 D

1:45:02

um I think a B and C are great but I'm I'm curious about whether or not D is really that it is important or integral

1:45:09

too given we have a lot of meat here so that's what I offer not attached but

1:45:16

end comment uh commissioner boatsman

1:45:22

that's a really interesting perspective and I I kind of do see the the great

1:45:28

ambition you know in this plan is it really necessary for an economic

1:45:34

Economic Development element to to start listing what sorts of things should be

1:45:39

in the marketing wouldn't that be something that would be appropriate for the people doing it to figure out at the

1:45:45

time so um maybe we could consider eliminating all the specifics just use the one first sentence in 1.8 and

1:45:51

eliminate the rest of it including 1.8 a through d to thought

1:45:58

um um after some certain discussion you know if if people seem interested I will propose that but

1:46:05

um okay um I'll self-recognize and then we'll get back to commissioner rashish since

1:46:11

he's already commented on this um I I'm not too concerned about over specifying the problem it's a could not

1:46:18

should or a must and it's a non-exclusive list it's just it's a suggestion

1:46:23

um I do like uh the inclusion of 1.8 D especially this high quality of life I mean part of that is safety and we're

1:46:30

seeing right now like a lot of businesses are departing um City centers like San Francisco

1:46:36

targets closing many stores uh because of that lack of one of those aspects of

1:46:43

high quality of life so I think highlighting it's fine um and I'm not concerned that we're over

1:46:48

prescribing it uh so that's my my personal input on this one uh commissioner rashish

1:46:57

I'm I'm a plus one on uh commissioner bataza's comments I think uh I I like

1:47:02

the Simplicity and I like the sentiment that we lead the uh

1:47:08

uh the work of promoting businesses to the organizations that know how to

1:47:13

promote businesses commissioner accuse

1:47:19

also a plus one um so I guess could I hand it back to

1:47:26

commissioner batazzo to Claire like restate her suggestion and then let's look to a thumbs up thumbs down on that

1:47:35

well there are two suggestions on the table mine is to strike the last sentence of 1.8 starting with the city

1:47:43

should and also strike 1.8 Point D commissioner boatsman suggested we

1:47:49

strike everything from the last sentence to 1.8 Point d

1:47:55

um in the interest of compromise I'll go with mine which is strike the last sentence and 1.8 Point D but

1:48:04

that's the one I'll propose okay so uh let's is there any opposition

1:48:09

to decoupling those oh uh commissioner Bozeman sorry let's hear you

1:48:16

I wondered about the word should versus could I mean okay so so

1:48:22

you're talking about deleting the second sentence entirely is that correct uh

1:48:28

from 1.8 is that right yeah I I think just eliminating the

1:48:33

conversation about marketing materials okay then then the the things 1.8 point

1:48:39

a through C that would remain they don't have an introduction so I just

1:48:45

grammatically it seems like something's missing there um would it be possible to say marketing

1:48:51

could could focus on 1.8 point a through C marketing could focus

1:48:58

I don't like the should of course but um I appreciate you pointing that out

1:49:04

because what I'm pointing to is the specification around marketing you're

1:49:09

right those substatements uh Focus that so I I'm recommending we strike the last

1:49:16

second sentence and strike those all and leave 1.8 as the first sentence as it stands okay so striking all of the

1:49:23

details 1.8 point a through D is that right correct oh okay all right I see uh

1:49:30

commissioner goals is itching to put a thumbs up so let's uh do a thumbs up thumbs down on revising 1.8 to just be

1:49:39

the first sentence and strike everything highlighted by Adam Zack thumbs up

1:49:46

um okay looks like unanimous so let's move on it's now one sentence

1:49:53

all right um and just as a recommendation uh for the

1:49:59

next time we get to one like that it might be easier to to make a motion earlier and then just

1:50:06

vote on it um just just as a as a recommendation for for speeding

1:50:12

some of these up too um that's another option um so the next uh the next policy where

1:50:19

we had um some deliberation needed was on policy 1.9

1:50:24

um and this was um looking at encouraging the planting of trees in the city's business

1:50:30

districts um there were a couple of comments here um commissioner boatsman you're

1:50:36

recognized okay um I am the second one there comment log number 68. I like the policy a lot I

1:50:43

just propose propose propose to move it to go for where there's a lot of other policies that have to do with climate

1:50:49

and sustainability

1:50:55

um and who is comment log number six okay

1:51:00

um yeah no I'm I like the the tree planting that you know I take staff's

1:51:06

point that it may not be entirely necessary and but I'm perfectly happy to pull this off and revisit it and undergo

1:51:12

four um okay I guess Carolyn already has a

1:51:17

proposal that's related to this would would anyone like to speak to whether we

1:51:23

have keep it in or not uh commissioner rashish

1:51:30

uh I think the last meeting I I expressed my opposition to this this in

1:51:35

particular and uh my opposition remains this is an economic development plan it's it's not a climate change plan

1:51:43

um is there any suggestion on or motion from the commission as to whether we

1:51:50

should debate keeping it in or moving it to four beforehand like which which

1:51:56

order should we oh sorry commissioner accused I see your

1:52:02

hand

1:52:08

uh you're on mute you think I'd be better at this I do

1:52:14

this every day um but I use a different platform just

1:52:19

um I I think we should discuss keeping it in or not for my

1:52:25

urban forestry studies and I stated this last time um you know there's just documentation that

1:52:31

people stay longer in business districts that have trees so I actually do see this as an economic development and I

1:52:37

understand we won't all agree on that so I think it would be good to just vote on whether we keep it in or not and if we

1:52:42

keep it in um my hunch is that people are fine with moving it to four

1:52:48

so I don't know if we should make that one motion or two motions uh commissioner boatsman

1:52:55

okay um I move that we remove this

1:53:00

uh proposed amendment from this location we know that it's already well that's

1:53:07

the motion I'll just leave it at that foreign

1:53:14

it just to get the discussion going

1:53:20

um for clarification Carolyn do you mean remove it to section four or do you mean

1:53:25

remove it entirely well I think it's in perfectly feasible to remove it here because it's already included in section

1:53:32

four as an I am using remove it here because we've got it in context in section four goal

1:53:40

four and it will be more reasonable to discuss its appropriateness in that context than to discuss it here okay

1:53:52

and um do I take role on this or does them

1:53:59

I would like clarification on what on there's been a couple of things that have been stated here so I'd like

1:54:05

clarification on what the motion is are we moving section 1.9 to a different

1:54:10

section no my motion is to delete this to delete 1.9

1:54:16

mm-hmm so seconded

1:54:24

okay I have a motion um by commissioner boatsman and the second by Vice chair again to remove

1:54:31

section 1.9 altogether

1:54:38

and one moment will I bring up my log

1:54:44

and taking a roll call vote commissioner accused aye commissioner batazzo

1:54:51

aye commissioner boatsman aye commissioner Rogue

1:54:57

aye commissioner gills aye and commissioner Rashid

1:55:04

all right thank you motion passes 6-0

1:55:11

and so the the next um oh I see there's a handout before I

1:55:16

move commissioner batazzo are you recognized just a quick clarification question what's the what's the

1:55:22

difference between our thumbs up movements edits and our emotions like

1:55:27

because I'm I feel confused uh I guess I'll State my understanding

1:55:33

of it is when we generally agree um

1:55:39

we'll do a thumbs up just to confirm um if we do discover we have

1:55:45

um no consensus then we'll discuss or do a formal vote um the history on this one was there was

1:55:51

some extended discussion in the July meeting plus uh Adam Zach encouraged uh emotion

1:55:59

earlier in the discussion so that that's my um

1:56:05

understanding thank you to put it into like a Robert's Rules

1:56:11

framework the thumbs up is a consensus we're seeking consensus whereas with

1:56:17

emotion we have to take a roll call vote um or we are taking a roll Club vote for

1:56:23

those motions yeah um the

1:56:28

the next policy with um that requires some deliberation is policy 1.10

1:56:35

um there was this was proposed by Kate accused um and I I put together a staff

1:56:40

alternative that um just refined some of the language a little bit so there's a 1.10 here at the top was originally

1:56:49

proposed in the comment and then 1.10 is the staff alternative um from that comment

1:56:55

uh commissioner accused you're recognized thank you um I'd like to make a motion

1:57:01

to accept the staff alternative I'll second that

1:57:18

oh my guess that would be Denver for roll call then um as a point of clarification in in the

1:57:27

past when we've had emotion it's open for discussion first and then we call the question  
yeah okay yes thank you

1:57:35

thank you um would anyone like to speak to the motion that's on the table

1:57:42

uh commissioner rashish I just I have a question so are we are

1:57:48

we voting on the inclusion of the motion or just which uh uh which version of

1:57:55

this we'll be discussing

1:58:01

was that we oh sorry no go ahead commissioner Hughes sorry no worries

1:58:08

my intent was basically to withdraw my comment and replace it with atoms and

1:58:14

that would be the one we discussed is there a general consensus to discuss

1:58:22

only the staff alternative um I guess commissioner boatsman I see a hand well I I presume  
that that Kate's

1:58:28

motion is to adopt some text and so I will speak to the text I think it's a

1:58:33

very exciting idea and um uh uh uh in

1:58:39

all of its pieces and I like the wording on this one's better so I'm in favor of both the concept and the wording which I

1:58:46

think are combined in one motion would anyone else like to speak to the

1:58:54

emotion um

1:58:59

is that a thumbs up commissioner goals to speak or to the motion

1:59:05

okay so recognized you're not to speak I'm I'm in favor I'm

1:59:11

voting oh understood understood um I'll I'll give some of my thoughts on

1:59:17

this I mean this seems to be a a Hot Topic a developing topic right now I'm not aware of a lot of the details behind

1:59:25

it um my concern with moving City Hall facilities to Town Center or even you

1:59:32

know mandating that we study it this is a short-term thing like this is presumably going to be resolved within a

1:59:37

year this is a document that's going to guide the city for what the next eight years until it's touched

1:59:43

um this seems like we're getting a little too specific um this like I don't know is this even

1:59:49

going to be approved and fully vetted through Council by the time they start

1:59:55

deciding what to do I think this is my I'm I'm against this one I just think

2:00:01

it's too specific and too short term for a comprehensive plan uh goal

2:00:07

um commissioner accused thank you um the thinking behind this

2:00:15

was that we've been talking a lot about the need for more economic and

2:00:22

Commercial activity and it it's we don't have that much land and and my my

2:00:29

analysis of land uses you know Mercer Island has one of the lowest amounts of

2:00:35

commercially zoned land um available of all the cities of our size and I do

2:00:41

um I do think uh some of our mixed use zoning is creating challenges for retail so I think we should optimize use of our

