

GMHB EXHIBIT 190

2023-10-25 Planning Commission Transcript

0:02

all right we are live and recording okay good evening and welcome

0:08

to the October 25th 2023 regular hybrid Planning Commission meeting I am Mike

0:15

Murphy chair tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is being brought to you courtesy of the zoom platform

0:23

welcome to all and thank you for joining us tonight I want to thank chair uh Vice

0:29

chair right for chairing last meeting in my absence uh it was a tough one to

0:34

start with frankly uh it was not an easy one when I had to uh fill in as Vice chair the

0:41

first time our meeting lasted an hour and there was nothing to do really um so

0:47

uh I'm sorry to have inflicted that on you no worries so Commissioners please

0:53

have your microphones turned on for the roll call uh Deputy city clerk please call the rooll
thank you

1:01

chair commissioner qes has requested an absence

1:08

tonight commissioner bazo here commissioner Bozman here

1:16

commissioner Gils here commissioner rishes

1:21

here Comm uh Vice chair rum here and chair Murphy here thank you

1:30

so for this meeting we continue to use zoom and I will do my best to recognize you in the order in which your hands are

1:37

raised um after being recognized you may then ask your question or make your comments as

1:43

appropriate the first item of business tonight is public appearances this is

1:49

the opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about issues of concern

1:54

Deputy city clerk is there anyone who has signed up for appearances or that wishes to address the

2:01

commission thank you chair we do have one individual that is uh asked asked to

2:06

speak and that's Mr will orof orndorf and uh when you are ready I will give

2:12

him access okay uh so tonight's agenda will then include remote public

2:18

appearances via Zoom individuals wishing to address the commission may do so in

2:24

person or by Zoom or telephone provided that they register with the deputy clerk

2:29

by by 400 p.m. today when it is your turn to speak you will be called by name

2:35

remarks are to be addressed to the commission as a whole not to individual Commissioners or staff please speak

2:43

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

2:51

time is ended I will thank you for your comments and move to the next speaker or item of business as the case may be uh

2:59

Deb can you promote the first Speaker most certainly just one moment

3:05

please so I have I have elevated our guest speaker and have requested that

3:12

they be unmuted they are at the community center

3:17

so it may take just a moment uh this is will I can hear you

3:23

all right perfect thank you sir awesome yeah um hi my name is Will rorf as Deb

3:28

said I'm coming to you from the community Center uh I've been a Mercer Island resident for over 15 years I want

3:35

to thank all of you for volunteering your time and all your hard work it's greatly appreciated by our community I'm

3:41

here to ask each of you for your support with the Mercer Island Country Club's effort to bring its ten tennis bubble

3:47

back by voting for our docket request on the November 15th Planning Commission

3:53

meeting on May 23rd 2023 our city council approved a motion made by by the

3:59

mayor with a 7 to zero vote directing CPD to prepare a docket request amending

4:05

our city code to include temporary uses this would create a path forward

4:11

for restaurants or preschools needing outdoor tents and the Mercer Island Country Club's seasonal tennis

4:18

bubble after Consulting with CPD and others we decided it would be in the

4:24

best interest of the city and our club's membership to proceed with our own docket request that addresses the city

4:31

council's ask for a code Amendment broadly allowing temporary uses and a

4:36

permitting process similar to our neighboring jurisdictions like Bellevue we look forward to working

4:43

closely with CPD Planning Commission City staff and City Council in the months ahead to address this Gap in our

4:50

city code as you consider the impacts of approving this docket request here are

4:57

some relevant details specific to the Mercer Island Country Club's seasonal tennis bubble

5:03

project our residential neighbors are supportive of this project and our club we will not add any new members

5:11

above our current cap of 861 families there will be no increase in

5:17

traffic our club's membership is over 3,200 Mercer Island

5:23

residents our current Landscaping screens the tennis bubble with mature trees on three sides and our existing

5:30

buildings block the fourth side the seasonal tennis bubble go on

5:36

the same Four Courts where it previously existed from 1969 to

5:42

1984 our historic tennis bubble is shown in the 1978 aerial photo hanging in City

5:49

Hall as you walk to council chambers thank you again for your time thank you

5:58

will no other appearances correct no sir okay

6:05

thank you uh so let's move on to regular business uh the first item of regular

6:10

business is to review and consider approving the September 27th meeting

6:16

minutes Commissioners may I have a motion to approve the minutes so

6:23

moved second they uh been uh moved by Comm

6:29

Rish and seconded by commissioner Vice chair RB um are there any comments or

6:40

questions Cara yes so I didn't understand what the line was about staff

6:47

coordinating an offline special meeting to continue with the economic development element I didn't

6:53

remember that from our meeting could somebody just refresh me on that and

6:59

then I could know what I'm voting on thank you Adam would you like to speak

7:05

to that if I I don't have the minutes open

7:12

in front of me but I think that was the direction where you were asking us to come up with some dates for possible

7:19

meetings if we go over um a review tonight um and need additional time it's

7:26

just a scheduling thing I guess okay thank you very much

7:34

yeah if there are no other questions or comments uh Deb can you please conduct a

7:39

roll call votes certainly commissioner

7:45

bazo I commissioner Bozman hi commissioner GS

7:53

hi commissioner Richies hi commissioner RAB

8:00

hey and chair Murphy hi thank you I did

8:05

watch the video a long video uh yes it

8:13

was that's how I knew how much fun anaman

8:19

had okay motion passes uh unanimously our final item of uh regular business is

8:26

the comp plan update Economic Development element for thft welcome uh

8:33

Adam uh thank you by the way for organizing the remaining issues so that

8:40

they can be dealt with efficiently I found the memo to be extremely

8:45

helpful um hopefully everyone else did too um so with that uh and I'm take it

8:53

away great thanks yeah hopefully we can uh keep rolling here um this this

8:59

evening um let me share my screen I've got a quick couple of slides to guide

9:04

our our uh discussion tonight um so let's see here um so our purpose

9:12

tonight is to conclude the initial review of the economic development element with the Planning Commission um

9:19

as a reminder this isn't the isn't the last step we won't be adopting the this element at this stage there's there's a

9:26

few more stages that I'll go over at the end um but this is kind of the initial review to get a public review draft

9:34

together so that we can get some comments ahead of the the public hearing on the comprehensive Plan update

9:40

overall um as a refresher for or for some of the public that may be joining us for the first time uh tonight the

9:47

economic development element is a new element of our comprehensive plan that we're drafting during this comprehensive

9:53

Plan update and it outlines the goals and policies that the city will use to guide its Economic Development uh

10:01

decisionmaking in the future um and it outlines all of the the projects and

10:07

programs um it provides direction for those projects and programs that the

10:12

city will undertake um in the next 10 years and um essentially over over a

10:18

20-year timeline ultimately our process to date um from

10:25

October to June of um this year The Economic Development workg Group

10:31

worked on the initial draft of this element um that Economic Development

10:37

workg Group was composed of uh three city council members and two Planning Commission

10:42

members um and then on June 28th uh the Planning Commission received their first

10:48

briefing um and that initiated a comment period on that initial draft um and then starting on July 26th

10:56

the Planning Commission started working through the Comm ments that came in during that initial comment

11:02

period that brings us up through today um or I guess in September the Planning

11:08

Commission continued to work on resolving those comments and that really gets us to today where we're looking at

11:14

the final comments that haven't been resolved through that process um again working toward that public review

11:21

draft um there are three categories um of topics to resolve tonight um there's

11:29

the simple amendments the remaining simple amendments um categorized in that comment Matrix um these were we decided

11:36

at the last meeting I say we um the Planning Commission decided at the last meeting um to hold a decision on those

11:44

remaining simple amendments until the next meeting till this meeting here um and so those those still need a

11:51

resolution um and then after that there are the amendments that were categorized as needing deliberations these are a

11:57

little bit more uh consequential changes or amendments to um the plan um or the

12:04

policies in the plan um so we'll take a look at those we can look at those more or less like individually and then

12:10

finally after after we met last time and we created this this policy parking lot

12:16

I think there's a couple of things that would help to resolve before we move forward um just um and we'll we'll get

12:25

to that here in a minute um just to clarify the parking lot um

12:30

so first off are the simple amendments and these are um wording changes that would not necessarily significantly

12:37

change our the policy Direction within the plan um you'll see in the memo and

12:43

on the screen here I've proposed a a single motion that could resolve all of

12:48

these um these simple amendments if if that's the direction you'd like to go

12:54

otherwise if there's one or two of these that um need to be discussed we can pull those out and and look at those

13:00

individually um but here I would turn it over to um the I think we can just kind of work

13:07

through these as I have them in the slide deck so if you'd like to um discuss the simple amendments here um

13:14

I'll stop sharing my screen for a

13:24

moment Carn you're you're on mute

13:31

Carolyn okay I move that we adopt the simple amendments as presented by staff

13:38

in table

13:46

one we have a second for

13:52

that a second okay motion's been made and seconded to

14:00

um adopt the table one amendments any

14:08

discussion Carn is that your an old hand or a new hand or do you want to speak to

14:14

the

14:20

motion yes I would like to speak to the motion okay go ahead it it's just very

14:25

simple I I made the motion because I felt that um the simple amendments as worded um were um uh were clear would

14:36

not um materially direct the Ed to be anything much different than you know

14:42

what the draft says and so I I just have any argument with any of those that are presented thank

14:51

you uh Adam you had been the second one up but you withdrew your

14:57

hand yeah let me let me continue taking a a second look yeah okay I'll I'll defer

15:05

Chris um yeah I'm fine with the simple amendments all of them but the uh I have

15:11

another thought about 7.6 and I don't know if the best way to do it I me one is that I think the liaison needs to

15:18

come out because we don't have a liaison anymore right and um you know the other thought I had was actually we take out

15:24

the you know we have the business owner Planning Commission but you know I don't think it would be bad a business owner on on in that group um just more

15:32

generally so I had a couple little thoughts about 7.6 I don't feel strongly about them and if there's a better way

15:37

to take them we can or I just don't know how to handle

15:43

procedurally okay well I think um Adam Zack yeah just to to clarify so the that

15:52

Planning Commission uh business owner um piece that that's just needs needs to come out

15:59

it it was a typo um that stayed in in the draft so and then as we we'll go

16:06

through and review these it for consistency and so that um striking the

16:12

council the aison position would also take it out here there isn't there isn't procedurally there isn't another action

16:18

that needs to be taken here um I don't think there's um need for it

16:26

Angie thank you um my only comment is that um with Goal seven

16:35

striking the words the Regulatory and changing any unnecessary burden I notice

16:42

um that I want to reject that one change

16:48

um so I I do want to put that out as a possible point of discussion um and

16:56

recognize that it doesn't materially shift how the city is going to be um

17:03

implementing this plan I just recognize that changing it from regulatory reducing regulatory burden um is a

17:10

pretty specific goal uh and oftentimes most of us would like to reduce regulatory burden in most of our areas

17:18

um when we change it from regulatory to any unnecessary it becomes a lot more

17:24

vague and a lot less directive um and for the sake of a efficiency I think

17:30

keeping that one as it was um is probably important um but I'm not I'm

17:37

not necessarily willing to hijack the entire conversation um if we're all

17:43

willing to pass all of these

17:49

forward so um would you like to make an amendment or friendly Amendment to the

17:57

um 's motion to pass all but goal seven and visit

18:08

that yes I would like to make a friendly amendment to pass all but goal seven is

18:14

there a second for that I I would second but I I have a

18:21

clarifying question before I second okay so by when we say goal seven does that

18:28

is does that include 7.4 as well as

18:36

7.6 or or would we just be talking about

18:44

7.4 I Angie you want to clarify that but I understood what you were saying is just that one line item go seven go

18:52

seven yeah I'm pointing to just goal seven yeah

19:00

uh second okay uh Carolyn uh and

19:06

um can't remember who second it I did you did okay um are you comfortable with

19:14

that oh oh I'm sorry I I seconded commissioner

19:20

bazo's right no I'm referring to the original motion Carolyn made commission

19:27

goals right have you called on me chair yes

19:32

Carolyn I'm asking you and uh Chris whether you're will accept that

19:39

Amendment well I just have to point out that I'm completely able unable to follow this discussion because it's not

19:45

up on the screen I I don't know what we're looking at could we get the text of our uh you know this table number one

19:52

on the screen so we can know what we're talking about yeah so that's my first problem so

19:59

I'm really not even quite ready to even address the question because I need to see the

20:06

text and maybe while he's getting up on the screen I would ask when we have a friendly amendment when we have an

20:12

amendment to an amendment don't we need to take a vote on that we have to vote on the amendment

20:19

first but you have to I believe you have to accept the friendly Amendment oh well

20:25

let me look at the I think chair if I may yeah

20:31

um we don't vote on friendly amendments right um if we are making an

20:41

amendment and voting on that Amendment you need to wait until you've voted on

20:46

the main Amendment and then you can vote on the amendment to the

20:53

motion the other option would be

20:58

the the individuals that made the original motion and the second can choose

21:06

to incorporate those suggested changes into the

21:13

motion it it really just depends on the body but I but we don't vote on friendly amendments
friendly amendments really is

21:21

a as a formal term form term for I I'd like to suggest that we modify the

21:28

original motion and if everybody agrees on that then you can vote on it if you

21:35

don't agree on it then you do then you proceed with your vote on the original

21:41

motion and then somebody can choose to amend the original motion right and that's why I
was asking Carolyn and

21:48

Chris if they would accept that okay okay I'm glad we're all on the same page

21:53

thank you no we are yeah so if I understand the um

21:59

uh request to change the amendment we're talking about pulling number seven out of the
table and dealing with that

22:06

separately is that correct correct yeah I'm fine with that okay

22:11

Chris I'm fine with dealing with it separately I want to keep the unnecessary in but uh if if
you're

22:17

talking about pulling it out and talking about it that's fine if we're talking about uh changing
it then and I would be

22:23

against it but yeah you can pull it out yeah that's all we're talking about okay okay

22:29

uh Adam you hit U you had a comment oh actually a quick

22:36

question on policy number 124 parking credits um could someone please refresh

22:44

my memory on that is that yeah um bottom

22:50

of the table I I can I can add I think that was something I suggested at some

22:55

point was uh I think the idea you know if you want to add spaces for people to park one way to do it is build more

23:01

spaces another way might be to work with private property owners to have some

23:08

spaces made available to public use and do that and uh through some sort of

23:14

parking credit but it's the idea of creating parking without building more parking and you know just something to

23:20

think about in terms of the overall context of how we deal with the parking problem okay thanks thanks for the

23:26

clarification uh Victor so two things and I'm happy to pick one

23:35

and then come back if if need be uh one I I would also like to propose 7.6 be

23:43

removed for discussion as well um I look at that ad hoc committee and it's uh

23:52

incredibly developer heavy um and that that's exactly what

23:58

got us into this problem in the Town Center in the first place and uh I'm not

24:04

supportive of that so do you want that as an amendment

24:10

or how another amendment or yeah I would treat it right now as as a a request for

24:18

friendly Amendment and see if there's a if the

24:23

um and Deb uh do we need a second for a friendly Amendment or

24:29

not no sir there's there's not a second to Friendly amendments at this point we're just I
qualifying our motion I

24:37

think qualifying that's a very good way to put you're qualifying your motion yeah so I'm
happy to pull out 7.6 I mean

24:44

we can talk about it Carolyn you okay with that you know I'm okay with this but I I I really
wonder why we're not

24:52

looking at what we're working with on the screen uh is that something I'm doing on my end
here but I can't see

24:58

what we're talking about can we keep it up on the screen like we usually

25:03

do I I can pull it back up I I'd taken it down um because usually as as folks

25:11

are discussing it's better to see each other but I can I can share the screen well I I will not be able to follow any

25:17

discussions if I can't read what we're talking about all right here's here's the table

25:23

okay so what is it where we pulled out number seven goal seven and number Victor wants to remove 7.6 for further

25:31

discussion correct y yeah I'm fine with that okay talk about it separately that's

25:37

good any further discussion on the original

25:44

motion or picture do you have is that a new hand or an old hand NOP uh no it's

25:49

actually my hand keeps going down and I don't know why that is um I i' had a

25:55

second question if it's okay I'd like to ask commissioner GS just for clarification on parking credits in

26:01

exchange for

26:07

what I remember Adam and I talked about a little bit I think the uh some sort of

26:13

uh I think bot Tex thing or I guess people would have to explore it that uh

26:18

you know but to do something from the city's point of view to make it worthwhile for private property owners

26:24

to Make spaces available but uh you I guess at this point I see it as a high level suggestion that just opening it up

26:31

is a possibility but I don't think I'm quite ready to make the plan

26:38

yet if we're not ready to make the plan can we pull that as

26:51

well that's uh up to Carolyn and Chris I don't know what number you're talking

26:57

about 12.4 12.4 7 7.4 12.4 12 12.4 okay

27:04

let's scroll down can you scroll down Adam uh Z so we can see the whole thing thank

27:09

you yeah I I don't mind pulling out that that to talk about later I would really prefer getting a vote taken on what we

27:15

are gonna uh adopt and then just pull that out and then we can can talk about it sounds

27:22

good okay no further discussion uh let's vote on the main motion which which is

27:29

adopting uh table one minus goal 7 7.6

27:35

and 12.4 Deb do you want to do the roll call

27:40

please yes sir just one

27:47

moment while I pivot between

27:53

documents okay uh commissioner bazo I hi

27:59

commissioner RIS hi chair Murphy hi commissioner bman I commissioner

28:08

gills hi and vice chair Rego hi thank you okay motion passes

28:16

unanimously uh let's uh go back to goal

28:21

seven and the question of the modified language there taking

28:27

out the reg the Regulatory and replacing it with any

28:33

unnecessary um Andie you want to speak to that since that was your

28:39

request yeah I would actually like to make a motion to um reject the edit in

28:47

the table uh and keep the goal as written

28:52

originally second

28:58

Chris yeah I guess for me you know I like to I feel like in the world there's a sense that regulation is bad and I

29:05

like to think that it's not and that uh we want to reduce unnecessary regulation

29:10

and it could be you know any unnecessary regulatory burden but I don't see that

29:16

reducing regulation just for the sake of is always a good thing as we saw where

29:21

the train crashed or the whatever I mean people like oh gosh what happened to all those regulations so I don't think it's

29:27

a big deal if everybody else wants to go back to the original language great but that's I think it's the right the right

29:36

result Victor or um Adam excuse me um

29:41

yeah I like the going back to the original I think unnecessary is too subjective and Regulatory burden I think

29:49

encompasses you know burden implies that it's un I think it's a higher standard

29:56

than unnecessary so I'm I'm supportive of re rejecting the

30:03

edit Barn yes I agree with Chris on this one um I don't consider regulations to

30:09

be a burden uh they're just how we function Pro um positively in our

30:16

communities and our nation to to live together and get things done so um

30:21

reducing the regulatory burden is an assumption that there you know there there is that it's a burden at this

30:28

point so I I'm in favor of speaking that you know anything unnecessary should be

30:33

pulled out and and regulation do sometimes have unnecessary baloney in them and they should be cleaned up but

30:41

um I I prefer the addit vict turn so I've spoken to a

30:48

number of businesses um about what it's like to start a business on RAR Island and I'll say that you know while

30:54

regulations have a place um obviously um here on Mercer Island we have a

31:03

disproportionate amount of regulatory burden that makes it difficult to open a

31:08

business on merer island and let's keep in mind that this is an economic development plan that's designed to

31:14

encourage Economic Development um I recently talked to the yoga studio that

31:19

just opened up here um they had a hard time opening up because of the regulatory burden you talk to uh

31:27

someone such as um Joe Kennedy at barrels where you know just trying to

31:35

get some sidewalk seating uh he ran into a huge amount of regulatory burden talk

31:41

to any business owner that wants to put a sign up the regulatory B burden is

31:46

enormous so um I am very very supportive of this uh

31:54

Amendment Caroline

31:59

uh you're on

32:05

mute I already spoke so I think that's sufficient thank you uh Angie do you

32:12

wna address this again before we vote I just want to say that um I I absolutely

32:20

acknowledge and agree that there needs to be regulations those are important components of applying consistency in

32:27

policies um and especially if we're going to grow our economy um so I I do

32:35

want to acknowledge the way I read the statement isn't so that we're eliminating burden but simply reducing

32:41

um I do think it would be important for the city to actively reduce the

32:47

regulatory burden especially when those burdens become so complicated which I

32:53

think has been some of the feedback we're getting that um it starts to narrow who's interested in opening IMM

33:00

merer Island and what I wouldn't want to see happen is too much regulatory complexity that favors corporations and

33:07

others who can afford to dodge and weave and and suddenly we have a lot of strip

33:13

malls with um chains because the burden the regulatory burden was too great for

33:21

small mom and pop shops so to the extent that we're at least just trying to create language

33:28

um that helps support it is the regulations that either promote or prevent um the variety within the

33:35

economic environment uh and the more complex it gets the more it favors the big guys and so I just acknowledge

33:42

especially given our business ecosystem um that the specificity around

33:48

regulatory rather than just unnecessary is important yeah it doesn't say

33:53

eliminate um and I don't think we should eliminate regulation but reducing it to favor a variety of of

34:02

potential economic mixes is important Carolyn final comments yeah I

34:10

did have something I wanted to add um I just think as we go through this this

34:15

Economic Development element and all the elements that we you know go through with this comp plan Amendment we really

34:20

have to be careful about subjective descriptions of uh you know what is too

34:26

much or not enough regulation I mean it's it's um it's it's a subjective call by people who are speaking about

34:34

it

34:39

okay the question before us the motion is to delete the edit and go back to the

34:46

original text which is reads the city actively reduces the reg regulatory

34:53

burden Etc so Deb do you want to call the

34:59

rooll thank you commissioner

35:06

Bozman nay commissioner rashis

35:14

I commissioner batazo I commissioner

35:24

Gils I'm sorry commissioner Gail oh sorry

35:31

nay Cher Murphy hi and vice chair reum

35:39

hi that's four in support motion passes 4- two let's move

35:47

on to

35:54

7.6 who wants to speak to that uh I'm happy to speak to

36:00

it so um and as I stated

36:07

um the at so while I'm

36:13

supportive of the edit which is the business owner planning

36:20

commissioner um I believe you do need some sort of business ownership

36:26

representation on this you've got

36:32

three Builder developer industry types here

36:39

and a city council local business liaison who is most likely unfamiliar

36:46

with uh the intricacies of business and so um I think that takes us to a

36:54

situation that got us to where our town center is today which was no business

36:59

representation very developer

37:07

heavy so basically as I understand Victor you're saying just drop this

37:12

whole thing uh yeah that would that would actually

37:19

be not a bad idea okay uh or or or or or create

37:27

create create more business representation in your ad hoc committee whichever
whichever one people have more

37:34

stomach for car when I first heard you heard um was

37:42

Victor was describing I thought he was talking about leaving the phrase in the b a business
owner and remove the word

37:49

planning commissioner I think this would be strengthened by including a business

37:54

owner and just and just delete the part about the planning Commissioners would that help
I like the whole proposal as

38:02

is I hate to delete the whole thing but I'd like to see some business owner representation on
it

38:08

certainly how do people feel about

38:17

that Adam I'm I'm kind of leaning towards my

38:22

my gut feeling would be scratch all of 76 um I'd be happy to put forth that

38:33

motion does that mean you're making that motion or I I will make a motion to

38:39

strike 76 in its entirety okay second motion has been made and seconded

38:47

to drop 7.6 any further

38:52

discussion I'm sorry chair I didn't hear a second did somebody second that

38:59

repeat who that is I'm sorry thank you so much two of our

39:05

commissioners sound very similar so I need to

39:14

verify uh Carolyn yeah um you know I think this

39:21

the concern with this um proposal

39:27

you know that it didn't have sufficient business owner representation um is where we started

39:33

but now we're talking about you know deleting the entire concept which is is a much bigger topic um you know I think

39:41

we do it it is a good idea to look at adaptive reuse of commercial real estate and that is a complicated topic and I

39:48

think it's really a good idea to have this kind of discussion going on and

39:54

some participants identified um including a business representative um and and leave the in

40:01

it it's it's not harmful and it could be helpful so they they whatever they come

40:06

up with has to be submitted through the docket process so if it's not found favorable by the Planning Commission or

40:13

city council it doesn't go anywhere but I think the discussions are really important to have and this group should

40:18

be retained uh

40:24

Angie um if I'm interpreting 7.6 to support the overall goal of number seven

40:31

and if we just accepted that the goal is to reduce unne to reduce the regulatory

40:37

burden um one of the things that it looks like to me is that

40:43

7.6 very specifically tells the city how to do that related to um commercial de

40:51

uh commercial reuse by convenient and ad hoc committee now I absolutely agree

40:56

with with commissioner Bozman and probably others that it needs to be a very active conversation to include a