2:00:48

commercial zones where they are um I also understand and and watch the

2:00:54

process of trying to do a public-private partnership on the Tully's property it was a lot of time a lot of money and it

2:01:01

failed um I think that having moving police downtown when the

2:01:08

light rail comes in is a good idea for safety and that was uh one of the primary considerations both we're

2:01:15

sitting on this plot of land and not doing anything with it and so many concerns have been expressed about

2:01:21

Public Safety it seemed like a a win-win and I'm sure there will be tons of

2:01:28

public debate about it so I I kind of like the idea of not making a decision ourselves but putting in front of the

2:01:33

public for debate um okay commissioner Bozeman

2:01:45

and it's true this is going to be something that's going to come to a head within a short time so um is it

2:01:51

appropriate chair or vice chair for me to ask a staff a question in the middle of a uh uh emotion that's being debated

2:01:59

I'm not aware of I'm not aware of any rule against it okay I wanted to to ask

2:02:06

staff I mean this does seem like rather an Oddball you know thing to put in a

2:02:14

long-term Economic Development element um can staff give me a thought about

2:02:20

that is this a little bit unusual

2:02:25

um I It's Not Unusual I don't think um yeah I think that it is a little

2:02:31

tricky we don't know exactly when or if or how the city is going to address the

2:02:37

city hall question okay I think if there are

2:02:43

if if you're if you want to move forward with a policy like this one way that you could soften it is change City Hall

2:02:49

facilities to city services and then that would that would include like if we

2:02:54

were just to do like a police station instead of a full City Hall um something like that

2:03:00

um broadening it out a little bit more might make it so that the time Horizon is is less important but you still get

2:03:06

the same idea okay well thank you adding on to that I also just wanted to say I

2:03:11

mean the city is one of the largest employers in Mercer Island and so if we

2:03:16

were to relocate a facility to Town Center you know it could represent a significant number of the Island's

2:03:23

employees you know being closer to businesses restaurants Etc so I mean I

2:03:29

think that might really be the link to Economic Development yeah so okay thank you very much for

2:03:35

that perspective and myself my second uh remains and I would like to leave it

2:03:40

both you know saying City Hall facilities because to me that's that's the real um Power of it is the whole

2:03:46

thing move the whole thing to Town Center thanks anyone else wishing to speak to it

2:03:56

um okay I I would like to speak to it um especially given the the most recent comment about moving all of City Hall I

2:04:03

did some rough math on this that plot is a triangular 12 200 square foot lot uh

2:04:09

City Hall currently sits on a hundred and eighty thousand square foot lot the building has 35

2:04:14

000 square feet of space and 100 parking spots um rough math there assuming we don't

2:04:20

lose any usable area of that building because it's a triangle um with 100 lot coverage we're looking

2:04:26

at a three-story building just for the office space 100 parking spots without ramps or paths between those spots would

2:04:34

be another three stories so to maintain the current capabilities of physical

2:04:39

size of City Hall and move it to that lot we would require a at absolute best

2:04:45

a six-story triangular building with three three levels of parking and three levels of office space and that I don't

2:04:54

even know if we're able to build that High let alone these assumptions would probably add another story or two so I'm

2:05:01

I plan to vote against this motion but I do like commissioner accuses suggestion to study the feasibility of moving

2:05:08

Police Services um to that Tully's property and I see that has sparked some more follow-on

2:05:13

discussions so uh commissioner batazzo uh thank you

2:05:18

um I think I want to acknowledge in the conversation and the points made about how this particular recommendation fits

2:05:24

into the economic development plan um it's potentially to move more people

2:05:30

toward Town Center um it sounds like a great idea and I am

2:05:35

curious about how the people around City Hall would feel about that I'd love to hear from them and putting it to public

2:05:41

comment would make sense um I did notice that staffs change um says to study the feasibility of

2:05:48

relocating the facilities to Town Center without specifying the Tully's property so while I recognize that there's a

2:05:55

debate about the property if we're studying Town Center generally it seems

2:06:01

like the results of a general study to move City Hall facilities could be

2:06:06

useful even if we don't end up doing it so I do want to acknowledge those

2:06:12

considerations uh commissioner goals then boatsman

2:06:20

oh okay we wonder if the idea of taking Hall out of the things this says locating City facilities the Town Center

2:06:27

might you know also you know create a little more flexibility so um so we both have flexibility as to

2:06:33

place and also as what exactly we're moving and at that point it also you know

2:06:38

creates a longer time frame potentially to know to address what I think is your legitimate concern

2:06:44

uh Vice chair for the uh speed at which the city hall decision will be made

2:06:49

uh commissioner boatsman

2:06:56

we weren't this former Tally's he's pretty it's just Town Center so okay thank

2:07:05

you I'm seeing no other hands I'll speak to it yeah that's a that's a good point I missed that and I think I could

2:07:11

get behind yeah studying real studying the feasibility of relocating City facilities uh to Town

2:07:19

Center um so should we vote on the city hall facilities town center or is would there

2:07:26

be a consensus on amending it um we have that current motion for

2:07:32

accepting 110 as written by staff commissioner accuse

2:07:40

yeah my understanding is we need to process that motion before doing anything else so it seems that we need a

2:07:46

vote I'm not planning on withdrawing the motion yeah so just a as a clarification sorry on

2:07:54

procedure so uh commissioner accuses correct um you you have to resolve the the

2:08:00

motion you anyone can propose a friendly Amendment if you wanted to propose an

2:08:06

amendment to the motion prior to the vote so if if you wanted to or if Kate

2:08:11

wanted to amend the motion and Carolyn was okay with it we could amend the motion but as it stands right now it

2:08:18

would be to go with this highlighted um staff alternative for 1.10 and then

2:08:25

we could amend it with a second motion if we want

2:08:36

so at this point Adam you could ask Deb to call the roll okay sorry yeah sorry okay

2:08:41

um I guess yeah Deb could you please call the roll

2:08:51

commissioner accused aye commissioner boatsman

2:08:58

aye Vice chair riggin hi commissioner gills

2:09:06

commissioner batazzo aye and commissioner Rashid

2:09:12

aye motion passes 6-0 and and another clarification sorry as

2:09:19

we were discussing that um as we were discussing that motion correct me if I'm wrong Kate but uh or

2:09:26

commissioner accused um but the motion was just whether which of these two options to go with it wasn't to include

2:09:33

1.10 is that correct um it I I intended to include 1.10 but I

2:09:41

think we split it and so I'd like to make another motion to accept the city alternative okay thank you has written

2:09:50

I'd like to I'd like to clarify the motion that I have that I recorded that was originally made by commissioner keys

2:09:57

and seconded by boatsman was to extend accept the staff alternative to section 1.10

2:10:05

yeah that's what I seconded okay did anyone believe they were only voting

2:10:13

on the text um or I think we're okay

2:10:19

sorry just just coming back a little rusty on my end thanks thanks for

2:10:25

clarifying that so we just voted to accept one one point

2:10:32

one zero okay so I I misunderstood I thought we

2:10:38

were voting to accept the staff recommendation so my vote is a nay on that

2:10:49

so is that a correction of the record Deb what's our Roberts rules procedure here

2:10:55

well I'm I'm a big believer in I am comfortable with changing the vote

2:11:02

to 5-1 it was a misunderstanding um this is why it's important to restate

2:11:08

the motion before we actually vote and I should have done that for you all

2:11:13

um so I'm quite comfortable with just changing the vote to five one uh rather than getting hung up on

2:11:21

process and procedure and Robert's rules for the sake of reference rules

2:11:28

is there a consensus on amending the record to five one

2:11:36

it is a 5-1 vote I mean he okay he gray yeah okay

2:11:42

um commissioner goals I said I'm still confused though because I do think it was in favor of the staff alternative

2:11:47

but it is to you know so the staff alternative is what we voted on and it was acceptance

2:11:53

to of the second 110. staff alternative and if that's five one that's five one

2:11:59

great

2:12:04

um back to back to Adam Zach I guess okay um so let's see there's

2:12:13

um there was like comments um under goal two

2:12:19

um to change the orders of goals two and three so that um well let me make sure that that

2:12:24

wasn't one that we've has been sent since been withdrawn it hasn't no it's still there

2:12:30

um and and you know I mean from my point of view we say that existing business is the Cornerstone kind of makes sense for

2:12:36

me to that that would be gold too and then new business would be goal three but yeah I don't think it's a big deal I

2:12:42

don't think you know if there's any concern that we should just keep it as it is that's fine too  
it's just you know mentioned

2:12:49

uh commissioner batazzo thank you uh before we move on

2:12:54

um I think there was a lack of clarity at least for me on uh we were going to accept the open  
motion to accept 1.1 as

2:13:01

as is and then potentially propose a second motion to edit 1.10 to eliminate

2:13:08

Hall in City Hall facilities did we close out that conversation or do

2:13:14

we need to finish that conversation I'm I'm happy to propose that motion if

2:13:19

someone wishes to Second so so so moved I'll I'm I moved to strike Hall from uh

2:13:26

the just um just accepted uh staff version of 1.10

2:13:37

one second okay we've got a second um commissioner Hughes

2:13:47

doing would weaken the tie to the economic element

2:13:52

um I think our two highest employers are the city and the school district

2:13:58

and moving all those city employees to a place where they can engage with local

2:14:04

businesses more um that was one of the key factors for me in proposing this idea was bringing

2:14:12

our largest Workforce downtown to shop and then also having more police

2:14:18

presence downtown

2:14:23

oh sorry continue were you are you okay commissioner boatsman now the way

2:14:30

it's worded now is is quite um uh there's some flexibility in it when

2:14:36

you say City Hall facilities you know it doesn't mean that absolutely every part of City Hall would be there

2:14:43

um but if you say City facilities that's quite weak that that might not mean very

2:14:49

much at all might get moved there so I I prefer the wording that we have

2:14:54

um I think the power in the idea is that it brings a good chunk of what goes on

2:14:59

at City Hall to the town center commissioner goals yeah for me it's a

2:15:07

high level planning document I'd like to believe the flexibility of those I don't see it any weaker because you know sure

2:15:12

we'd love to bring as much down as we can I'd like to leave open the possibility that there's like the Tully

2:15:17

space a smaller space that there's a good fit for some city facility and not have that foreclosed as an option

2:15:23

because it's City Hall robust I mean I take your point uh Carolyn that one could read it more broadly but I don't