41:01

variety of opinions and perspectives but I think that I believe that the city is

41:08

capable of coming up with a number of different possibilities and opportunities without necessarily having

41:13

us try and direct it very specifically through this particular Avenue I agree it should be debated I agree there needs

41:20

to be a variety or a balance of people there and I think the city is probably capable staff are probably capable of

41:27

putting together a committee without having it articulated here specifically um so I I am in support of

41:33

the amendment to eliminate it

41:39

Adam I yeah I think it's we're overp specifying this I think I'm looking at

41:45

our you know the the let's talk list of docket proposals I mean I I see one

41:51

there already from a developer if if I'm interpreting it correctly uh so this is kind of you know there's already a a

41:58

pathway for a developer to bring forth some um docketing proc a docket

42:06

submission so this is just you know this committee is duplicative um so yeah that that's kind of my thinking on why I'll

42:13

support removing

42:18

76 yeah I I have one comment on I think

42:23

it's a an attempt to Institute uiz a process to deal with a specific

42:32

type of issue um and whether that requires something in the comp plan or

42:40

not or we rely on the city uh staff and

42:46

docket proposals to bring that forward uh is really the question do we want to

42:52

institutionalize that in this way uh in this specific specific

42:58

way any other

43:04

thoughts okay well there's motion to drop 7.6 uh should we take a roll

43:16

call chair Murphy

43:24

I commissioner gills hi Vice chair RAB

43:30

I commissioner bazo I commissioner Bozman hi and

43:38

commissioner rashis hi okay motion passes

43:46

unanimously on to 12.4 um chair if I could there's there's

43:53

another issue needing deliberation on 12 for and I've got that in my slide deck so I can we can do it kind of all at the

44:00

same time oh okay yeah that probably makes more sense yeah let me get that slide deck

44:07

pulled up here um all right

44:15

so um well we've already got this process down now for further deliberations so the first uh policy

44:21

marked out for further deliberations is policy 7.1 f um it was a proposal to add reducing

44:30

greenhouse gas emissions to this list of um things to address with an audit of

44:37

the commercial development

44:50

code Andy I want to make a motion to accept

44:55

the edit proposed in 7.1

45:00

F second okay motion has been made and

45:08

seconded do you want to speak to the motion Andy before I have others weigh

45:15

in uh I think I think it speaks for itself other than it's

45:20

simply uh adding language to tie this particular element to greenhouse gas

45:27

emissions um and at least

45:33

evaluating Carolyn um I'd just like to ask uh I didn't understand what we did with 12.4

45:40

under table one we're going to review it at when we get to 12.4 in this group

45:48

thank

45:54

you any other comments or questions on the

46:01

amendment or the uh proposal that has been

46:07

tabled Deb you want to do a roll call vote

46:18

here commissioner Bozman

46:24

I Vice chair rig

46:32

Nate chair Murphy

46:37

I commissioner gills I commissioner Richies

46:45

name and commissioner bazo

46:51

I vote passes 4 two

46:59

all right the next change is to policy 7.3 um or the next proposed change um

47:06

and it is um essentially pulling in the uh climate action plan project manager

47:13

into the group that will develop uh annual docket recommendations um as

47:24

needed Carolyn I move that we uh adopt this

47:30

change second okay it's been moved and seconded

47:36

any discussion Carolyn you want to speak to your motion sure um process and code

47:44

improvements which is what this this paragraph is about will take input from

47:50

many City staff depending on the nature of the proposal uh Transportation staff

47:55

regarding bicycle and pedestrian plans parking arts and culture uh people with

48:01

those responsibilities utilities so I don't really think that it makes sense to just make a special mention of the

48:08

climate Action project manager when there's going to be many many staff coming in about many different things

48:15

should I don't think we should try to list

48:21

them so um I think there's a little bit of

48:26

confusion I thought you were proposing to accept the edit that would let me see

48:34

if I've made a mistake here

48:39

um oh I'm sorry um I'm sorry yes

48:45

I um just let me read this for a moment

48:52

here oh I'm sorry yeah yes

49:01

see okay I'm sorry I withdraw my

49:07

motion okay do we have a motion relating to

49:13

7.3 BR move for the uh including the climate action plan project manager and

49:20

deliberations on the code improvements

49:27

we have a second second okay moved and seconded um

49:34

I would make one comment um for Adam Zach uh this references the council

49:41

local business lays on to so that should be taken out in the editing process yes

49:51

so the the the motion to approve has has been or a motion to approve this change

49:59

has been made and seconded do we have any further discussion Carolyn do you now want to readdress your

50:08

point uh sure yeah I think I think you already heard my point it's just um okay

50:14

St in Reverse but am I hearing you say that you're we need to delete the phrase and council local business Le on as well

50:21

that's been delet that's been deleted throughout that position no longer exist yes so we need to amend the motion then

50:28

right well I don't think so because that's really in the purview of the uh

50:34

cleanup edits that Adam will do okay I just want to make sure he was aware of

50:41

that uh Victor uh I'll just say plus one to

50:47

Caroline's earlier comments I agree okay Adam um since we have multiple changes

50:54

could we just have a read of what we will be what the motion is the text um

51:03

that the motion is covering sh if

51:09

if this is what I have slash propose for

51:16

clarity uh given that this is the document in front of you uh is to adopt

51:21

the amendment to policy number 7.3 and remove quote and council local business

51:30

liaison I think it's important since this is the document that was included in your uh agenda

51:38

packet that were clear that even though that's been removed previously yeah no

51:46

sorry the actual motion that is in front of us that we're talking about is to

51:51

accept the language uh accept the deletion of the

51:56

word dedicated and the insertion of the climate action plan manager into

52:05

7.3 that's the motion that's been made um

52:12

or I'm sorry the motion that's been made is yeah is to to include those

52:22

changes okay I'm my apologies I was working off of yeah no you're how we have presented

52:30

the or how we've worded this previously but that's okay we're saying the same thing just two different ways that's

52:36

that's sort of my fault because I confuse you by raising the local business layers on point for Adam Zach

52:44

so but back to the original uh point of the issue is

52:50

uh the motion to accept the change change language language um and I think

52:59

now we can have a roll call vote on that okay and for for my um sake as your

53:07

recorder I have a motion by GS seconded by bazo to accept the deletion of quote

53:15

unquote dedicated and accept the

53:22

insertion quote action plan project

53:28

manager climate action plan project manager thank you

53:40

yeah do policy number 7.3 and remove quote and council local business

53:53

liaison you can delete that last part that'll be dealt with later the the

53:58

sorry Deb the the liaison part is not part of the motion it's it's something

54:04

that I just need to do it doesn't need to be it wasn't part of the original

54:11

motion

54:22

okay okay if we are able with what I have presented I'll proceed with the

54:28

vote the roll call vote commissioner bazo

54:36

nay commissioner gills hi Vice chair

54:42

RAB nay commissioner Richies

54:50

nay commissioner Bozman nay

54:56

and by and excuse me chair Murphy nay motion

55:05

fails okay next one Adam

55:11

yeah all right so I ask one question just clarify are we leaving dedicated in

55:18

I guess no that was I think I think by the motion

55:26

by the motion failing it is I think there's can be a new motion that that

55:31

removes it I I would like to propose a motion to

55:37

only remove dedicated and of course not add cap project manager to

55:43

73 second okay motion's been moved in second and any further

55:54

discussion Carolyn would you please read the motion then again

55:59

please uh the motion is to Simply strike the word dedicated from

56:12

7.3 okay so climate Action project manager is already struck yeah it's not

56:18

no yes it was not added cor could you just read the whole the whole statement

56:23

as it's going that we're voting on here please it would be evaluate additional

56:30

process or code improvements on an annual basis with input from the economic development

56:37

staff um this yeah this evaluation should

56:44

inform the development of annual docket recommendations as needed this council

56:50

local business liaison pieces is done okay

57:02

yeah any further discussion Carolyn is that an old hand

57:07

that's an old hand yeah okay let's do the

57:14

vote just one moment please while I catch up with the voting and the Motions

57:21

to ensure that I'm capturing everything correctly if I could please have

57:27

somebody restate who made the motion and seconded it uh the motion was made by

57:33

Adam by Vice chair RB and seconded by commissioner

57:38

resis thank

57:47

you commissioner boesman hi Vice chair Ricky hi

57:57

shair Murphy hi commissioner Gils

58:03

hi commissioner RIS I and commissioner Bozman oh I already voted I'm sorry I

58:11

commissioner bazo then I thank you motion

58:22

passes all right the next uh proposed amendment is a new um a new policy under

58:30

7.7 um that reads study allowing smallscale retail outside the existing

58:36

commercial districts um there's also so I guess it's worth

58:44

pointing out that there's also a proposed new 10.5 that addresses the

58:49

same issue um and so I think we can we can look at whether or

58:55

not you want to keep both or only want to keep one so here's

59:01

10.5 that reads review residential development standards and consider addition of small neighborhood

59:07

establishments such as cafes and small boutique grocery so those are both kind

59:13

of addressing the same thing um here I'll go back to

59:18

7.7 um and we'll turn it over to you

59:26

um not sure whose hand came up first but Carolyn

59:31

um yeah I this one's a little bit complicated because we're talking about two different proposed policies but uh

59:38

my approach to this would be to move to adopt this one and not adopt the other

59:44

one and I have some talking points to that that I could go through in a

59:49

discussion if we were to take that as a motion

59:57

uh you can make that motion okay I I move that we adopt um this proposed

1:00:04

policy um and not adopt the other one so I I

1:00:11

guess what I'm proposing is to have this discussion all at once if that doesn't work chair I will just move to adopt

1:00:17

this policy as is whichever you will work better for the commission now let's

1:00:22

see if we get a second for ad opting this policy

1:00:34

okay second okay I understood the motion it's

1:00:39

the second motion then just adopt this policy and nothing about 10.5 is that your motion Caroline yes

1:00:47

okay point of clarification chair Murphy

1:00:53

yes commissioner Batman's motion is to adopt

1:00:58

policy 7.77 and nothing about not adopting

1:01:03

something else correct yes correct thank you okay that's been moved in second and

1:01:11

do we have discussion Adam uh yeah I am strongly opposed to

1:01:17

both of these I mean first off you know people complain about our town center not being walkable and

1:01:25

that's that's you know partly caused my understanding because of a lack of

1:01:30

density within the Town Center um so you start sprinkling you know we don't even

1:01:35

have a a d you know dense enough for critical mass in our town center so why

1:01:42

would we you know if we're trying if we're trying to develop our town center why are we starting to sprinkle stuff

1:01:47

everywhere else and then I think even more impactful than that is

1:01:55

just even studying adding smallscale retail in in residential areas like that

1:02:01

completely destroys the residential zoning right because you can't have only

1:02:06

specific Lots um have the ability to have these the small scale retail right because

1:02:13

that would be a spot zone so I mean essentially you're opening the door to retail anywhere in the entire Island so

1:02:21

I am absolutely opposed to both of these These are dangerous

1:02:26

policies B um if it's possible to be more opposed

1:02:32

to this policy than Adam is than than I am um this um so first first and foremost

1:02:41

zoning is the third rail of M Island politics and as Adam says the discussion

1:02:47

of um putting retail in residential

1:02:54

is absolutely ludicrous I'm completely unsupportive of

1:03:04

this uh

1:03:09

Chris I guess I'm not sure if I'm in favor or against you know I think there are good arguments both ways for me the

1:03:15

study idea is a good idea I think it's a you know something that people have asked for that you know just came from public comment and that uh you know the

1:03:23

idea of having a yoga student that uh that's walkable to people you know is there someplace in Island Crest

1:03:29

that could be have a corner grocer that people could walk to that you didn't have to be so car dependent you know I see some attraction to that and and I

1:03:36

think it merits uh someone to take a look at it um you know recognizing there may be some strong arguments against it

1:03:41

and at the end of the day it might not happen but uh I'm not afraid to have it

1:03:48

studied Carn um I would uh second what what Chris has

1:03:55

said I think um studying it is not uh so frightening um I think we should let a

1:04:02

public process decide whether small scale retail by the way this is small scale retail is something that people

1:04:09

want rather than us trying to decide that that even can't even be discussed so I do think letting it go forward as a

1:04:15

study is is letting people give input and letting us consider something quite

1:04:21

new and again it's very small scale retail it's referring to um and it again it allows people to um

1:04:28

you know do some easy socializing at a small coffee shop or something in their neighborhoods without getting into their