2:15:30

see any reason to constrain it um you know at the same mess is that we want more

2:15:36

um you know what people will be around and people can make the case that you know the more people you bring downtown the more impact they'll have on the on

2:15:42

the local economy

2:15:47

is there any more discussion on the motion

2:15:58

okay I guess uh with that I'll turn it to them for a roll call

2:16:04

okay to restate the motion I have a motion by commissioner rigid and the

2:16:09

second seconded by commissioner Rashid to strike the word Hall from the staff

2:16:14

alternative to 1.10 uh clarification I did not second that

2:16:21

commissioner goals oh I'm sorry your voices sound very similar

2:16:28

on the meeting okay so our vote commissioner vanitazo

2:16:36

I commissioner gills I

2:16:42

Vice chair rigam aye

2:16:48

commissioner Hughes May

2:16:54

commissioner boatsman nay and commissioner Rasheed no

2:17:03

well the vote fails it's uh three three

2:17:14

I guess back to Adam okay um all right so we had started to get

2:17:21

into this one um but there was a proposal to move goal two to switch the order of goals two and

2:17:27

three um and this was proposed by commissioner gels with his clarification that this is

2:17:36

a take or leave I suppose um so that's the the next comment there

2:17:48

is I I think we can we can look for consensus to make the make the change and swap the

2:17:55

two goals two and three um or um

2:18:01

yeah consensus might be the easier part uh commissioner batazzo

2:18:07

um I I suppose I don't know that the moving of the goals

2:18:12

will actually change how the city or staff or people actually implement the plan in the future and so

2:18:19

to the extent that we're really trying to put something together that supports folks I'm not sure that the goals are

2:18:25

ranked in priority order per se and um that's all I want to comment about

2:18:31

commissioner boatsman I haven't really uh carefully examined

2:18:36

whether the changing of these two goals the order will cause any confusion sometimes when you write a plan you know

2:18:43

you put in a goal and you put certain things in it and there's an understanding that okay there's people

2:18:49

have been you know um provided with information about this topic and then we'll segue into the next topic it's

2:18:55

possible that by switching them around something will be missing so I'm a little nervous about changing if it's not important so I would be not in favor

2:19:02

of changing the order right well that's it seems like it dies for the lack of emotion so let's move on

2:19:10

is does anyone want to make a motion to change the order just just to confirm

2:19:17

okay um then I'll say commissioner goals evaluation is correct um there's no motion to support seven or

2:19:23

ten on

2:19:28

the next comment is on policy 2.1 um there was a proposal just so you know

2:19:36

I withdrew that one so thank you yeah oh it wasn't picked up it wasn't picked up in the uh in the draft but I was through

2:19:43

that okay great um so let's see here then the next one

2:19:49

would be on policy 2.4 um oh sorry on 2.2

2:19:54

[Music] um and yeah the proposed changes are

2:20:00

amendments to 2.2.b and 2.2.c

2:20:12

is there a motion to reverse the order of BNC uh commissioner boatsman

2:20:19

I was just gonna ask that the only change here is just changing the order of these two things right is that it that's all it is

2:20:26

okay yeah I guess I just don't think it's that important to do that I'm I don't read things as being

2:20:33

you know it's more important because it was set first so

2:20:39

any emotions anyone else wishing to speak

2:20:45

okay um no motions or speaking more speaking on 39 so let's move on without action

2:20:51

okay does it remain the same or does it remain the way it's uh under struck out and underlined here if we don't do

2:20:57

anything oh yeah I think it's we can we should just see if there's if anyone

2:21:03

would block consensus to making the changes proposed oh so okay so we're

2:21:08

being asked if we want to block consensus as to the way it's already been changed is is there a consensus

2:21:14

around making the change as proposed I believe I pulled this one this might have actually been one of the simple

2:21:20

amendments okay I I frankly don't care it's all right didn't bother me okay

2:21:26

um let's see keeping track here I think that's it for

2:21:32

the substantive deliberation comments under um policy or goal two

2:21:40

um there was one other Simple Text Amendment yeah I

2:21:47

I would like oh um I guess I would like to discuss uh I think it was

2:21:54

I thought we I thought there was a comment on policy 2.4

2:21:59

there is yeah I think that's just a simple text Amendment there um

2:22:04

so that would be one that we could address in October it's changing young adults to people

2:22:11

ah okay sorry I was looking at a different one I was looking at log number nine so okay no I  
yeah

2:22:18

um is there a consensus to accept uh 2 4 as drafted by by staff

2:22:25

the so the change from young adults to people uh commissioner boatsman okay my

2:22:30

understanding is that if in The Matrix staff has highlighted a change as being one of these  
simple amendments we've

2:22:37

already decided we're going to talk about those things in October so my request would be  
to honor that and just

2:22:43

not talk about 2.4 right now okay yeah I was I was just raising the

2:22:51

issue because I thought log number nine the comment from commissioner goles was

2:22:56

a deliberation and Direction needed um comment but that's not 2.4 Oak I

2:23:03

thought it was maybe I'm looking at this the 713 version so I'm I'm out of order okay

2:23:09

oh yeah okay sorry nope um back to back to Adam Zach I think you're right

2:23:15

actually you know that uh hadn't I've forgotten about that yeah but you know I

2:23:21

I guess 2.4 that I had proposed is this it makes sense to talk about trying to

2:23:26

encourage opportunities for bipod Community or perhaps something but I'll just withdraw that just

2:23:32

feel like it's going to be too complicated for us to uh to take on we have enough other things to do

2:23:39

but I think I don't think you're making it up Adam I think it was there wasn't there there

2:23:46

um and I I think there's a similar policy proposed under goal four when we get there too so we've kind of still

2:23:52

discussed that um great um let's see here

2:23:58

um that's a simple Amendment um

2:24:06

let's see the next uh substantive comments were on policy 3.5

2:24:14

um there was a a simple text Amendment and then comment log number 40 proposed

2:24:19

uh possibly adding to this this policy here

2:24:27

uh commissioner pitazzo thank you um I want to propose

2:24:33

a motion to strike this um I think it gets a bit granular again about marketing and the specificity

2:24:40

about how and why regarding marketing and marketing on Transit Transit actually

2:24:47

determines how marketing gets made on their buses it's not something we do in our comp plans

2:24:53

um so I want to propose striking this second second yeah we're talking about

2:25:01

3.5 or 3.4 3.5 okay

2:25:07

so we have a motion from commissioner batazzo seconded by boatsman uh

2:25:13

commissioner goals would you like to speak oh no that's okay okay

2:25:20

um I'll I'll speak to that motion I would generally uh agree with it um yeah it seems like over specifying

2:25:26

things would anyone else like to speak to that

2:25:33

motion okay um Deb could you please take a role

2:25:42

permission to received okay can you repeat the could we repeat

2:25:48

the motion please yes thank you it's a motion to Emotion

2:25:54

by commissioner vitazo seconded by commissioner votesman to strike section 3.5

2:26:03

and commissioner Rashid aye um commissioner gills I commissioner

2:26:10

batazzo I commissioner accuse aye commissioner boatsman

2:26:17

aye and vice chair again aye thank you

2:26:26

um Adam and don't don't wait for me just okay just shame shame in please great

2:26:33

um well we're moving we're Trucking along this is good um so the next uh substitute is a

2:26:39

proposed new policy 3.7 um as shown here

2:26:52

uh commissioner goals yeah no I I think I there's two parts to this I wanted to add something this is

2:26:59

under you know trying to help existing businesses Thrive to notify businesses of any potential Redevelopment and then

2:27:06

once doing that I thought it'd sit better here than under goal four where they had this first sentence identifying

2:27:12

adopt method is to reduce displacement so it's taking the old 4.4 and adding

2:27:18

the second sentence to it and moving it all to to goal three um you know and if we wanted people like

2:27:24

it better on both or fine and and substantially the only thing I wanted to add is the notification businesses of

2:27:29

any potential Redevelopment

2:27:37

commissioner batazzo uh I have a question for staff

2:27:42

um are aren't doesn't the city already perform standard notifications for

2:27:50

development or Redevelopment for properties uh yes

2:27:56

um the only difference the only difference is under the under the code you're only

2:28:02

required to notify Property Owners within a certain radius

2:28:07

of the development and so this is a little more General wording than what's in the code

2:28:15

so the city follows current code which is only notifying Property Owners but not necessarily tenants or for example

2:28:23

tenants in the commercial District correct there isn't a requirement in the code that that the tenants be notified

2:28:29

there is or is not I'm sorry is not thank you

2:28:35

commissioner rashish

2:28:40

and just a follow-up question what's the notification mechanism currently

2:28:46

uh currently it depends on the type of development that's proposed but you

2:28:53

usually it's a notice of application gets published in in our weekly permit

2:28:59

bulletin and then also posted on the site there's a sign posted on site and

2:29:05

notice is mailed to those property owners that's usually what what the

2:29:11

notification is required

2:29:19

um commissioner boatsman I I want to ask staff um what kind of

2:29:24

measures could be adopted and implemented to reduce displacement of

2:29:30

existing businesses so like for example let's say a business is coming in a new business

2:29:36

and it's got some overlap with an existing business so there's some considerable competition and maybe the

2:29:42

new business you know might attract more business and then you know we're trying to make sure

2:29:49

that the existing business doesn't go out of business I mean it makes me wonder what what this is

2:29:55

really about here is there is there more to it than that there must be there is so this policy has proposed um specifies

2:30:02

that we're we're seeking to reduce this displacement as new development occurs so so what that's really referring to is

2:30:10

like you have an existing business in a space and then the owner of that space

2:30:15

sells to someone else and they're going to redevelop it with apartment buildings or something oh I see or a mixed-use

2:30:21

development and you know during that nine months that they're constructing the building the business might get

2:30:27

displaced through that so we'd be looking at measures to address that rather than like your business is losing

2:30:34

business okay okay thanks a lot um I guess I see no hands I'd like to

2:30:41

I'd kind of where how would the what would those measures be would the city foot the bill to host the business would

2:30:48

they make sure that in the new building the they subsidized the the rent to make sure that the the

2:30:56

business is not priced out like that that starts sounding to me like where uh gonna

2:31:02

inject money um from the city there am I interpreting that incorrectly

2:31:08

um in all likelihood it wouldn't be that kind of direct subsidy um sometimes anti-displacement measures

2:31:15

are like you require as as part of the um development that they that the

2:31:21

developer um in some way um provide compensation for the displacement of that business those

2:31:29

kinds of measures or it could be um you know that that kind of incentive

2:31:34

rather or requirement rather than like we're the city would be paying for

2:31:40

accommodating that business somewhere else so there's there's a number of different measures that we could go through

2:31:47

um and we could identify those under this policy yeah okay thank you for the

2:31:52

clarification commissioner goals

2:32:02

you're on mute if you're speaking

2:32:10

appreciate the further information and you know as uh has Adam sack was

2:32:17

explaining it occurs to me that the word adopt may be stronger than would want if we keep what is now Four Points what was

2:32:23

4.4 what I've suggested Politico 3.7 and just say identify and consider measures

2:32:28

to reduce displacement of existing build businesses as new development occurs rather than adopt which you know does

2:32:35

create the the concern that the city is you know on the hook for something

2:32:44

um so commissioner gels did you make the original motion on

2:32:49

um

2:32:55

and so I guess I would be something willing to move to uh adopt the existing

2:33:01

text where it is um change and change the word adopt uh

2:33:07

in 3.7 to consider I'll second that

2:33:14

okay we have a motion from commissioner goals seconded by commissioner boatsman

2:33:19

um I see uh commissioner batazzo oh I don't want to extend too much

2:33:27

debate but I think I see the point of what we're trying to do here if it's hey

2:33:33

we want to retain existing businesses um and to the extent that the con the

2:33:38

city can do its part to encourage retention to to reduce displacement

2:33:45

um and to make sure that businesses are aware before the boards go up on the Block that something's getting

2:33:51

redeveloped I I am supportive of all that I think we're trying to find the right language to identify and consider

2:33:58

is to just say hey I looked at it I considered it but it doesn't quite go

2:34:05

go to and then we implemented something I would encourage more of implementation

2:34:11

language there but I also don't want to get it hung up all night on it so I just wanted to say that for the record and

2:34:16

then we can decide from there commissioner rashish

2:34:25

uh muted in the in the interest of brevity

2:34:31

um plus one to a commissioner but also just said uh I like it as written

2:34:40

any more comments on the motion

2:34:45

okay I'll hand it off to Deb then for roll so to confirm I have a motion by

2:34:53

commissioner Gales seconded by commissioner boatsman to approve section 3.7 and change the word adopt to

2:35:00

consider uh commissioner batazzo

2:35:08

thanks before we go because we because we coupled those two

2:35:14

um to move it and make an make a modification if we move and make

2:35:21

a modification I'm going to have to vote no because I don't agree with the modification if we vote on the move

2:35:28

uh I'm okay with that but I'm not okay with the modification so I just want to make that clarification before we make

2:35:34

that vote so procedurally we would vote on the

2:35:41

motion at hand which has the modification and then

2:35:47

if that doesn't pass then commissioner batazzo or someone could make the motion

2:35:52

to accept as written am I correct there yes okay uh commissioner goals

2:36:01

fine with that procedure I mean you know it just seemed like we're just trying to decide if we do adopt or consider and

2:36:06

frankly I don't care so

2:36:11

it might be faster if we amend the motion than to keep adopt and remove

2:36:18

consider just to get it in one vote Carol are you okay with that

2:36:24

uh I'm not quite sure are we talking about an amendment to the motion then is that what we're talking and what is the

2:36:30

amendment to the motion yes to the amendment would be uh take 3.7 as written that use the word

2:36:39

adopt instead of consider and move it to this and you know it's really that in

2:36:45

other words the motion is the way it was originally written correct so I'm being

2:36:51

asked if I want to second the motion to the way it was originally written is that correct correct you would have to

2:36:57

I'm sorry but if we're going to do this procedure I mean correctly you can either

2:37:05

take a vote on the original motion or commissioner Gales and commissioner

2:37:10

votesman can agree to withdraw their emotion and then the motion can be restated

2:37:17

okay so what is the original motion at this point the original motion that I have is

2:37:24

to approve six section 3.7 and change the words adopt or the word adopt to

2:37:30

consider okay I'm ready to vote on that

2:37:38

okay so again motion by by commissioner gel seconded by votes going to approve

2:37:45

section 3.7 and change the word adopt to consider

2:37:53

commissioner accuse nay

2:37:58

commissioner boltzman aye commissioner vitazo

2:38:04

nay commissioner gills

2:38:09

I'll say nay commissioner Rashid

2:38:15

name I think and vice chair Vega

2:38:20

I doesn't matter okay the vote is uh 4-3 uh against

2:38:28

so four two or two or two excuse me yeah

2:38:37

uh commissioner boatsman sorry yes I move that we adopt 3.7 and delete the

2:38:43

words and adopt

2:38:49

so seconded

2:38:56

um old hand commissioner boatsman oh yes all right um anyone wish to speak on

2:39:02

that motion

2:39:07

um hearing nothing I'll hand it back to Deb oh sorry commissioner accused I see a

2:39:14

hand I feel like this is the same thing we just voted on it's it's a nuance

2:39:21

that's basically weakening the statement and at least in my opinion I voted that

2:39:27

because I want to keep it as is adopt and I don't I'm not really saying I mean it I'll just shut up okay so

2:39:35

commissioner batazzo I agree with Kate's interpretation I I

2:39:40

was recommending we just keep the language and put it out to the public for debate so I do I did recommend

2:39:46

identify and adopt measures

2:39:52

uh uh in the

2:39:59

in the interest of time all all may I withdraw my second

2:40:04

and I will withdraw my motion okay motion withdrawn

2:40:10

uh commissioner accused I see a hand

2:40:16

are we looking for a motion to hold okay are we looking for a motion to

2:40:23

um except as written I will propose a motion to accept as

2:40:28

written okay 3.7 has written second all right

2:40:34

um anyone wish to speak okay uh handing back to Deb

2:40:42

T we have a motion by commissioner Q second of a commissioner rashes is that correct

2:40:48

to approve section 3.7 as written

2:41:01

okay commissioner gels

2:41:07

commissioner batazzo I commissioner Rashid

2:41:13

I'm commissioner boatsman aye commissioner Hughes

2:41:20

I and vice chair radio I motion approved all right I do want to

2:41:28

say it is 8 41 I know we were talking about um continuing till 9 30 and then

2:41:35

deciding whether to stop or actually stopping um but in the in the past I think

2:41:41

um our chair has called a Break um would anyone any quick thoughts on

2:41:48

taking a 10 minute break or a five minute break or just powering through commissioner  
boatsman

2:41:54

feel free to go right to 9 30 myself

2:42:00

anyone I second that preference all right anyone opposed to just continuing for until 9 30.  
all right

2:42:07

let's go all right let's keep rolling we're making good progress here um so the next uh the  
next comments uh

2:42:15

policy 4.2 proposed in Comet log number 14 that would add a new policy balance

2:42:22

economic growth with maintaining easy access to services and small town feel

2:42:28

yeah so I guess for me and there's a lot in this plan you know it was obviously worked up  
with some recognition that

2:42:34

perhaps the city hasn't done all that good for business but I do feel for a lot of people who  
live on the island you

2:42:40

know having the you know commercial uh Zone be as robust as possible is it

2:42:45

necessarily Optimum and that it's something nice about you know the city not becoming you know Bellevue or even

2:42:52

Kirkland in terms of or Tukwila in terms of how it feels and you know I guess I'd

2:42:57

like to have something in there that recognizes that um so that's why I suggested that to at

2:43:03

least be some mention that it's all not about grow grow

2:43:13

uh commissioner accuse I'm wondering if this is something that

2:43:20

we should put in the parking lot um only because

2:43:27

without opening a huge can of worms I hope the state is mandating us to grow and we

2:43:34

can debate that until the cows come home when we when we talk about the housing element

2:43:39

um but I don't feel like we can have a conversation about growth

2:43:46

that is complete without going through that housing discussion

2:43:52

and I know that there's strong public opinion on this um and and that's part of the reason I

2:43:58

think it's important let's not tackle this one piece of

2:44:03

piece of it commissioner rashish

2:44:12

I'll say that um generally I am supportive of the

2:44:17

sentiment I'm a little bit concerned as to how this is written and worded

2:44:23

um small town feel is something that is very Broad and widely open to interpretation

2:44:30

so I'm not quite sure what that means I think to Kate's point it it at best it's

2:44:35

a lengthy discussion um but it's also a little bit of an ink

2:44:41

plot test I didn't hear it's a little bit of a

2:44:47

what sorry ink plot test okay

2:44:52

understood open to interpretation yep uh commissioner batazzo

2:45:02

thank you um I I want to acknowledge the sentiment I think there's a place for the

2:45:09

acknowledgment I'm not sure that it's here um if we do I I would recommend we move

2:45:18

this to a parking lot and find a way to have this conversation and incorporate it someplace without necessarily making

2:45:25

incorporating it in the policy or goal given that we are living in the tension

2:45:30

between how do we maintain my interpretation a lot of those high quality quality of life elements we talk

2:45:37

about are what contribute to this small town feel but I think we need to flesh that out more

2:45:44

um you know I'm inclined to make

2:45:50

a motion to move this to a parking lot and strike it from

2:45:55

the text here um I have a I'll speak

2:46:03

um with a actually a clarification question to staff on one of on one of

2:46:08

commissioner q's's comments where were mandated to grow are we mandated to

2:46:14

grow or are we mandated to accommodate the growth if desired

2:46:21

um can I I would love to answer that question but I think first commissioner batazzo had made a motion and so oh okay

2:46:30

sorry as a second for that motion I'll second it sorry

2:46:36

correct yeah striking it from the the motion as I understood it was to strike

2:46:43

this policy but keep it in the parking lot oh no I didn't want to second that I want to leave the policy here but I

2:46:49

wanted to put in the parking lot to discuss it later so I'm sorry I don't want to second that  
yeah

2:46:55

wait can I'm sorry uh commission commissioner Hughes

2:47:00

um now I'm completely confused I thought the motion was to just put it in the

2:47:06

parking lot for now yeah am I mistaken okay

2:47:12

no I did recommend we strike it from the text here and acknowledging it's a bit

2:47:19

it's an important component we move the conversation to the parking lot I do see a hand  
from Deb I want to get

2:47:26

her procedural input um first of all I'd like to get

2:47:31

clarification on exactly what the motion is what I heard commissioner potasso say is I'm  
inclined to make I'm inclined to

2:47:38

make emotion which is different than making emotion thank you um and so I was

2:47:44

going to ask if she was indeed putting emotion on the floor so

2:47:49

it sounds like that's the direction that that's where we want to be is we want a motion so

2:47:56

correct me if I'm wrong commissioner but Tazo thank you Deb for asking that the reason

2:48:02

I use the word incline is to make sure my fellow Commissioners understood that

2:48:08

I'm inclined to vote no on this but I think it's important I'm not ready to

2:48:13

make a motion but I feel fairly strongly about this so I'm not making a motion yet but I am signaling to my fellow