1:04:34

vehicle um so I think I think it's something to consider um I would like to

1:04:40

point out that this proposed policy um actually incorporates

1:04:45

everything that's in 10.5 but just says it more concisely so that would be why I would be in favor of

1:04:52

this one um but we can talk about that later as we get to 10.5

1:05:00

Angie um yeah I acknowledge that there's a diversity of perspectives across the

1:05:06

island about um residential what we allow in residential and Commercial zones um I I can certainly hear it in

1:05:15

opinion and across this particular commission it doesn't sound like anyone's ready to recommend that we

1:05:20

change the zoning um but I think that is where studying something so that we have

1:05:27

more information when the time comes to review it again is a reasonable um shall

1:05:32

I say compromise and so uh I do support studying and and exploring ideas further

1:05:39

um I don't necessarily support um reviewing and considering changes uh

1:05:46

without first studying things so thank you Carolyn did you have

1:05:52

another comment or is that an I'm I'm I'm sorry I'll I'll get that hand down Adam do you have a new comment or

1:06:00

is that uh yeah I mean

1:06:06

sorry is that go ahead I I guess I'll say yeah I mean I think even studying it

1:06:12

is just opening the door opening a Pandora's Box and this reminds me of a book I read when I was like in

1:06:18

kindergarten or something if you give a mous a cookie they're just going to keep asking so studying is the beginning of a

1:06:24

slippery slope so I'm strongly opposed well I'm going to weigh in on

1:06:30

this one um I recognize the concerns

1:06:36

that Victor and and anim have expressed about there being a lot of vocal and

1:06:42

strong opposition to this down the road but I think the key word here is study

1:06:49

uh and when you consider that we're going to be required by the state state to increase density outside of the um

1:06:58

immediate uh core uh that this is something that might make sense to be

1:07:05

examined and studied hand inand with that um so I would be in favor of

1:07:11

this so let's do a roll

1:07:17

call Adam another comment may I just add to your comment

1:07:22

about the you know 1110 requiring us to um you know increase density outside

1:07:30

of the Town Center that's increasing residential density so this would actually work counter to that

1:07:36

correct I I don't agree with that okay I just thought I'd throw that out there

1:07:42

thank you Deb commissioner

1:07:49

bman I Shar Murphy I commissioner Gils

1:07:57

I commissioner riam no commissioner bazo

1:08:04

I and commissioner rashis n motion passes 4

1:08:14

two okay ad I'm Zach yes so you'll see

1:08:21

policy 10.5 is is largely uh similar to 7.7 um so I I think we've had the

1:08:30

discussion on this one I'll turn it over to you

1:08:37

you um Angie did we skip 10.1 are we just

1:08:43

resolving 10.5 first and then going to 10.1 we're just resolving 10.5 first

1:08:50

thank you

1:09:04

Adam Vice chair rag your sorry that was old old hand old hand apologist Carolyn

1:09:12

yeah I move that we delete this because

1:09:18

everything it says well I don't need to explain why I move that we delete this second yeah
it's been moving and

1:09:24

seconded any more discussion beyond what we've

1:09:31

had Carolyn did you want to add something your hands still up I'm very sorry I'll try to do better on that

1:09:37

thank you okay no discussion uh to be had Let's uh do the roll

1:09:47

call may I ask who made the second it was commissioner gills sorry no that's

1:09:53

quite all right I just okay motion was made by bson

1:10:02

seconded by Gils to delete policy number 10.5 and uh commissioner Gils h i Shar

1:10:10

Murphy hi commissioner rashis I commissioner

1:10:16

bazo I commissioner Bozman hi and vice chair raagam I motion pass is

1:10:29

60 all right so the next uh proposed amendment is to strike um policy

1:10:36

10.1 um policy 10.1 reads emphasize quality of life as a Corner Stone of the

1:10:44

Mercer Island economy

1:10:52

rris you're muted so you know I guess for me I find

1:10:58

the quality of life concept you know relatively marginally related to the business development side of things you

1:11:05

know it's my personal view I also think it's very vague for some people quality of life is you know Big Lot big

1:11:11

houses and lots of space and other people want a real diverse you know action filled Community with you know

1:11:19

and so I'm not sure it really gives a lot of guidance to what that means you know it's the eye and the beholder and

1:11:25

frankly for me it has a bit of an exclusionary feel to it that uh that makes me a little uncomfortable so on

1:11:31

balance you I haven't tried to excise it from the entire document there's a lot of quality of life we talk about but I'm

1:11:37

not sure I want to make it the Cornerstone of our economy so I would strike this I'll second

1:11:44

that okay motion been made and

1:11:51

seconded Victor so um I support striking this I don't

1:11:59

know what purpose it serves uh I've been on the receiving end of the former comp plan and I know

1:12:07

that all kinds of unintended consequences happen from it and people latch on to things that probably

1:12:16

weren't intended to be latched onto and so anything extraneous I'm all for getting rid of this feels incredibly

1:12:23

extraneous I don't know what purpose it serves Can this is exceedingly vague

1:12:29

and I don't think it gives anything useful or guidance to our staff or future Commissioners or yeah

1:12:39

okay any other comments Deb you want to do a roll call

1:12:48

vote the motion is to delete to strike the entire Poli poliy

1:12:55

10.1 I have that that motion was made by commissioner gills and seconded by both

1:13:01

commissioner boatsman correct okay commissioner Rick

1:13:07

GES I chair Murphy

1:13:13

I commissioner Bozman I commissioner bazo I commissioner GS I and vice chair

1:13:23

r i motion passes 60

1:13:29

okay on to 12.4 we are at 12.4 um so here um the deliberation

1:13:37

piece of this as shown in the memo was just to about striking this last

1:13:43

sentence but um there's still it's still unresolved whether or not this this other

1:13:48

insertion um addition to the element or the policy um um should be made so we

1:13:55

can we can have one motion to amend as as uh um as presented or if you want to

1:14:03

take each piece of those individually uh we can we can do that too um however how

1:14:09

we'd like to proceed yeah I think to avoid confusion let's take each piece

1:14:15

separately and let's start with the parking credits

1:14:20

so Angie yeah I'd like to make a motion to reject

1:14:26

the addition of that entire set of text through a combination of regulations and incentives like parking credits motion

1:14:34

to reject that insertion second yeah the motion's been made and

1:14:40

seconded to eliminate the entire text insertion starting with through and

1:14:47

going through credits and it's been seconded okay discussion uh Chris yeah as I said you

1:14:55

know my thought was really just to you know raise the possibility of you know allowing um to to respond to the parking

1:15:03

need by you know creating uh parking on private property um you know I don't

1:15:08

think it's necessary and if people feel strongly that it's does not a good idea to have it here I don't you know I don't

1:15:14

I'm not gonna it's not that big I don't think it's that big a deal but uh it is just sort of a placeholder to you know

1:15:21

broaden the discussion when people talk about parking and not forget about the you know maybe a different approach than

1:15:27

typically thought of Angie I you know I do want to

1:15:32

acknowledge uh commissioner gs's intent and I do think that it's important um

1:15:39

that we're evaluating like what are those regulations what are those incentives what are those things we're

1:15:44

doing um to ensure sufficient parking uh so I want to acknowledge I think it's

1:15:50

important for us to look at what are we doing um I'm just not sure that this language in this location is the right

1:15:57

location um I will also say that while I'm suggesting we delete this added text

1:16:03

for me it's going to be really important that we also add back the other one um because it's important not to lead to a

1:16:09

reduction in parking unless that so that's important to me uh

1:16:15

I went along with this particular breaking up of those things but it makes sense to delete this text to me as long

1:16:21

as I have the opportunity to retain the deleted text later on in the

1:16:30

statement uh Carolyn I think it's um you know really important to uh you know include in the

1:16:38

comp plan that we should ensure that sufficient parking is provided but I think kind of ties the hands of staff

1:16:45

and people working on this to try to say how it should be done so I just believe it should be just left open and um again

1:16:53

good ideas that Chris has brought up here but um better to leave it

1:16:58

flexible Victor um incentives like parking credits are incredibly vague and

1:17:04

I think again can lead to unintended consequences and big giveaways uh I'm not supportive and and

1:17:12

I support commissioner bazo's comments as well in in their

1:17:21

entirety yeah I'm I'm going to make one comment I do think it's overly prescriptive and implies that those are

1:17:29

things that are to be done and to the exclusion of others and as such it's not

1:17:35

necessary or appropriate okay Deb should we take a

1:17:45

vote the motion the motion is to delete the entire underlined insertion in 12.4

1:17:53

and I have that that motion was made by bazo and seconded by RAB

1:17:59

yes okay commissioner Bozman hi chair Murphy

1:18:09

I commission rishes um I we're we're voting to not

1:18:17

include this correct yes correct all right all right

1:18:24

commissioner Gils hi commissioner vazo I and Comm and vice

1:18:31

chair RAB hi thank

1:18:39

you okay the next issue the motion passes that language is deleted and the

1:18:46

next question is the inclusion or exclusion of the

1:18:51

language at the end interpretation of the policies of this element should not

1:18:56

lead to a reduction in parking do I have a motion

1:19:01

Carolyn yes I move that we delete the last sentence as

1:19:10

shown second okay the motion's been moved and

1:19:16

seconded you want to speak to the motion Carolyn with now that your hands up yes please yes please um

1:19:23

there may be a day when uh less parking is needed and again in keeping with what

1:19:28

we did to the first part of this draft policy I don't think we should tie the Hands by um precluding flexibility to

1:19:37

meet future conditions we've already said that we ensure sufficient parking is provided so

1:19:45

I think we should allow for flexibility in more and less parking as time goes on

1:19:51

as to what is needed

1:19:58

Chris yeah no I agree completely and you know I think the idea is that let's just you know see what we need and make sure

1:20:05

we have enough and I don't understand why we would put this in to to to

1:20:11

dictate one result and you know one thing I read about a lot about is the world of driverless cars the people are

1:20:17

postulating there be a lot less parking needed you know that they'll open up whole swatches and you know I don't know if going to come to pass I don't know if

1:20:24

it's going to come to pass in the next 10 years but it's a possibility that could you know would' be S looking silly

1:20:29

with all these parking places and and no cars in them um so you know as I said I would I don't see what the upside of it

1:20:35

is and I would take it out Victor so as a business owner who

1:20:42

was on the receiving end of uh of a city council and a former mayor who touted

1:20:47

the the benefits of self-driving cars and all the the wonders of the of self-driving cars as they took away

1:20:54

parking Spa spaces in the Town Center I am absolutely 100% opposed to

1:21:05

this Andy um as someone who doesn't own a car

1:21:13

and so I don't necessarily always struggle with the parking situation however um as someone who works with a

1:21:20

variety of different neighborhoods in business businesses uh what I've recognized or learned is that um predominantly the

1:21:29

people who actually need cars and still need to get around to get support tend

1:21:34

to be lower and middle inome folks with families and that parking is a critical

1:21:40

piece of their ability to frequent businesses um and there are whole

1:21:46

neighborhoods that surprisingly the Waterfront in Seattle is one of those places that without parking accessible

1:21:54

um you see a reduction in families being able to use resources like the aquarium

1:21:59

or like small businesses um I do think sufficient

1:22:04

parking is important until um Transit is better developed and

1:22:11

provides more Equitable access uh I think we're on our way to that but um

1:22:17

we're still in a place where uh parking is actually an equity issue shockingly

1:22:23

um and it's more an equity issue for the people who really need to use their cars

1:22:28

than the people who just get to and want to so I I still want to support

1:22:35

um making sure that the interpretation of the policies for now don't lead to a

1:22:40

reduction until some of these awesome Technologies and opportunities that I

1:22:46

hope come in our future and help us reduce greenhous gases are also widely and equitably accessible to

1:22:55

most Chris yeah just yeah I I agree completely and you know and hence the

1:23:00

first sentence says we ensure that sufficient parking is provided and I'm just not quite sure why we need to say

1:23:06

more but I made that point so I will PPE

1:23:14

down yeah my concern is this is the

1:23:19

point that Chris just made seems to be at odd with the language in the last

1:23:26

sentence that is you ensure adequate parking or sufficient parking but yet

1:23:32

you say that we can't interpret the policy to reduce parking um so there seems to be a bit of

1:23:40

a a contradiction there um number two um

1:23:46

I'm not terribly enamored with the idea that we're going to have self-driving cars um all that quickly

1:23:53

uh I share commissioner bazo's comments about

1:23:58

accessibility I view it through a different lens given that I'm disabled parking is a big deal for me personally