2:48:20

Commissioners that I am not inclined to keep this statement in at this time

2:48:27

um in light of their not being emotion could I um reiterate my question to commissioner or

2:48:34

sorry senior planner Adam Zach please yes yeah

2:48:40

yeah so your question was does the state law require us to accept a certain

2:48:45

amount of growth or do we have to plan to accommodate the growth should we

2:48:51

choose to accept growth right is that a fair no no I was saying I guess I was

2:48:56

saying like do we have to grow just to grow or do we have to accommodate growth

2:49:02

if if someone if you know a developer comes and says we want to

2:49:08

build like I heard the comment as this is how much we have to grow by

2:49:14

this year not but I my unders I I thought the interpretation was we have

2:49:21

to support next we we have to support it up

2:49:26

to this level if desired so I guess I'd look for some clarification sure there

2:49:32

are a couple of things there so we are required to accommodate our projected

2:49:37

share of Housing and and employment growth under the growth management act the city is required to accommodate

2:49:45

a housing Target and an employment Target in a 20-year time period that

2:49:51

housing Target and the employment Target are based on the uh population forecast

2:49:57

that the office of financial management prepares and then those that and that's

2:50:03

like our population forecasts and then that goes to the to the county and the county determines through its

2:50:10

process how much housing and employment each City needs to accommodate in its

2:50:15

comprehensive plan for the 20-year period those are not things we don't we don't

2:50:21

get to decide whether or not we are going to accept some amount of growth that growth is something that we have to

2:50:28

accommodate um under the growth management Act um so it's it's not an if desired it's a

2:50:36

thing it's we have to accommodate the growth that's allocated to us through that process the

2:50:43

the state and County process and there's some new teeth to it with

2:50:49

this comp plan update in that in five years we will need to show how much housing has been produced and we need to

2:50:56

be on track to achieve those targets and if we're not on track we may be subject

2:51:01

to reasonable measures which is you know the state will be looking at us to make

2:51:07

some changes so that we can get back on track uh point of order Vice chair earlier

2:51:13

tonight we made and passed a motion that we were going to discuss

2:51:18

housing components I feel like we're really getting into into this now and I'd like to put this in the parking lot

2:51:24

in honor of the agreement we made at the beginning of the meeting it's an important topic and we don't

2:51:30

have time to do this topic and the rest of the things that are on our list tonight okay is would that be a motion

2:51:38

to park it

2:51:44

turn in line as was making a point of order no un understood um

2:51:50

I think that's a good point um I'd be happy to make a motion to park it if that's what's appropriate right

2:51:56

now okay I'll make a motion I'd like to make a motion to parking lot this comment but not delete it from the text

2:52:03

second second part okay great yep

2:52:12

um [Music] anyone want to discuss this motion

2:52:21

um can we all get uh credit for the second anyway I'll hand it off to them yeah

2:52:30

okay um to clarify the motion was made by commissioner cues seconded by

2:52:36

commissioner votesman to parking lot or put in the parking lot

2:52:42

comment 4.2 is that accurate I think it's Comet log 14 on

2:52:49

item comment log14 thank you on policy 4.2 yeah

2:52:58

that's helpful thank you Adam yeah that's that's what I understood I'm seconding is to just take comment 4.2

2:53:06

or policy 4.2 and put in the parking lot okay I'm going to restate this so that

2:53:12

we're all in agreement it's a motion to parking lot or put in the parking lot

2:53:20

parking lot comment log for number 14 on policy 4.2

2:53:29

can't keep it in the text was my understand what I heard it's an emotion

2:53:35

I'm sorry commissioner boatsman commissioner accused you would be the one who would need to clarify your motion it's your motion sorry

2:53:44

my motion is to table maybe I stated in a correctly table

2:53:49

debate on this which which would inherently mean we're not doing anything with the text right now that was my

2:53:55

intent

2:54:00

then so your motion is to table debate on

2:54:06

parking lot comment on excuse me on comment log number 14.

2:54:15

yes table debate and move comment log number 14 to the parking lot

2:54:31

commissioner boatsman are you second in that well may I ask a question

2:54:39

remind me to second on it before you can debate it so second I'll second it yeah

2:54:44

okay okay uh sorry commissioner boatsman

2:54:52

like to just say that we're in the case that we do we have a

2:54:59

proposed uh policy included and I think what

2:55:04

we're doing is we're putting the proposed policy in the parking lot not the comment but the

2:55:10

proposed policy as as written so that's what I would suggest that the motion B

2:55:15

uh um so I guess I'm I would propose an amendment to the motion

2:55:22

can I propose an amendment to something I seconded a friendly Amendment

2:55:33

yes you can propose a friendly Amendment from the amendment I propose that the

2:55:39

motion be amended to say um Place policy 4.2 in the parking lot for

2:55:46

later discussion and then Kate would need to accept that

2:55:52

or make that friendly Amendment given that we are going to have a bunch

2:55:58

of these and I don't want to do this I have several that need to be put in the parking lot

2:56:04

um I would like to ask Deb for clarification if you could read the agreement we made at the beginning of this discussion about the parking lot

2:56:11

and um if we get some guidance on staff about whether we need to make a motion

2:56:17

since we already made a motion um to put things in the parking lot

2:56:23

okay to answer the first part of your question

2:56:28

the motion that I have from the beginning of the meeting was the Planning Commission that the

2:56:34

Planning Commission address simple amendments as marked by staff at the

2:56:39

next Planning Commission meeting and that at tonight's meeting the committee create a parking lot for

2:56:46

comments that the commission will not address tonight and instead address

2:56:52

after the hearing excuse me after the housing element is drafted

2:56:57

given that do we even need this motion can we get a thumbs up thumbs down about

2:57:02

whether something can go in the parking lot instead so we don't go through this rigmarole for each of these many items

2:57:10

that sounds like a good idea yeah the the thumbs up thumbs down would

2:57:17

be a consensus where we'd be taking consensus to put this in the parking lot

2:57:27

uh chair ragab your your muted

2:57:32

um I'd like to recognize commissioner rishish his hand's been up for a while before we thumbs up thumbs down this

2:57:39

so I just have a question I understand that we're parking a lot of discussion on this

2:57:44

does the text of 4.2 remain in the doc or not

2:57:50

it would remain as currently proposed

2:57:56

so if if the motion passes the texts remain four point the text for

2:58:03

uh 4.2 remains to be discussed later yes okay thank you commissioner boatsman

2:58:12

um yeah I would really recommend that we just do these things by thumbs up you know just like

2:58:17

just by consensus rather than make motions and vote on and so on all right

2:58:23

thumbs up thumbs down on parking lotting 4.2 a point of order sorry there's

2:58:29

already been a motion in a second made and so at this point I will withdraw my emotion okay and I will withdraw my

2:58:36

second if I'm a good person Thumbs Up Down on parking lotting 4.2

2:58:43

all right looks like um consensus right parking loted very good it's it's parked uh great

2:58:53

um so now the next comments um is on 4.2 Point D

2:58:59

um it's split across these Pages here so it's it's a little long but there were two comments on this one um proposing

2:59:06

different changes to 4.2.d

2:59:13

foreign

2:59:19

commissioner boatsman um I move that we adopt the second 4.2

2:59:27

Point d uh for inclusion in the the element

2:59:43

any seconds

2:59:49

uh hearing no seconds wait a second okay

2:59:55

all right seconded um who would anyone would like to speak to this

3:00:04

I would speak to it because it's something I proposed um so I'm sorry yeah

3:00:10

yeah there's I'm sorry did I did I speak out of turn no no no I'm sorry yeah okay

3:00:16

all right um I proposed it because um the climate action plan is another

3:00:23

city plan and it would be appropriate for us to be guided by it in in many

3:00:29

aspects of our planning here but um so I just want to make that rather

3:00:35

general statement here rather than focusing on one particular aspect of

3:00:42

climate change the relevance of climate change

3:00:57

I'm sorry commissioner batazzo as I was reading on my other screen

3:01:02

thanks um I I do think based on having read through a number of comments that

3:01:11

references to or inclusion of revised language that point to The Climate

3:01:16

action plan or how the city looks at business development through climate

3:01:22

action in some ways to me reminds me of the conversation about well how are we also incorporating housing into Economic

3:01:30

Development so where I feel we we have two big pieces as a commission we get

3:01:35

comments on how is the climate action plan or a climate um

3:01:41

change and how the city is addressing climate change affect how we're looking at the economic development plan where

3:01:49

we start getting granular in our comments is where I start feeling like the it's a parking lot type conversation

3:01:57

where if if we feel like we need to add emphasis and reference to another plan

3:02:03

it feels like we probably need a bit more discussion about it um because that's one of the things I'm

3:02:10

noticing as I'm reading comments related to both housing and the

3:02:16

conversation around housing and how we're looking at housing and its connection to Economic Development how we're looking at climate change as its

3:02:22

connection to Economic Development so I am inclined to take these kinds of

3:02:29

revisions um and parking lot them where they feel

3:02:34

like we're referencing something we're talking about um and also I feel like 4.2 Point D would

3:02:41

need some additional clarification except for I don't know what to offer it

3:02:47

um so those are my two comments on this piece commissioner goals I mean I sort of do think you know I'm

3:02:54

certainly somebody who thinks the climate needs to be considered in this element in some fashion but I'm not sure

3:03:00

which of the various places is the best place and so you know I'm sort of inclined to think we just put all these

3:03:06

guys in the parking lot and you know have a discussion among ourselves at some point about the extent to which it's relevant to this element

3:03:12

and then we're best to put it if there's some consensus that there is some relevance to it so I wouldn't be

3:03:19

favorably inclined in you know sort of along the lines of Park and modding it

3:03:29

um seeing no other hands I'll speak my opinion on it um you know I see 4.3 if we

3:03:36

don't elaborate further on it it's just a good reminder let's be consistent with the climate action plan

3:03:42

um so you know I see where hey don't forget about that even though

3:03:47

by default it's included so my I would be inclined to

3:03:54

um not support comment log number 70s 4.2 D and just you know as long I to me

3:04:00

4.3 um without even A and B is is suitable

3:04:05

to say hey don't forget about the climate action plan uh commissioner Bozeman yeah um can you scroll up just a little

3:04:12

bit Adam to the beginning of this goal uh so we can see what this goal says

3:04:17

well the goal yeah yeah okay so goal four you know is about social

3:04:23

environmental economic needs sustainability so I think that it's the

3:04:29

appropriate goal to put this under and then if you scroll back down to floor 2D whatever it's called there

3:04:36

um you know 4 2D first I want to address and the

3:04:43

comment about whether to parking lot this so my understanding about parking lot items is we're parking lotting

3:04:49

things that have to do with the housing element because that's an element that's not done yet the climate action plan is

3:04:56

an adopted completed plan and um this statement 4.2.d was proposed I

3:05:04

proposed well it was an amendment to an existing existing um uh item because

3:05:10

it's a in a in an economic development element

3:05:16

what does that have to do with climate change this policy is meant to show that

3:05:24

um reducing the negative effects of climate change have to do with attracting business

3:05:30

workers and customers in a warming climate and I think that's a very broad statement that is important to include

3:05:38

here whereas 4.3 that Adam mentioned is is very very limited it doesn't

3:05:45

really tell you what does that have to do with economic development so I think it's important to point out

3:05:52

that attracting business workers and customers in a warming climate is is a task you need to meet at this point

3:06:01

commissioner accuse I have a proposal

3:06:08

I agree with what commissioner boatsman said that the parking lot was intended

3:06:13

for items that um are related to housing which there is no element for yet

3:06:21

um I do also agree with commissioner but Tazo that I really can't read this

3:06:28

sentence and understand it so I'd like to propose that um the proponents

3:06:34

um maybe reword it for next time to make it a little more clear because I

3:06:40

think 4.3 is an easier win and that way we can get through some of this climate stuff and accept some of this climate

3:06:45

stuff um I just really don't know what 4.2 Point d means I understand there's a

3:06:52

need of a broad topic but I still don't know what it means as

3:06:57

written even broadly um I can get behind 4.3 because it makes sense to me that people want trees to

3:07:06

rest under that's proven there's lots of peer-reviewed Journal articles about that

3:07:12

so um I think recognizing commissioner accuses comments um kind of like

3:07:18

commissioner goes and I were sent to Wordsmith things offline

3:07:23

um I'll suggest that um you know I I was involved with 4.2 D

3:07:29

comment 41 um I also suggest that um commissioner boatsman commissioner

3:07:36

q's and I word Smith from four from 4.2 C to um the beginning of 4.4 offline and

3:07:44

bring that send a recommend send some proposed text to staff for our next meeting

3:07:49

um is there a consensus on taking it offline with us three and if anyone else wants to participate we have a motion on

3:07:57

the floor don't we yes we do yeah oh all right

3:08:06

uh commissioner accused um can we can we call for a vote on the

3:08:11

motion and then consider Adam's recommendation yes all right yeah I forgot about the

3:08:17

motion apologies that's quite all right so

3:08:23

um I have a motion by commissioner Bozeman seconded by commissioner rishis

3:08:29

Gales okay technology gentlemen your voices do sound quite similar here and

3:08:35

uh to adopt the second version of 4.2 d

3:08:40

I'm sorry Carolyn I did not catch the end of that motion is to adopt the second version of 4.2  
d

3:08:48

that's good enough that's what I meant right there yeah I probably had some extraneous  
words on it so commissioner

3:08:55

gills do you support that okay

3:09:01

I'm taking it to a vote commissioner cues nay

3:09:09

commissioner batazzo nay commissioner boatsman

3:09:15

aye commissioner gills thank you commissioner rashes

3:09:23

name and vice chair Reagan nay

3:09:28

motion fails all right um so I'll I'll go back to searching for consensus

3:09:34

um commissioner boatsman commissioner accused and I and anyone else who wishes to participate uh Wordsmith from 4.2 C

3:09:41

to 4.4 um commissioner boatsman you wish I see your hand yeah why are you including 4.2 C which

3:09:48

is regarding disaster like start I mean starting after sorry so like from from

3:09:53

line I think line two to line 17. come up works that offline

3:10:00

oh he's that line okay we were talking about just four percent inclusive of 4.2

3:10:08

D through 4.3 B that's a good idea I think all right

3:10:14

let's look for consensus one two three four okay looks like we're good so

3:10:19

um yeah uh may I say commissioner boatsman could you kind of take the lead

3:10:25

on that since I think two of those comments were yours happy to all right let's move on okay

3:10:32

um uh the only thing I would point out there is that as they're coordinating that um please make sure that you're not

3:10:38

meeting with more than three of you um and that includes uh emails so there we

3:10:46

don't want to have any emails that are that include more than three planning commissioners

3:10:51

on in the in the two line and it's probably better to just not not do email

3:10:57

as much as you can um so that we're not creating a public record or a public meeting that that's

3:11:03

just our your team's Optima warning today thank you

3:11:09

thank you for that reminder yeah um okay so with with 4.3 being included

3:11:15

in that um we move now to um well comma or number four four we

3:11:23

already addressed that um previously uh so that's that's resolved so now we move to

3:11:31

um goal five and six and the only reason I withdrew that okay great thank you for

3:11:38

helping me keep track of that that's yeah um okay so then the first the next

3:11:44

comment is under um policy 6.1 um and that's a proposed new policy

3:11:51

um again addressing uh climate action plan yeah this is me I mean I think this was

3:11:58

a common in first draft and the subsequent comments with respect

3:12:05

to climate you know have probably superseded it so I'm perfectly happy to

3:12:10

let's draw that too consensus on withdrawing or if anyone

3:12:17

would like to speak first

3:12:24

um missioner boats I mean I don't see a thumb oh you know the way okay what are

3:12:32

we with the con looking for consensus to withdraw comment six one right all right

3:12:38

let's withdraw it okay um so so basically as as I understand it

3:12:44

we now have consensus to return six one to its original form and then

3:12:50

then we can we can come back to it at the next um at the next meeting I think that

3:12:56

makes sense yeah so um you you'll see in the draft all

3:13:02

highlight six one here so that you know that we we haven't finished that but

3:13:08

um that's a better starting Place yeah then I'll look for uh consensus uh six

3:13:15

three is parking lot right per our discussions

3:13:21

very unambiguously parking a lot yeah anyone opposed okay

3:13:27

okay

3:13:33

um let's see so then that brings us to 6.4

3:13:39

um which I'm I'm certain that there will be debate here um so I will this is a proposed new

3:13:46

proposed policy to establish a minimum wage on Mercer Island

3:13:51

yeah commissioner gold so I saw your hand thanks I guess for me you know I

3:13:56

think it's a complicated issue for a lot of reasons everybody knows I think that uh I would to support it it would at

3:14:03

least have to say study establishing a minimum wage on Mercer Island the idea that we were to you know to

3:14:09

take that issue and decided among ourselves with the information we have strikes me as a stretch so I guess

3:14:15

that's just my point before we get too far into you know debating it as written that uh and see what Carolyn says but uh

3:14:24

you know if it could be study established establish a minimum wage that's something that is much more

3:14:29

interesting to me okay commissioner boatsman okay so um since this is not a housing element

3:14:36

issue I feel like we should take care of this one tonight um so it to me it um

3:14:44

it it doesn't really seem to be part of

3:14:49

the economic development element to include that particular policy

3:14:57

um so I guess I'd be very interested in hearing um I think Kate proposed this

3:15:02

why she thinks it is something that should go in an economic development element

3:15:09

if if we could hear that okay uh commissioner Hughes I want to jump the line with

3:15:15

commissioner batazzo oh apologies I saw yours first but uh commissioner because

3:15:20

I think you were first and I do want to hear what you have to say first well um I appreciate commissioner Gill's

3:15:28

comment I am very happy um if there's General agreement to put

3:15:33

emotion forward on this at this time to change establish this study

3:15:40

um so maybe I should put that motion on the table and then we can

3:15:45

um deliberate about it and then I can make my comments about why I propose it in the first place in this plan does

3:15:50

that make sense this process all right I'd like to propose um

3:15:56

item 6.4 remove the word established and insert

3:16:01

the word study

3:16:14

I'm happy to second that for discussion purposes thank you commissioner

3:16:21

both men so the reason I think this belongs here is when I first read these economic development plan

3:16:28

um I was struck by how much it focused on one half of the equation

3:16:36

of our economy um which was the

3:16:42

the comp I guess the business the business owner side of things and there

3:16:47

were there were not a lot of recommendations about the sustainability of a Workforce

3:16:54

and I was kind of bothered by that because um I do a lot of equity work in my job

3:17:01

outside of uh outside of enjoying this time on this commission

3:17:06

um and I'm I'm very concerned that

3:17:13

that we are changing as a community away from a community that used to have like

3:17:19

a wide variety of workers living on it and I'll give one example

3:17:24

um a daycare worker at my son's daycare bought a condo on Mercer Island years

3:17:30

and years ago and she was able to walk to the daycare I think she made 12 bucks an hour

3:17:36

um and while we can debate later in the

3:17:42

housing element whether affording Hospital housing will be realistic again or not

3:17:48

um on this topic we know that retailers are

3:17:54

having a really hard time maintaining a Workforce and I think that having some

3:18:02

having a minimum wage not only signals that we care about workers but it also

3:18:09

is practical there's a recent study in 2018

3:18:15

um that said that Seattle's minimum wage had um

3:18:20

they found that um it had actually overall increased

3:18:27

earnings for low-wage workers there have been other studies that conflated

3:18:32

Seattle with much smaller towns that that did not that said the opposite

3:18:38

um that I think the analysis was fair so you know it's like people had people

3:18:46

working less hours um but it was something like 45 minutes less a week and the wage increase more

3:18:52

than made up for it for their total income um and that's in Seattle in our area as opposed to rural towns farther away

3:19:01

um because of the types of jobs we have and um so I just I want this economic development

3:19:08

plan to or economic element sorry to reflect

3:19:14

the needs of all of the people in our community and not just

3:19:19

um I wanted to address the the worker side of this equation as well sorry that was so long

3:19:28

no worries uh that we need this we need to speak our opinions uh commissioner batazzo you were next

3:19:35

um I I reread the goal the title of the

3:19:40

goal is commissioner accused with speaking uh and the goal does talk about

3:19:47

um the Mercer Island economy providing residents the option to both live and

3:19:52

work on island um you know and having a minimum wage I I

3:19:57

doubt a minimum wage you could still live on Mercer Island very well um if I'm really honest about it I think

3:20:04

if we are looking at um trying to incorporate a

3:20:12

a wage element into this goal I can support studying a minimum wage but I

3:20:18

also you know I just want to put out maybe for public thought and for this group it's not just a minimum wage it's

3:20:26

a range like it's a range of wages that we want to

3:20:32

attract and address like we need diversity in the workforce in the wages

3:20:38

that are coming into so I actually I almost think the study of a

3:20:45

minimum wage it's a great idea and a little too narrow and we need to look at also the range of wages