1:24:06

uh and adequate parking is a big deal for me personally um so you know I I'd

1:24:12

love to see more parking but I my concern is that this is a document that

1:24:18

is intended to last or govern things for 10 years and A lot's going to

1:24:26

change in 10 years um hopefully for the positive um and so I'm a bit concerned

1:24:34

that that including this seemingly contradictory

1:24:39

language uh in here um that's going to

1:24:44

to theoretically bind the city for 10 years um may not be the wisest course um

1:24:51

and some something else might be more appropriate uh to insert in there um and

1:24:59

we can maybe revisit that but um I I I have a problem with that language um

1:25:06

that's in there right

1:25:11

now any more further comments point of clarification yes the

1:25:18

motion on the table being debated that was made I Believe by boatsman is

1:25:25

to keep the existing edit strike the last

1:25:30

statement yes yes thank you no no I'm sorry I think that was incorrect I the

1:25:39

motion is to keep the last sentence to not strike it so no no that's not that's

1:25:45

not my motion my motion is to delete the sentence as shown okay on screen

1:25:58

which to clarify does not speak to the underlying portion that was already

1:26:05

addressed in the previous motion yes yes

1:26:12

correct any more

1:26:19

discussion Deb if you can call the rooll

1:26:26

CH Murphy hi commissioner

1:26:33

bazo nay commissioner gills

1:26:39

hi Vice chair rium

1:26:45

hey commissioner Bozman hi and commissioner rashis yeah

1:26:55

motion

1:27:03

fails it was a split vote what's that mean mean it was it was 3 three right

1:27:09

I'm just trying to think what it means for the screen does it mean that the deletion stays

1:27:16

or if if we move on it would mean that that the um the original language of the

1:27:24

policy would would basically stay for that last sentence so that that sentence that begins with interpretation is going

1:27:31

to stay in the draft unless an additional action is taken by the

1:27:40

body okay so we will move on to um there was a proposed policy

1:27:49

12.5 um that um propose some language about a

1:27:56

um public Plaza or public space and kind of harmonizing that with the um

1:28:04

pedestrian and bicycle facilities plan um there's a staff proposed alternative

1:28:10

to that uh proposed policy and I'm not

1:28:15

staff is not recommending one or the other it's just the the staff proposal

1:28:20

is a little bit more concise um in um well in our

1:28:28

opinion um before move on uh Angie did you have a question or

1:28:35

comment I was going to make a motion regarding this policy but for that then

1:28:42

okay um I'd like to make go ahead no you're Adam are you

1:28:49

done I am yes yeah okay go ahead I'd like to make a motion to accept the

1:28:54

staff proposed alternative I'll second

1:29:10

that okay it's been uh moved and seconded uh Carolyn you want to speak to

1:29:15

that sure um the reason I think the staff proposed alternative is better is

1:29:21

that it refers do all functional plans not just The Pedestrian and bicycle facilities plan which I think is really

1:29:27

important um and it refers to all people to create safe walking and cycling

1:29:33

routes doesn't try to say for residents for children etc etc create safe walking

1:29:38

and cycling routes for everyone and then um it does continue to include

1:29:44

connection of residential with public spaces so I think it's I think it's a better a better

1:29:50

statement any other comments Adam I I'm supportive of

1:29:56

staff's proposed alternative I think having safe roads especially given that

1:30:02

a lot of them are in some cases narrow and yeah this is I like

1:30:08

it okay seeing no further

1:30:13

hands Deb would you like to make the roll call

1:30:20

vote have a motion by commissioner bazo seconded by Bozman to accept the staff

1:30:25

proposed alternative to policy number 12.5 survey

1:30:35

says commissioner Gils hi Vice chair ream

1:30:42

hi commissioner bazo hi chair Murphy hi commissioner Bozman

1:30:51

hi I and commissioner rashis hi motion passes

1:31:00

60 right so before we get to the parking lot

1:31:05

um at when we left off in September at the last meeting um there were two

1:31:11

policies that uh commissioner Bozman accuse and vice chair ragab were going to

1:31:18

draft um and those weren't included in the memo um because I hadn't gotten the

1:31:24

draft yet so um I'm going to uh share that document and um turn it over to

1:31:32

them if they want to talk about that um in a little more detail so the first

1:31:38

one was policy 4.3 let me get my screen shared

1:31:47

here believe that was 4.2 wasn't it Adam yeah 4.2

1:31:53

too oh okay yeah sorry thanks um so Carolyn if you want or Adam

1:32:01

RAB uh if you'd like to point out where sorry I just got this before the meeting

1:32:07

so I don't know I'm glad to summarize but can you scroll up a little bit further to the top of the document thank

1:32:13

you okay all right so um may I take it uh yeah go for it okay all all right

1:32:22

so Kate and Adam and I were assed to work on policies 4.2 pointd and po

1:32:27

proposed policies 4.3a and B and so I'm going to summarize what we discussed and

1:32:34

what we concluded were good proposals to put before the commission before we got into it in any depth we discussed and

1:32:41

agreed on several principles addressing climate change could be good for economic conditions and that since the

1:32:48

cap does not clearly state that we thought we should say something like that in the

1:32:53

Ed um we might consider adding climate oriented policy to the Ed if we think

1:32:59

something is good and the cap neglected to include it conversely we would

1:33:05

typically not recommend adding climate oriented policy to the Ed if the cap adequately addresses

1:33:12

it and we also felt that mentioning to the cap here and there sort of gratuitously in unnecessary ways was

1:33:19

probably to be avoided so those are sort of guidance that we kind of gave ourselves in in moving forward on

1:33:25

drafting these policies okay moving along if you could scroll along there thank you Adam um in the previous draft

1:33:32

Adam RB had suggested deleting um policy

1:33:37

4.2 d uh with his comment 41 and I had proposed keeping it but amending it with

1:33:44

my comment number 70 now I would like to Pro point out that my comment number 70

1:33:51

was was not copied correctly into the draft so there was a lot of confusion last time what does this even say the

1:33:58

reason is because there was about six or seven words that were meant to be struck that were not struck so of course it was

1:34:05

very confusing now if you want to see that mistake you could take a quick look

1:34:11

at the Matrix at comment number 70 uh could we do that please Adam could you put comment number 70 up on the

1:34:18

screen so so we could see what the cause of the confusion was um car well I can do that I don't have

1:34:24

it like ready to go Caroline I think it might be better if we just get to the I

1:34:29

I think you have a proposed policy here if maybe you okay okay very good I can do that so um the way it would read in

1:34:37

clean copy would be as shown right here um so be guided by relevant strategies

1:34:43

in the climate action plan to reduce the potential negative effects of climate change UND doing business in the city

1:34:51

and to to attract businesses workers and customers in a warming climate by the way we added the word potential negative

1:34:57

effects that was something Adam R felt he would be more comfortable with so with that change in what I had drafted

1:35:05

previously and correcting up that little mistake that had been made before this is what we put before you for 4.2

1:35:14

pointd um should we keep going or should we well let's consider it all at once and then come back could we do that

1:35:21

there's just a few more things to do what do you think well we can discuss all of them and then we're going to

1:35:28

tackle them individually sure okay so um 4.3 I had proposed a brief Amendment and

1:35:37

it is shown there be consistent with the climate action plan State strategies

1:35:42

during Economic Development so we all agreed on that one we thought that would be better than just using the word

1:35:48

consider because it seemed to lack meaningful Direction okay scrolling along

1:35:56

4.3a um I had proposed enhance city-led

1:36:01

Street tree planting um in the right of way and promoting Street Frontage planning and

1:36:07

this was a replacement and a relocation of something Chris had proposed which was encourage the

1:36:15

planting of trees by businesses in the city's business district and I propos

1:36:21

that because I thought it was good to define the city and the property owner roles um in the interim I checked again

1:36:29

to see if the cap sufficiently addresses this topic and at this point I would

1:36:35

reverse my view because I think it does sufficiently address the tree planting um policy and um we thought

1:36:45

that the commission should delete both of these proposed policies and then address the trees and related Concepts

1:36:52

in the policies 4.3 which appear below okay so 4.3

1:36:59

B um I had proposed the underlined policy to encourage the establishment of

1:37:05

vegetated walkways and rest areas to combat heat island effect now the cap

1:37:11

doesn't say anything like this which is why I proposed it yet the proposal is rather vague so Kate and Adam

1:37:18

collaborated on further language which is presented in 4.3a and B um to Foster development of a

1:37:27

thriving business Community with an attractive Urban Tree canopy to develop a strategy to increase tree canopy in

1:37:33

the town center that is compatible with Redevelopment and infill development so

1:37:39

we wanted to propose those two policies and scratch the ones that I had proposed previously

1:37:45

there okay so that's the whole summary of our discussion about climate policies and if we could take them one by one um

1:37:53

that would be

1:37:58

helpful um if I might suggest a process for this um I think if you want to make

1:38:04

a recommendation or a a motion on 4.2d um here that that would be the way

1:38:11

that we could kind of move forward with this formally yeah so I I move that we adopt the um phrase for 4.2 D be guided

1:38:22

by relevant strategies in the climate action plan to reduce the potential negative effects of climate change on

1:38:28

doing business in the city and to attract businesses workers and customers in a warming

1:38:33

climate

1:38:39

second motion has been made and seconded to adopt the proposed

1:38:45

4.2d do we have any discussion further discussion

1:38:53

seeing Oh Carolyn you want to talk more on you seem to cover the

1:39:00

Waterfront um so the reason that I was proposing this language previously is

1:39:06

that um businesses are interested in their

1:39:11

green bottom line uh workers want to work in a place that um they can feel a

1:39:17

little more cheerful about when they go out on their lunches and um that it there that heat island effect is

1:39:26

being mitigated it's more comfortable um and and customers you know in a in a

1:39:33

place that's just a lot of concrete gets real hot and they can be affected so um

1:39:39

I think there's some some economic benefit to um to implementing our

1:39:45

climate action plan so that's s of something that the climate action plan

1:39:51

plan didn't really say and so this is why we felt we should say it

1:39:56

here Andie um I think I need some clarification um and I might

1:40:03

need uh Adam to help me um it looks to me like there's a motion on the table

1:40:11

discussing 4 two D but when I look

1:40:19

back at The Matrix of the parking lot items and the document I have goal four

1:40:27

I have two 4.2 and so I I actually before I think I

1:40:33

can vote on 42d I need to know which 42 we're working with yeah let me uh let me

1:40:39

take from Carolyn's document here that I had shared let me um let me show you

1:40:46

what this would look like in line with the text um of the of the draft here

1:40:54

so um here's that so here's there's there are two policy 4.

1:41:01

tws and that's because we hadn't resolved which would which would go

1:41:06

where or what we were doing with both um so now in line with the text Carolyn's

1:41:14

text would go

1:41:19

here

1:41:40

you can see that the the other 4.2d which you know the third one on this

1:41:45

document that's the one that did not have the did not correctly transcribe what I had suggested so um that could be

1:41:58

ignored can we clarify what the motion is on the table then because if was the previous one

1:42:05

that we ignored was it already in the document and we have to do something with it

1:42:11

or no it would essentially replace 4.2d with with this text that's highl is

1:42:21

the corrected language due to just simply a transcription error made before

1:42:26

so this is what I had proposed previously including the word potential

1:42:32

so this is what we're proposing at this point wa Angie the original 4.2d is above it

1:42:43

uh and uh lined out I'm tracking now thank you

1:42:56

okay any further thoughts

1:43:04

comments so a motion has been made and seconded to adopt the

1:43:09

4.2 pointd language on the screen that is reflects the work of the committee

1:43:18

the small committee uh and uh

1:43:23

Deb would you like to take a roll call thank you chair I have a motion uh

1:43:32

by boatsman there were two individuals that spoke for the second and I couldn't distinguish who made the

1:43:40

second seconded thank

1:43:49

you commissioner

1:43:57

rashes I commissioner bazo hi chair Murphy

1:44:06

hi commissioner Bozman I chair

1:44:11

Ram Vice chair I Vice chair thank you and commissioner Gils I thank you motion

1:44:19

passes 60 chair Murphy

1:44:27

bazo yes can we resolve the new 4.2

1:44:33

that's in the Matrix before we continue to further down 43 and all the rest of

1:44:40

the um I don't have a problem with that if that's causing confusion it's uh

1:44:47

probably good to get rid of it or address it when way or the other I'd like to make a motion then to strike the

1:44:56

new 4.2 and the Matrix that says balance economic growth with maintaining easy

1:45:02

access to services in smalltown field I would like to make a motion to strike that AI together okay do I have a second