3:20:52

um so I'm inclined to support but I'm also concerned that if we're if we're looking at resilience and we're looking

3:20:58

at um wages in for businesses we need to look at attracting businesses that provide a

3:21:05

range of wages

3:21:10

being no other oh commissioner boatswain

3:21:16

I can kind of you know warm up to this idea and think that

3:21:21

you know looking at the looking at it from the side point of the sustainability of a Workforce is is rather important

3:21:28

um I wonder however we are such so much a um Community with a rather small

3:21:34

commercial area and this seems like a a very big topic uh it seemed to me it

3:21:40

would require a lot of Staff time and a lot of a controversy I'm just not sure

3:21:47

that it's a really high priority for us and I think that you know the business

3:21:52

is on Mercer Island if they can't get anyone to come and work at their businesses you know they're going to have to raise the ways raise the wages

3:21:59

however if you're a Seattle you know a big big city you know you would need to look at this you know certainly

3:22:06

um address this but I'm not so sure a small City like Mercer Island really needs to do this that's my reservation

3:22:12

about it okay not seeing any other hands I'll

3:22:18

speaking my personal comments to this um I did a lot of reading on this is an interesting topic my first concern if if

3:22:26

people were not able to read the email that Allison forwarded to the commission I don't think this is within our purview

3:22:33

right it's not I'm trying to look at my it's not land use it's not development

3:22:39

regulations and it's not growth management um if anything this will push away growth um that the comment about

3:22:45

companies can't hire people I think commissioner Bozeman is absolutely correct it's like if they can't hire at

3:22:51

a low wage they're gonna have to pay more um as for studying this I cannot back

3:22:57

this I mean the University of Washington has studied it that uh research paper that I referenced there that's been

3:23:03

iterated upon and published in a peer-reviewed journal and it says increased wages by 3.2 percent but

3:23:10

reduced hours worked by 6.9 percent so that was a University of Washington

3:23:16

public policy study on Seattle and that was only the 11 to 13 jump

3:23:21

um so I don't see how the city of Mercer Island studying this would add any value

3:23:27

I mean the University of Washington has studied this in depth um the only two cities uh that have it

3:23:34

Seattle as commissioner boatsman mentioned is they're big enough they can do that they also like to Signal things

3:23:40

I heard that word used all this would do is signal stuff um you know where our household we

3:23:47

probably couldn't move here uh now um and we are not minimum wage workers

3:23:54

um so this is just signaling it's been studied we don't need to study it I

3:23:59

don't think it's part of our even part of our advisory capability and as I said

3:24:05

the only other city that did this was uh SeaTac and in that case you know there's

3:24:10

certain jobs in ctac like baggage handlers and I think that was the impetus for creating it those jobs just

3:24:16

can't pick up and move right because the airport can't pick up and move uh we signal this that's going to provide a

3:24:22

cooling effect on new business here and they're just going to move right over to Factoria so I will get off of my soapbox

3:24:28

but I am absolutely against this procedurally study wise it just makes no sense uh commissioner

3:24:34

accuse

3:24:42

you muted

3:24:50

you're still muted

3:24:55

ah thank you Adam uh oh

3:25:00

City Adam can you scroll up to the high wage job comment part of part of the

3:25:06

reason for putting this in here I think it's a little bit higher oh no

3:25:11

no work to increase High wage on island job opportunities

3:25:18

if we're not going to include something about lower wage workers then

3:25:24

I think we also have to exclude 6.1 and

3:25:30

regarding the University of Washington study has been critiqued and found to be

3:25:38

flawed by several entities and I know we're not

3:25:43

supposed to debate like that but I I don't think um any one study any of us bring to the

3:25:49

table should stand as Canon because that's not how science and uh stuff

3:25:56

works you know we have we open a conversation we debate it we we discuss theories and so

3:26:02

um I just wanna say we've got it we've got to keep an open mind to different ideas and

3:26:09

interpretations and I'm just really concerned about having item 6.1 and not something that

3:26:16

balances that in consideration of workers and I would argue that

3:26:22

um we need a grocery store we need a couple grocery stores and the average

3:26:29

wage work on Mercer Island is making forty thousand dollars and they're being priced out of all of King County

3:26:35

so if the expectation is that we're gonna ask people to come serve us here

3:26:41

in our community and commute two hours to buy groceries I think that's a little

3:26:46

absurd um I think there's got to be a balance here between six one and six four I

3:26:54

don't know what that is um but I'll stop comment

3:27:08

sorry on mute uh commissioner batazzo

3:27:14

you're you're on mute now we're all I love it I'm so glad we're doing this uh

3:27:20

Vice chair again do you still have your hand up or is that an old hand old puppies but I'll put a new one up

3:27:27

after you I you know I I do appreciate this conversation

3:27:33

um I do I actually agree with Kate too that it would be great for us to have bookends if Adam if you could scroll

3:27:40

back up to the original goal of which we're sourcing all of this debate on the goal States the Mercer Island economy

3:27:46

provides residents the option to both live and work on island now I realized

3:27:52

the way I read that inserted um punctuation if you will and we can

3:27:57

read it six ways of Sunday but if the goal is to provide residents

3:28:02

the option to both live and work on island then the conversation I think is going to include a conversation about

3:28:08

wages and it's going to be a conversation about a range of wages when I think about what we're doing here

3:28:14

which is the economic development plan and it's the first economic develop development plan this city has had and I

3:28:21

know we have an active motion on the table and so I don't want to supersede that or move toward anything but based

3:28:28

on the conversation which I think the debate has been very good I'm inclined to suggest that we move towards

3:28:34

potentially striking this entire goal because I'm not sure it's actually a

3:28:39

good goal for our economic development plan given all the other components so I

3:28:45

do want to offer that for thought as food for thought because I think a number of the points 6-1 makes a good

3:28:51

point uh Kate makes a good point but I actually think this goal might be

3:28:56

Beyond or outside of or maybe in excess of where we might need to go in this

3:29:02

plan um

3:29:08

so for clarification you're proposing all of six just

3:29:14

goes away I'm suggesting ignoring it but we have an active motion you have an

3:29:19

active motion open so I'm not making any new motions understood but I am saying based on listening to the conversation

3:29:25

and recognizing what we're trying to achieve here with this particular goal once we complete our emotions I might be

3:29:32

inclined to make a new one in the direction I just suggested um commissioner accused and then I'll

3:29:38

I'll speak after I think what commissioner batazzo has

3:29:44

said is intriguing and rereading the goal and rereading all of the elements

3:29:49

associated with this goal it's just intrinsically tied to housing and you

3:29:55

know I I could go a couple different ways here

3:30:00

I I could agree to remove six one and six four you know or B I could vote that

3:30:07

way um or I could agree to parking lot

3:30:15

this whole I don't think folks are I I'm not ready to abandon the whole goal

3:30:20

um so I think we could just put it in the parking lot because it is so intrinsically tied to housing

3:30:26

it has housing in it it has live in it

3:30:33

um in the absence of other hands I'll I'll speak my so commissioner Boseman

3:30:38

sorry go ahead I

3:30:45

I think maybe I'm missing something here but I think the main thing is vibrant

3:30:50

businesses that can that can succeed right so that means people shopping there and doing business there

3:30:56

it's not really required that people live there in order to

3:31:04

um I mean live there it is not essential that the people who work at the businesses or

3:31:10

shop at the businesses live on Mercer Island so I think we might be getting like like um

3:31:16

Angie commissioner batazzo mentions maybe this is

3:31:21

um beyond the the scope of this element

3:31:28

absence of other hands I'll speak my oh commissioner goals sorry I want to give everyone a chance

3:31:35

the point you know I'm not a big strike for me is that critical but I do

3:31:42

think the minimum wage thing you know I'm sort of a little disappointed I didn't think of it myself because

3:31:48

you know there's so much in here about you know the business Community doing better and you know other another

3:31:53

stakeholder in this whole thing is the workers here and to my mind if it

3:31:59

doesn't fit in this uh goal I would be looking for somewhere else to put it because I think there's something

3:32:06

that um kind of strikes me as the right thing to do that uh in trying to look at

3:32:12

our Economic Development to take into account in one line uh a whole another

3:32:19

set of stakeholders who maybe have a smaller place at the table but I think should you know deserve our respect and

3:32:26

at least some appreciation for what they're doing in a very complicated world

3:32:36

and um I'll I'll speak my second round of opinions on this like that specifically on minimum wage I'm going

3:32:42

to reiterate it's not land use it's not development regs and it's not growth management

3:32:48

um I do like commissioner batazzo's suggestion that yeah it's like maybe maybe we put forth

3:32:55

emotion after this too um strike all of section six I mean of course six three has already been

3:33:01

parking loted um but I mean yeah I understand we have we have three grocery stores here they

3:33:07

are at as far as I understand they're viable businesses um if we raise those prices you know

3:33:15

there's there's a McDonald's in Factoria there's a QFC in Factoria um

3:33:21

I could you know I would think those businesses would just close up and move there so I'm I'm still against including

3:33:29

six four study or establish um but I could be I could back a future

3:33:34

motion to strike all of six six because it's it's tough to do um and I think data that was provided to

3:33:41

us by the consultant um I think the number of people who live and work on Mercer Island

3:33:47

when we were given those data last year was 914 that's four percent of our population that's a very small number

3:33:54

um we're not a city like you know we're not a city that is a complete City in

3:34:00

isolation um people come in people go out um commissioner accuse

3:34:06

sorry before we move forward can I just interject here um just briefly so we've we have a

3:34:14

motion on the table and everybody has had a chance to speak on it um I think and so it might be an

3:34:20

appropriate time to call the question um just because the we're not

3:34:26

necessarily getting I I'm not trying to step on any tote here but I I don't know that we're getting

3:34:32

new comments here and so it might be best to just find out where the where the commission's at on the country I

3:34:39

hear your words Adam I was going to offer to withdraw the motion and offer a new motion to table

3:34:46

discussion on all of policy six until after the housing

3:34:52

element is drafted but I don't know if Carolyn would

3:34:58

um second by withdrawing your motion I would Second That Emotion I would second that change to your motion

3:35:05

can I do both in one motion Deb or do I have to withdraw my original motion and

3:35:10

then propose tabling you either need to withdraw your original motion and both you and

3:35:17

commissioner boats who need to withdraw the original motion or you move forward with that motion and then