1:45:12

second okay moved and seconded uh Chris yeah

1:45:18

I'd like to keep it um I feel like it's a an important point you know I'm not sure it goes exactly here and maybe

1:45:25

there's someplace else to go but I do feel like in our rush to address the business concerns think a lot of people

1:45:32

on this island you know like you know people talk about the quality of life in some general sense but I think the sense

1:45:38

that walking around the business district and feeling like hey this is the town that I know is important to

1:45:44

people and I just don't want that completely lost sight of so I would keep it but uh I understand that others might

1:45:51

not want to Carolyn yeah I would um like to delete this because I think that we

1:45:59

deal very significantly with access in other policies um and I think that the

1:46:05

phrase small town feel I don't really know what it means and I think it's

1:46:10

subjective um and difficult for planners to interpret um I think we are what we

1:46:16

are and our Economic Development element is a blueprint for change and I recommend we go with it without trying

1:46:23

to label it in some way any further

1:46:33

comments okay the motion to delete 4.2 that states Balan economic

1:46:41

growth with maintaining easy access to services and small town field um has been made to delete that uh

1:46:51

seconded Deb do you want to uh call the

1:46:57

rooll thank you sir commissioner Gils

1:47:04

nay Vice chair riab I commissioner bazo

1:47:12

hi chair Murphy hi commissioner rishis I and

1:47:19

commissioner Bozman I motion passes

1:47:26

51 okay we're back to

1:47:32

4.3 okay we have um you need a motion

1:47:40

on those two do new the other document

1:47:46

back up so we can see what we're moving for 4.3

1:47:51

yeah that would be good yeah can you can you see here this is from your document

1:47:57

oh okay thank you very much I see okay

1:48:03

okay I move that we oh I could do that okay okay I move that we adopt new

1:48:13

4.3a and new 4.3b or just one at a time if you prefer

1:48:19

chair uh I think these kind of go together so let's maybe put them

1:48:24

together for now okay do we have a

1:48:36

second a second okay motion has been moved and

1:48:41

seconded to adopt new 43a and 43b uh do

1:48:47

we have discussion Angie uh I can appreciate the desire to

1:48:55

enhance the environment that retail and Commercial district is in for some

1:49:03

reason given that this is the economic development plan I feel like these particular specific elements would be

1:49:11

more appropriate somewhere else in the comprehensive plan maybe as it relates to development and RightWay um

1:49:18

especially since they're talking about vegetated walkways um I I get the sense that this

1:49:24

is actually addressed elsewhere and I have some real hesitation about including it here in the economic

1:49:30

development portion of things

1:49:35

Victor so I think we've we've discussed this before and I've raised this issue

1:49:40

before I'd like to hear uh from either the people on the subcommittee or

1:49:46

whoever else is supporting this where exactly are we missing trees in in our town center um
if I look at uh the main

1:49:56

Corridor through our town center which is 78th there is a median that is full of trees there
are also trees on either

1:50:03

side of the sidewalks if we go down to 76 there are trees on the sidewalks if

1:50:09

we go over to the boy building there are trees there um there are trees on 27th

1:50:16

so where this seems to be a solution in search of a problem where exactly are we

1:50:22

missing trees

1:50:28

Carn um you know I'm gonna I these are these are some policies that Kate

1:50:33

drafted I I thought she would be here to be speaking to them but I will do my

1:50:39

best um um I guess that Victor makes a point

1:50:46

there are already uh tree trees on many streets and I I've made the point

1:50:51

earlier that the climate action plan does include clear policies about um the

1:50:57

city engaging in city-led tree planting and encouraging businesses to plant trees so um I'm afraid I I don't have

1:51:04

anything more specific to say there about it Adam I think you and Kate discussed this one a little bit back and

1:51:09

forth in email did you have anything to add or 4.3a no I think we had some stronger

1:51:17

language originally and I think then I proposed something and Kate proposed

1:51:24

something in the middle that I was amenable to Bringing before the Planning Commission yeah um so this is this is

1:51:32

kind of an in between between rather rather than the in between I'm supportive of no

1:51:38

language yeah right got that got that um so you know I would like to revise my

1:51:45

motion to consider these two policies separately I just really don't think we can do them at once um can I is the

1:51:51

second willing to go along with it that way

1:51:58

Chris yeah I guess sort of along Caroline was just saying you know you know I can't say that I know where trees

1:52:04

would go I can't say that I can't say that they can't be added because I don't know but I think you know maybe it makes

1:52:09

sense given given uh Victor's point that uh if we just took you know the first of

1:52:16

the two which is simply recognizing that we wanted you know the canopy without

1:52:21

you know specifically saying to increase the canopy you know that might be a A

1:52:26

Way Forward which would be along the lines of just doing you know doing them

1:52:32

separately uh okay so did you did you agree that we could consider these all right I guess I was the second right

1:52:38

yeah no I think I'll let one splitting them is fine okay okay all right so I'm

1:52:44

done discussing the proposal for 4.3a myself

1:52:50

but okay Deb would you like to call the

1:52:57

rooll just to clarify we are now splitting the motion for 4.3a and 4.3b

1:53:04

into two separate motions correct so this Mo this vote would be to approve

1:53:14

4.3a okay so this vote is not to split it this vote is on 4.3a corre thank you

1:53:20

thank you for the clarification I have a motion by Bozman a second by Gils to adopt new policy number

1:53:28

4.3a are we in agreement yes yes

1:53:33

okay commissioner Gils I chair Murphy

1:53:40

nay commissioner bazo nay commissioner Bozman

1:53:48

I Vice chair Ram me and commissioner rashis

1:53:55

n the Nays have it the motion

1:54:02

fails okay we have a motion for

1:54:07

4.3b I will move to adopt

1:54:13

4.3b with a change if I may do that develop a strategy to maintain tree

1:54:22

canopy in the town center that is compatible with Redevelopment and infill

1:54:34

development is that a Lou of 4.3b has

1:54:42

written I propose to adopt 4.3b with a change of one word is that okay as a

1:54:53

motion the the proposed 4.3b as proposed in your email y what's

1:55:01

highlighted on the screen right now yes that's okay this is my motion is to

1:55:07

change one word in what I'm sorry I'm sorry I'm read I'm reading the old 4.3b

1:55:13

in my screen oh I see I see okay point of

1:55:18

clarification yes go ahead

1:55:24

um is the 4.3b that is currently in the document

1:55:31

the one not highlighted below 4.3a that's the that's the 4.3b

1:55:38

currently in the document correct and I believe no no

1:55:44

these well yeah these were something I proposed a couple of months ago right so

1:55:50

there they need to be withdrawn you know if we adopt something new so you are

1:55:55

proposing to replace the existing 4.3b with new language yeah um and you

1:56:04

it sounds like you are trying to change that new

1:56:10

language like change a word on it I don't do have to do we even have to do

1:56:17

any motions and acceptance of that language or can she just propose the language to replace 4.3b because I'm I

1:56:24

think it's getting a little confusing it's her motion she can do whatever she wants so you know I am moving to adopt

1:56:31

this new language and as I explained in the previous summary the subsequent two things would be deleted we we decided we

1:56:39

we weren't proposing them I mean you could just vote to keep them if you wanted but um so no I'm proposing new

1:56:46

4.3 pointb at this point second

1:56:56

any

1:57:02

discussion Victor I agree with commissioner bazo's earlier comments

1:57:07

this belongs somewhere else in the comp plan it's not part of the economic development

1:57:14

plan Carolyn is that a new hand yes um I do think this belongs in the economic

1:57:20

development element because uh these are this is a what is the the title of this

1:57:27

goal please if you could scroll up please Adam could we see what this is this um okay so this business

1:57:37

ecosystem meets the social environmental and economic needs of residents in the future so I really feel that this is

1:57:44

something that falls into the environmental needs um and of of the residents so if we get scroll back down

1:57:50

again you know trees are part of the environmental needs of the residents in in where they where in their

1:57:55

neighborhoods as well as in their business area um and I think this policy uh

1:58:02

unlike the one we voted to delete um we're talking about maintaining tree

1:58:07

canopy and remembering that as we Redevelopment and we infill that we

1:58:13

maintain a tree canopy in the town center and I do think that's something that we should do in his defense

1:58:24

I any further

1:58:30

comments Andy well I I do want to recognize the point that commissioner

1:58:35

Bosman is making about uh ensuring that we've got an environment like quite literally the

1:58:43

physical environment um is addressing the climate that people are operating in

1:58:49

um I I do think that I do believe this actually belongs in a different development location of the

1:58:55

comprehensive plan than in the economic development

1:59:01

plan Carolyn may I ask what part of the plan that you feel it should be located

1:59:09

in you can ask that and I would like to get back to you

1:59:16

please okay they're being uh no for oh Adam um I'll say like yeah I think

1:59:24

Victor articulated that we have a nice tree canopy here um and while I

1:59:30

recognize recognize commissioner bazo's um idea that maybe there's a

1:59:36

better place in lie of another place since it's not in our climate action

1:59:41

plan I think I'm I'm supportive of 4.3 Bravo um so I think let let's put it

1:59:47

here and we can move it around later if

1:59:53

needed so just for clarity Adam you're saying that 4.3b as highlighted on the

2:00:01

screen should stay here and if we want to move it later we can that that's my

2:00:06

take on it yeah I I like the edit of maintain that tree canopy um as

2:00:11

articulated by uh commissioner asish Andy that wasn't that wasn't

2:00:18

articulated by me I'm not supportive of this it was me I

2:00:25

oh um I I think what I just want to say is in absence of having our comp plan or

2:00:31

sections memorized um I do recommend I I do recognize you know we have zoning and

2:00:38

Commercial development regulations that Exist Elsewhere um outside of the economic

2:00:44

development plan that drive these particular actions so when we encumber develop vment
or Redevelopment on

2:00:51

Parcels uh we put regulatory requirements on those development Redevelopment Parcels
there's specific

2:00:59

places where that already exists in terms of how much permeable or impermeable surface
um and canopy and so

2:01:06

you know that's why I'm looking I I'm looking at this through an econ a particular Economic
Development lens

2:01:12

which is why I'm pointing to I do think it's important I don't think it belongs here so I I'm not
trying to DOD where do

2:01:19

you think we should put it I don't have the comp plan memorized but I certain

2:01:24

that there's a there is a development standard or section that exists elsewhere that this would serve uh and

2:01:31

be a stronger component of Carm I just want to point out that

2:01:37

this is not an encumbrance on businesses or developers it's developing a strategy

2:01:42

it's an instruction to our city staff that there would be a strategy to

2:01:48

maintain tree canopy because City street trees are particularly a city

2:01:53

responsibility and the climate plan directs the city-led tree planting so

2:01:59

um I don't think it's an encumbrance on on

2:02:07

business okay seeing no further hands uh Deb would you like to call the

2:02:15

role the motion has presented is to adopt

2:02:20

new 4.3 pointb has on the screen which

2:02:26

states develop a strategy to maintain tree canopy in town center that is

2:02:31

compatible with Redevelopment and infill

2:02:43

development P Murphy oh I'm sorry you're calling on me

2:02:51

to vote okay uh

2:02:56

nay commissioner Bozman I commissioner bazo

2:03:06

nay commissioner gills hi commissioner rashis

2:03:14

name and uh Vice chair ream I

2:03:21

motion fails 33 so one comment I'd make on that is

2:03:30

that if we you know we're as a as as been pointed out several times we're going to

2:03:37

have several more touches on this I think the the goal that is being

2:03:44

promoted here um is a good one and we might think about where else we would

2:03:51

put this um whether it's somewhere else in the comp plan or somewhere else um or

2:03:58

reflected in other uh regulations um but I think the point

2:04:05

here is that it's really you know we've got a broad statement about consistency with the uh cap and and that's probably

2:04:13

a good starting point um and not be too prescriptive in this provision right now

2:04:21

in an economic development plan but the sentiment the goal of preserving a you

2:04:28

know the tree PL tree canopy that that has been uh well described by Victor not

2:04:35

but the the uh proposal not endorsed um

2:04:41

is is really important I think and is is worth preserving Adam and yeah apologies for

2:04:49

creating that confusion and thank you for straightening that out chair

2:04:55

Murphy okay and Zach where do we go from here we're we're moving we're we're making

2:05:01

good progress here so there's a couple other um issues that are in the parking

2:05:06

lot so as a reminder at the last meeting we created uh this thing called the

2:05:12

parking lot and its intention was to put policies there that needed more

2:05:18

clarification um once the housing element was

2:05:23

drafted um and and as I was reviewing those policies um that were put in the

2:05:29

parking lot um there were a couple of clarifications that would help um help

2:05:34

make that a little bit more uh productive to have those policies in the parking lot um and we already addressed

2:05:43

4.2 so that's um that's great um so then there were there were two policies um

2:05:50

that there was a proposed policy 6.3 there were two different versions of that and then also a proposed policy

2:06:00

6.6 um and and they all address housing and this the appla the supply of

2:06:06

affordable housing and I'll apologize there's there's a lot of text on the screen because I wanted to have all the

2:06:11

give you the all the policies here but essentially what what I recommend in the memo is that um

2:06:19

that you could you could keep the policy the proposed policy

2:06:24

6.6 and that really addresses kind of the question of affordability and then

2:06:30

you know this proposed 6.3 both versions of that will have similar policies in

2:06:35

the housing element and so we don't necessarily need to have uh have both um

2:06:41

and so I proposed in the um in the memo just just rolling forward with with

2:06:47

policy 6.6

2:06:58

Andy I have notes before today's meeting because I thought

2:07:04

through this I'd like to make a motion to strike both policies 6.3 and

2:07:12

6.6 entirely from the

2:07:17

okay so as I understand the motion is to

2:07:25

strike both versions of both policies correct

2:07:33

okay okay discussion Carolyn oh whoops sorry um Okay g to

2:07:42

make sure I understand this the the motion is to dra to strike both versions

2:07:48

of 6.3 proposed policy 6.6 which I presume comes from commissioner and the staff

2:07:55

alternative is that correct that's the motion yes I believe so okay well I'm

2:08:02

gonna have to digest that for just a moment please but I I will have something to say in a moment okay Angie

2:08:08

you want to speak to the motion um I do so first I want to say I am an

2:08:15

absolutely enormous proponent of affordable housing and a variety of housing mixes this is very important I'm

2:08:22

a big proponent of it on Mercer Island I also think um housing availability and

2:08:28

economic housing mix is important to our economic Vitality however I don't

2:08:34

believe especially given where Mercer Island is right now in its first shiny

2:08:40

economic development plan that trying to insert housing goals into our economic

2:08:45

development plan I don't think it would be supportive um and so I would like to

2:08:50

support us in having a focused plan and to really focus the housing mix and

2:08:56

housing goals in the housing plan and keep the economic development plan um

2:09:02

streamlined and simple yeah I I agree with I fully

2:09:09

support striking 6366 I mean we are a we are a suburb we are a bedroom community

2:09:16

um many people by choice um want to drive you know want to be away from work

2:09:22

um and yeah let's let's not saddle our economic development plan with this

2:09:28

especially in light of all the mandates coming down from Olympia I think that's going to have enough of an impact um on

2:09:36

our city so yeah I'm all for getting rid of everything

2:09:41

here Chris I guess you know I guess what got me started on this a little bit was just

2:09:47

the goal goal six Mercer Island economy provides residents the option to both live and work on island and you know it

2:09:55

just struck me as kind of a big Omission not to deal with half of that which is what it costs to live here and in in an

2:10:03

environment in which you know I think one thing that got a little confusing I don't think affordable housing as I was

2:10:09

initially putting in the top of three of those is was meant to mean you know within the the term of art essentially

2:10:16

something that was more affordable something that cost less than \$4 million or whatever is

2:10:21

going on these days so um you know but I I take the point that this is going to be a big part of the housing element and

2:10:29

you know if we want to take it out uh just looks like a huge sort of gaping

2:10:35

hole within the context of goal six not to say something about housing

2:10:40

here Carn yeah I kind of agree with what Chris is saying there um so I wanted to

2:10:47

ask staff if you were trying to get separate get us to separate

2:10:53

considerations or or wait on housing aspects of our economic development plan

2:10:58

until the housing element was done element is done why did the staff

2:11:04

propose the staff alternative could could you help me out with that not try to understand this a little bit better

2:11:10

sure so uh the first part of your question um the parking lot was

2:11:15

something that was created by the Planning Commission at the last meeting so it wasn't a staff recommendation that

2:11:22

you hold um deliberations on those topics until a housing element was drafted that was a a Planning Commission

2:11:30

decision so it wasn't uh our recommendation the second part of

2:11:35

question um in terms of of the staff alternative here is I

2:11:41

if so the original proposed policy 6.6 is shown here um I was proposing an

2:11:49

alternative uh with some more concise language that would accomplish more or less what what the pro The Proposal was

2:11:57

in 6.6 um so if you want to go with this idea that's in 6.6 here's a way to do it

2:12:04

um a little bit cleaner um and more consistent with the other style it wasn't necessarily a recommendation for

2:12:11

adopting that policy it was uh so and if we have if we have something in our Ed

2:12:18

when it goes out for public review we'll get comments on the the the connection

2:12:24

of Housing and economic uh you know thriving so but if

2:12:30

we have no no policy connecting those two things as Chris points out it's just like housing and economic development

2:12:37

are completely separate um so my thought is that

2:12:44

um uh I I would take issue I think Adam that we were we were encouraged by staff to

2:12:53

um consider housing aspects of the economic

2:12:59

development element after the housing element had been been completed I think I have mailed to that effect from

2:13:05

sta um in any case I would prefer to have something in our draft that

2:13:12

connects housing and working in the community so that we can get public

2:13:17

feedback on it for one thing and also because I believe they're connected so um

2:13:24

my I would disagree that we need to um delete all of this and I would probably

2:13:31

suggest in contrast to amend the commission version of policy 6.6 to read

2:13:40

coordinate with housing element to

2:13:46

um let's see coordinate with the housing element

2:13:54

to I'm sorry um I'll have to take a break I gotta think about what to how to

2:13:59

say that Adam I have a uh Adam Zach I have a

2:14:08

point to clarify with saf um right now

2:14:13

the version in the Ed forth draft shows

2:14:19

everything from 6.1 to 6.6 are all

2:14:25

inserts and so then the question is if

2:14:31

the um for some reason you

2:14:36

know we end up with ties or with certain things going certain ways what gets left

2:14:44

in to go to the public

2:14:50

so at the at the last meeting um I should should have included this in my introduction of this this topic but it

2:14:58

at the last meeting everything under all of the policies under goal six were added to the um to the parking lot

2:15:08

so and any of those um can stay or go

2:15:13

depending on how the Planning Commission would like at under the current motion

2:15:19

if 6.3 and 6.6 were struck from the draft um the other policies under goal

2:15:27

six would would remain in the draft to go forward to public comment but yeah

2:15:33

point of clarification go ahead um I believe unless I'm looking at the wrong version

2:15:41

6.1 is still in the document as written so that that one is still in the

2:15:50

document under goal six there is no

2:16:00

6.2 yeah I may have misspoke there there's two 63s a 64 a 65 and two six

2:16:09

sixes and the motion on the table is currently to strike all versions of 6.3

2:16:15

and 6.6 correct which would currently lead 61 64 and 65 under goal

2:16:29

six

2:16:37

correct

2:16:44

Adam old hand apologies okay Carolyn have you uh formulated your

2:16:52

thoughts on 6.6 I'm going to

2:17:05

try coordinate with the housing element to increase opportunities for employees

2:17:11

who work in our community to have opportunities for housing in the community

2:17:19

that would be proposal for policy 6.6 so it doesn't say ensure

2:17:26

it says try to increase opportunities okay I think the proper

2:17:34

way to do this is to vote on the motion and then if you want to propose that as

2:17:41

a replacement then uh you can fine-tune that in the meantime agree

2:17:49

any further comments on the motion seeing No Hands Deb would you

2:17:57

like to call the rooll thank you chair I have a motion

2:18:02

that was made by commissioner bazo I do not have who made that second I

2:18:08

seconded uh RIS yep thank

2:18:15

you to strike both versions the policy numbers 6.3 and

2:18:22

6.6 commissioner Gils

2:18:27

me Sharon Murphy hi commissioner bazo

2:18:37

I commissioner Bozman nay commissioner Richies

2:18:43

[Music] I and vice chair reab

2:18:49

I motion passes

2:18:55

42 so the question then Carolyn is do you want to make a

2:19:02

motion to add something back in to draw the connection between housing

2:19:10

and economic development yes I do could you get the um the the document back up

2:19:16

on the screen please

2:19:39

okay I move that we include a proposed policy 6.6 as follows coordinate with the

2:19:48

housing element to increase opportunities for employees to live and work in the

2:19:59

community do I have a second for that

2:20:04

motion a second discussion Carolyn you want to

2:20:11

speak to your motion first uh yeah it um I do think it is

2:20:16

important to have a connection between the economic development of our community and the desire for employees

2:20:24

to live and work in the community and um I think it's an appropriate level of

2:20:30

activity to um to increase opportunities for employees to live and work in the

2:20:40

community it's not insuring it it's just yeah okay thank you I'm done okay Adam

2:20:47

um I I like the idea of increasing job opportunities um for residents on Mercer

2:20:55

Island and I I don't see how this differs from the current

2:21:01

61 uh lines 11 through 13 of uh the fourth draft like that's I'm I

2:21:12

can read it if if necess if desired um Let me let me share my screen

2:21:17

I've got it

2:21:25

[Music] um so 61

2:21:46

here

2:22:00

and then for your reference I typed up the proposed policy 66 so you could see

2:22:05

it in line with the text so I would like to respond if I may

2:22:11

to is well is that okay my hands up yeah just a moment

2:22:18

Adam were you finished okay go ahead Carolyn I think

2:22:24

the really important thing is not including the word affordable I mean that's a very strict

2:22:30

definition and it's a really tough one to meet on merer island so I really think that we should back off from that

2:22:36

term but I think increasing opportunities for people to live and work here is a fairly flexible approach

2:22:44

and um I want to clarify something based on what Adam R said

2:22:49

um coordinate I know I have proposed this but um I I would probably suggest

2:22:57

with my second that we add a word here coordinate with the housing element to increase housing opportunities it wasn't

2:23:04

meant to be job opportunities Adam R that's what I meant was housing so um if

2:23:10

Chris you're comfortable with that that would be what I meant by me per me it's

2:23:16

okay yeah okay okay so yeah anyway so I think that's quite the difference really Adam

2:23:23

between what was already stated before both of those phrases had the word affordable in it and this one

2:23:33

doesn't Adam uh yeah I think that the addition of housing helps differentiate

2:23:38

it from my view from six1 So yeah thank you that that that clarifies yeah thank

2:23:46

you okay any further

2:23:54

discussion yeah I have one more thing to say okay I do think it's important to

2:24:00

get something in here roughly can be Revisited after the housing element is looked at so we can get some public

2:24:06

input on this uh when it goes out so um can always be changed later but it would

2:24:13

be great to get the Public's view on that

2:24:21

I think um Carolyn's last point is perhaps her strongest point in support

2:24:28

of this um that there would be some value to have at least a placeholder

2:24:36

here to get feedback much of that feedback May well be

2:24:42

negative but it does create the opportunity to get feedback and input to

2:24:49

see if there's a desire to to bridge that to make that connection between

2:24:56

housing and economic development um and especially in light of the state of goal

2:25:03

of goal six um which is not you know

2:25:08

only designed to promote work from home professionals um so I think I think

2:25:15

Carolyn's last point is a good one and it would give the opportunity for for

2:25:20

there to be some input on this and you know we'll probably know pretty quickly

2:25:26

if there's any interest or uh uh in moving that concept

2:25:32

forward Adam um I think you rais a good point um

2:25:37

I'm going I plan to oppose the wording as suggested uh due to the increase but

2:25:44

I'm I'm not opposed to saying something about coordinating with the housing element on the topic of living and

2:25:52

working in the community so you're you're uncomfortable

2:25:57

with the increase word is that right

2:26:09

okay okay seeing no further hands I assume

2:26:15

Carolyn that's an old hand yeah I'm sorry okay okay Deb would you

2:26:20

like to call the

2:26:29

role thank you Mr

2:26:37

chair commissioner Bozman hi commissioner rashis

2:26:45

yeah Vice chair RAB nay commissioner bazo

2:26:52

hi shair Murphy hi and commissioner Gils

2:27:00

hi motion passes for

2:27:08

two okay and the final um issue I'll just St in this document here um because

2:27:14

it's easy enough to to see it here um these proposed policies 6.4 and 6.5

2:27:22

were placed in the parking lot and neither of them are related to housing

2:27:27

and so if we hold decision on these two policies until after the housing element

2:27:35

is drafted we're unlikely to get um additional information from that housing

2:27:40

element that will help with the decision-making process on 64 and 65 so

2:27:46

so again here um what I'm asking for is some more clarification as to why these

2:27:51

two policies were placed in the parking lot and then if they're going to stay in the parking lot
um some information