3:35:23

um you can do another emotion to amend it or you can amend it and then you know

3:35:28

big dinosaur little dinosaur yeah I think I need to withdraw I think

3:35:34

I need to withdraw the motion because I I don't know that we have the data

3:35:41

um without the housing element drafted to discuss or debate this issue

3:35:48

yeah I I agree to I withdraw my second okay

3:35:56

so what is the motion now I don't think we need emotion right there is no emotion now

3:36:03

table discussion of policy six number six in the parking lot

3:36:09

sorry for clarification Kate when you say policy six do you mean all the policies under goal six

3:36:16

so that'd be six one through six six we're gonna correct parking lot those

3:36:22

correct because I I want time to consider um commissioner batazo's recommendation

3:36:27

I I might or might not agree with it and I I need time to consider it

3:36:34

um and I don't think we can do that in this meeting so I think we should table it um and then reconsider after the housing

3:36:41

element is done whether we want to ditch this entire thing or

3:36:46

um craft different language that is um you know

3:36:52

broadly inclusive of all wage ranges depending

3:36:57

on the outcome of the housing element and whether or not we are going to have all sorts of types of housing for all

3:37:04

sorts of types of workers here um it's just it's such a quagmire I don't think we can discuss it now that's

3:37:10

my opinion commissioner batazzo thanks um I need some clarification from

3:37:19

staff please um if we table this whole discussion um does this mean that we leave the

3:37:26

language in the draft and the draft will actually go to public review as is

3:37:32

while those other elements are considered and then we'll be able to revisit this after public review I'm

3:37:39

curious when public will be if this goes to public review yeah so it would be available for public

3:37:45

comment um it currently is available for public comment

3:37:50

what this this text would stay in there and the next draft would add that caveat

3:37:55

that that we're coming back to this that it's in the parking lot essentially but

3:38:01

the text would still be out there available for public comment so for example then the text says it as

3:38:07

it stands would be out for public comment because if that's the case then I feel like we

3:38:13

probably should have voted on a motion that we just unvoted on

3:38:19

correct so the well

3:38:25

um the the text that would be out there is what's shown on the screen here

3:38:31

um that would be available for public comment but you you'll have a chance to return to this but we would essentially

3:38:37

be saying that we're gonna um just keep this language and not make a decision until after the housing

3:38:43

element stuff is done that that was the

3:38:50

but hearing commissioner potasso's statement I would if this is going I didn't quite make that connection that

3:38:57

this would be going out for public review and I think we would want the word study and not establish if this were going out for public review

3:39:03

I second that opinion uh lots of hands uh commissioner rashish

3:39:15

at the risk of pointing out the obvious we're now at 9 40.

3:39:22

um yeah how how can we call a vote to to end

3:39:28

this um commissioner boatsman

3:39:34

um yeah I would just point out that these various things that we're looking at right here under goal six they've been out for public review already

3:39:40

they've they've been in our draft and available for public review I don't think that's a it's not it's not the

3:39:47

public hearing draft it's just it's just our usual packet that we're working on so I'm not

3:39:53

concerned about having this remain in there I do agree with putting all of number six in the parking lot

3:40:01

because it all has to do with housing really essentially so so to help because we are

3:40:08

um pretty late in the evening here I think what we're looking for is

3:40:13

consensus on putting all of these policies under goal six in

3:40:19

the parking lot I think we should get consensus on that first and then we can if we want to

3:40:26

change established a study just for the next draft we can get consensus on that as well so maybe the first one would be

3:40:33

consensus on the policies in the parking adding those to the parking lot

3:40:38

is there a consensus on that

3:40:47

okay so I only see one thumb somewhere two thumbs

3:40:54

three thumbs and I can't see Angie so I don't know if

3:40:59

she's got a thumbs up okay um so it sounds like there's consensus to

3:41:06

parking lot these now is that second piece of it is there can is there consensus to change established

3:41:13

a study um for the for the purposes of review

3:41:23

I see three thumbs there's four four

3:41:28

I guess the the question is would anyone block consensus on that

3:41:34

I would I would I mean this is this is a I feel we're punting this issue we're

3:41:41

trying to tie in non-housing related things and trying to punt them

3:41:46

out of fear of a possible loss in a vote um

3:41:52

that is 100 not the intent and the fact that we disagree about whether or not

3:42:00

housing is an economic issue for worker housing is an economic issue

3:42:06

doesn't I'm saying minimum wage versus housing but yeah oh I guess I

3:42:14

won't block consensus I've I've spoken my mind on the issue

3:42:20

Adam City Adam you said someone can block consensus I thought we voted or didn't vote and someone can block

3:42:26

consensus what's that so if we're not taking a roll call vote if there is an emotion on the table but there's just a

3:42:33

general idea and we're getting consensus as we're reviewing a document if one

3:42:38

person would block consensus then you could put it to a it would get blocked consensus would be blocked and the only

3:42:45

way to make a change then would be to take a roll call vote it's just a way of moving through without taking a roll

3:42:51

call vote at every decision point I I'm not I'm not going to abuse the procedural so I won't block consensus um

3:42:58

I see commissioner boatsman's hand oh sorry that's old sorry okay commissioner

3:43:03

goals I take seriously Adam you're concerned

3:43:10

that where it's outside our purview I don't think it is given or you know reviewing the entire comprehensive plan but I think it might be useful if we're

3:43:17

going to talk about this later or in the meantime staff could give us a little bit of you know discussion about whether

3:43:23

this is within our purview or not and we could add that to the equation when we talk next time because if it's outside

3:43:28

our purview then great I'd like to know that yeah commissioner rashish uh if you won't

3:43:36

block consensus I will

3:43:41

okay and just to be clear that was on changing established a study

3:43:48

yep okay I'll I'll give I'll give commissioner some solidarity then so

3:43:54

I'll I'll rejoin okay so so there's no consensus on on

3:44:00

changing established a study but we did have consensus on putting these in the

3:44:06

parking lot until um after putting all of the policies under goal six in the parking lot

3:44:13

um and then I I will let I will answer the question as to is is this within the

3:44:21

purview um I'll include that in the next um in the next memo and now we need a vote

3:44:28

on the change from established yes

3:44:35

you need a motion I think someone made one didn't they no it was made okay I'll remake the motion change

3:44:43

establish to study second

3:44:52

anyone wish to speak or should we hand it to Deb

3:44:57

all right Deb hey I have a motion by commissioner Q's

3:45:03

second invite commissioner vitazo to amend policy 6.4 and change the word

3:45:09

established to study

3:45:21

share uh Vice chair Reagan may I vote present to indicate I don't

3:45:28

support either may you vote present yeah

3:45:33

it was like uh I thought in our bylaws there's a like a protest vote I don't want to indicate

3:45:39

that I support other either it has already been parking loted okay

3:45:46

uh okay I'll just vote in a

3:45:51

it doesn't even have a second is anyone going to Second yeah it does have a second

3:45:57

yeah okay I there were actually two people

3:46:02

that tied for second uh commissioner Picasso and commissioner boatsman okay so we vote

3:46:11

commissioner gills

3:46:17

commissioner boatsman aye commissioner accused

3:46:23

aye commissioner rishis yeah

3:46:29

and commissioner batazzo I have four in favor and two against

3:46:35

motion passes oh right um seeing how we are at an

3:46:43

overtime Commissioners are there any comments or questions

3:46:49

um seeing none um I do see the Now we move to other business

3:46:55

um deputy director report

3:47:02

I don't have much to say I think what we should talk about now is the schedule so

3:47:09

our next meeting is scheduled for the end of October like this meeting well the primary focus

3:47:15

will be on finishing going through the economic development element um do we think that one more meeting is

3:47:23

adequate to get through what remains of the element we also have the implementation plan although I know

3:47:30

Adam has some ideas if you know kind of holding that to talk about later

3:47:35

if we need to

3:47:40

I would think no I think we need some extra time I certainly think we might want to have

3:47:47

a date that's on account if we don't need it then we can dump it but I think it's hard to schedule something on short

3:47:54

notice yeah so I think in the staff memo there

3:47:59

were a few dates mentioned one of which is next Wednesday which feels very soon

3:48:05

um and then there was a couple in November as well so do we want to look at sort of

3:48:14

locking in a date that works for folks either to for sure have a meeting or as a

3:48:20

backup in case we need it after the October meeting [Music]

3:48:27

foreign we could uh coordinate offline Perhaps

3:48:35

it is it is I think unless people have a strong feeling of like yes let's definitely have one next week or in two

3:48:42

weeks um if we're looking at a November meet like backup option but it's definitely something we can coordinate

3:48:47

offline I I think in the interest of being very late let's let's try to coordinate that

3:48:52

offline please okay um oh sorry I don't have any other

3:48:59

updates on that um well one quick one so the docket is still open it will be

3:49:04

closing October 1st which is Sunday um so we'll be looking to get all those

3:49:11

applications in the Planning Commission is scheduled to review the docket applications on November 15th like we

3:49:17

talked about earlier this evening so there there will be additional information coming to you as we approach

3:49:23

that as well but just wanted to kind of give that final reminder if folks are considering

3:49:28

putting an application in commissioner cute thank you for recognizing me um Allison I was wondering

3:49:36

can you remind us all of the process if a commissioner wants to put an item on the docket do we do it through this

3:49:42

process or do we have a different process yeah you're welcome to submit an

3:49:48

application you know as an individual through this process

3:49:57

all right any more um Deputy director's report uh commissioner batazzo

3:50:03

thank you I just want to be clear about the future work coming up so this group

3:50:10

has talked about the fact that we need at least one more meeting and potentially more than that to finish the

3:50:17

work on the economic development plan and the implementation of plan um can you remind us what else we will

3:50:23

be addressing like I think you just said the dockets coming up in November yeah so

3:50:29

at the October meeting will be primarily focused on economic development perhaps we'll schedule an extra meeting

3:50:36

in early November to finish that work November 15th we'll be talking about the

3:50:41

docket that'll be the only thing on the agenda for that meeting um at some point we need to come back

3:50:46

and talk about the bylaws I think that may end up being in December just with how things are going here with full

3:50:52

agendas um I think December is also available as kind of a fallback if there are any

3:50:59

remaining Economic Development issues that we need to talk about um

3:51:05

we're also briefing the city council on some of the technical work that's going

3:51:10

into the housing element in November so you know if time allows in December we

3:51:15

may want to bring some of that information for discussion with the commission as well

3:51:24

all right um anything else on this topic if not um

3:51:30

are there any planned absences for future scheduled meetings

3:51:37

okay then there being no other business to come before the Planning Commission the time is now 9 51 pm and the meeting

3:51:45

is adjourned as a reminder to Commissioners please stay seated until the city staff has terminated the