2:27:58

about what would be helpful um to um you know if they're in there for um the

2:28:04

purpose of getting public comment or if there's some other information that the
commission

2:28:10

needs Adam um it I would like to put forth a

2:28:15

motion to Strike 64 and if seconded I'm happy to

2:28:22

speak okay yes seconded I think you were about to say

2:28:29

you would like to speak to the motion if it's seconded which it was sure motion

2:28:35

has been made and seconded go ahead okay um so yeah this

2:28:41

this was were some interesting discussion last time um I know commissioner's provided a
web blog uh

2:28:50

resource um you know I had provided that working paper she had provided a web

2:28:56

blog resource and I reviewed some of the references in that document and that you

2:29:02

that web blog was is published and some of the references are published by a you

2:29:07

know if you look at I think I forget some there's some website where it talks about you know
the the Leaning of

2:29:15

different resources and I think the one that I had found was from a slightly

2:29:21

right of Center leaning one and those resources mostly came from think tanks that were
labeled as farle very Pro

2:29:29

labor um so IR respective of any data there I think I think studying this you

2:29:38

could find well-respected economists that would say this is great

2:29:45

and this or this is horrible so you know who are we as a small City to try to

2:29:52

study this on our own when this is a very hot topic among economists um you know how
are we going

2:29:59

to do better so the next thing would be okay we bring in a consultant right and then it's like
well how do we pick the

2:30:05

consultant we're going to either pick a consultant that's Pro or against it um

2:30:11

so I think this would it's just going to foster a lot of division in our city and then I I think someone also mentioned in

2:30:17

the last meeting it's going to Signal it's going to Signal this is not a friendly place for business um there are

2:30:23

only two cities in the state that have this Seattle and seac and Seattle's

2:30:29

large they can do this and they're also quite they have a reputation of doing a lot of signaling and then the other city

2:30:36

is SeaTac and that came out of I believe it was uh Alaska Airlines Outsourcing

2:30:41

their baggage handlers and that is a job that cannot move um our jobs here on

2:30:47

Mercer Island can move uh so this will not help our uh Economic Development and

2:30:53

as I said I think jokingly I said last time it'll it probably will help our parking problem in

2:31:01

downtown uh Chris yeah I mean you know I think I appreciate that seems like uh

2:31:08

the vice chair has done some studying but yeah I think I'd like the study to be a little more rigorous and and by uh

2:31:14

you know I I don't know what somewhere in the next 10 years I think it's an issue about economic Justice I feel like

2:31:21

the Seattle next door has a different minimum wage it makes me think that maybe it makes sense to to have one that

2:31:28

uh that is also maybe consistent with Seattle but you know I I just think I I don't know the answer to it I can seek

2:31:34

some concerns and I guess I'm both in favor of getting public input on the idea and and uh and having a study about

2:31:43

it somewhere along the way it wouldn't be the first thing on the economic plan but I think it uh it's something worth

2:31:49

looking at in in this day and age something that I think we should take

2:31:54

seriously Victor so I think commissioner Gil said something interesting at the end there

2:32:01

which is this wouldn't be the first thing up on the economic development plan I guess my question would be who

2:32:07

determines that um because what I found is these

2:32:13

um this comprehensive plan the broader you make the target the bigger the menu

2:32:19

that you provide City staff and city government to choose from and as a business owner I'll tell you I'm

2:32:25

incredibly frustrated with our city government and our city staff and their

2:32:30

inability to focus on the basics uh things like fix the development code uh get rid of uh

2:32:40

regulatory uh overhead um and the more we focus on

2:32:45

these additional issues uh the more the core issues for businesses don't get fixed and so uh I'm

2:32:55

unsupportive of that for for for that reason alone as well as many

2:33:01

others Andy I am you know I I want to

2:33:11

say I agree with commissioner G's the way commissioner G phrased the

2:33:17

conversation um about Justice about um

2:33:22

taking a look at things about being able to study and putting out to public comment and I've I struggle with this

2:33:29

one and and I want to make sure I go on record saying this because like I I'm the first one to say people need to have

2:33:36

living wages and minimum wage is both hard for small business and

2:33:42

hard for the people making minimum wage um that said uh I also agree with commissioner

2:33:49

rashish and the environment that we currently have that you know if we're if

2:33:54

we're streamlining and making our regulations efficient so that some of this can work better uh having plans

2:34:02

that help Focus the city is important because this is our first plan and

2:34:08

because it does seem to me that we are looking to develop our economy I'm going to use the word develop our economy not

2:34:14

necessarily grow um even though growing could be described in a number of

2:34:20

different ways um it feels early in the game to study and really even talk about

2:34:27

do we need a unique minimum wage to Mercer Island so while I want to support

2:34:32

commissioner accuse when she first I think it was accuse who actually first introduced this before uh and I am on

2:34:39

board with where we want to go with our economy so that this can be a healthy conversation I just don't think we're

2:34:45

ready for it in this plan and I want to support the city and staying

2:34:50

focused Carolyn yeah I think uh Angie makes some very good points um

2:34:57

I also um like the idea of studying it considering it um it does seem a bit

2:35:04

early um I do want to point out just a tiny little edit here we do have three

2:35:10

cities with the minimum wage Tuva has jumped on board recently so Seattle CAC

2:35:15

and tu but um yeah it's it's a difficult one for me but I I do think it's a little

2:35:21

early our first Economic Development element we have identified that our um

2:35:28

downtown Center commercial areas are maybe not as robust as we would like them to be
um I feel like maybe this is

2:35:35

something to look at a bit later

2:35:41

so bris yeah just quickly I think the Victor's question about about you know

2:35:46

how do you time these things out I think that's in the implementation plan um and Adam
can correct me if I'm wrong but I

2:35:53

mean there's things you know year 1 through four 5 through six 7 through nine so all I meant
was if we wanted

2:35:59

this not to be year one through four but whether year you know six or seven that can be
something we would include in the

2:36:05

implementation plan I just wanted to I think I'm right am I right about that Alan yes uh that's
where the

2:36:12

prioritization of these projects would happen as in the implementation plan

2:36:20

Adam um I think yeah that's interesting I was not aware of tuilla um but when I

2:36:25

think of tuilla not but well also when I think of tuilla I think of South Center Mall you know they've got a lot of

2:36:31

dining so that that makes sense for Chila but we're trying to attract dining we're trying to attract retail so I I

2:36:38

can see that to to me that took will a lot of those jobs are also

2:36:43

non-portable but I appreciate the new info I I learned that pict turn so I'm well aware that

2:36:51

this would go into an implementation plan the point still stands the the

2:36:57

broader the menu and the broader the amount of things to choose from the less

2:37:02

likely the important things from an economic development perspective the most important things for business get

2:37:10

uh get completed

2:37:16

Marilyn yeah um given Chris is you know pointing out that one can determine when

2:37:22

this should be done I I think I'm going to reverse my previous Viewpoint and uh

2:37:27

I I would encourage it the word study is doesn't have to be a consultant it doesn't have to be uh something

2:37:36

um elaborate so um I think at some point in our 20-year Horizon we should be

2:37:44

studying this just considering it it doesn't mean it has to be adopted so um

2:37:50

yeah i' I'm for it okay Deb would you like to call the role

2:37:57

on this thank you chair I have a motion uh

2:38:02

by commissioner RAB seconded by commissioner bazo to strike policy number

2:38:08

6.4 is that accurate yes

2:38:14

okay Vice chair Rigo

2:38:19

I commissioner bman

2:38:25

may commissioner bazo I commissioner gills

2:38:34

hey commissioner vishes hi and chair Murphy

2:38:41

I motion passes 42

2:38:52

Mr Zach you're up okay well the only one that's left is

2:38:59

6.5 here oops uh

2:39:06

Victor I move that we strike 6.5

2:39:13

second Victor you want to speak to the motion sure so um as a business owner I

2:39:19

think kind of as it's written I would probably benefit from the tax incentive um we provide a living wage we

2:39:26

provide time off we provide health insurance um however um I'm actually not

2:39:33

interested I I do that because I think it's the right thing to do not because the city uh is incenting me to do it or

2:39:40

telling me to do it um I would ask you know if a few questions first and

2:39:47

foremost where's the money from the for this tax incentive coming from um we

2:39:54

are continuously being told that the city is is running out of money and yet we want to provide tax

2:40:04

incentives um and then I will just Echo the comments that I have that I had on

2:40:11

on uh 6.4 um

2:40:16

and you know the same the same comments still stand there I think the

2:40:22

broader the Target in our comp plan the less likely it is that the important

2:40:29

work that actually benefits businesses will actually get

2:40:38

done Carn this is um extremely prescriptive

2:40:44

um considering the very small amount of money that the city might be able to scare up for such a thing and then to

2:40:50

figure out who would get it and for doing what incentives um I think it just would not

2:40:57

be workable

2:41:05

whatsoever any further comments Deb would you call the role

2:41:14

please the motion was made by commissioner

2:41:20

rashis and seconded by commissioner Bozman to strike policy number

2:41:27

6.5 Vice chair riob your mic's not

2:41:34

on I commissioner gills

2:41:42

hi commissioner bazo I chair Murphy hi commissioner Bozman hi

2:41:51

and commissioner rashis hi thank

2:42:02

you okay um that concludes the proposed

2:42:08

amendments um we've we've finished our review or at least this stage of the

2:42:13

review now there is uh I I did want to point out there are some next steps with this element so we have

2:42:20

a public review draft now more or less together I'm going to go through and

2:42:25

make sure that the draft is you know internally consistent and clean up those uh you know numbering and things like

2:42:32

that um and then we'll have this available for public comment um and posted on our the city or this Project's

2:42:40

let's talk page let's talk Mercer Island page so it'll be available there we plan

2:42:45

on holding a public Workshop um probably in the late winter um to get feedback on

2:42:54

the comprehensive Plan update generally and um a specific um Workshop to get

2:43:01

comments on the economic development element itself so there will be two workshops there um so we can get some

2:43:09

specific comments on this newer um element of the plan then from there

2:43:14

you'll have you'll have a tune-up meeting where um you can respond to the comments that we receive at the

2:43:20

workshops and fine-tune the um the draft and then and then you'll hold a public

2:43:26

hearing and then have your deliberations and then make a recommendation to the city council so there's there's several

2:43:34

touches before you make your final um recommendation but those are the next

2:43:39

steps for this element here um and then i' turn it over to any questions chis

2:43:46

yeah I guess I wasn't clear to me that we'd ironed out every sentence that we

2:43:53

were talking about in the narrated part and so I assume we'll see a draft before you send anything to

2:44:00

anybody else to make sure that's clear and I I think for one thing uh Vice chair and I worked on language and the

2:44:07

quality of life section that I think it was ever really it was sent around but I don't think we ever really voted it in

2:44:13

so there's a number of things like that that uh are floating out there but you know I think maybe the next step is for

2:44:18

you to figure out if there's a few more questions and I don't I guess I don't know if we have to have another meeting

2:44:23

to to to straighten those things out if you find some issues or how we would could handle them a little more

2:44:31

expeditiously yeah I would I mean ultimately um you can as a as a body you

2:44:36

can decide how you would resolve those but if they're I will send out a draft for individuals to review and make sure

2:44:42

that um you'll be be able to see the the review draft and if there's something

2:44:47

that I missed we can absolutely get that in and then if there's like a lingering question um we can figure out how to

2:44:55

slot that into the schedule before we go to the um the workshop so um if there's

2:45:01

if there's something else hanging out out there um let me know um and and I'll

2:45:06

if something comes up when I'm refining the or finishing the draft um I'll

2:45:12

reach out for sure

2:45:18

any other questions on this process Adam thank you uh very much

2:45:25

again I think uh you organized the process in a way that U made it go very

2:45:34

smoothly and uh uh efficiently and uh you know maybe a few things got lost in

2:45:40

the shuffle but we'll we'll get those taken care of and um want to thank

2:45:46

everyone for a good um succinct discussion of these issues uh

2:45:53

tonight and uh now on to other business is there a deputy director

2:46:00

report um just a very brief one um just a reminder that we've got a meeting

2:46:07

coming up on November 15th and that meeting will be solely focused on reviewing the proposed items for the

2:46:14

docket um been doing some work behind the scenes the last few weeks with the

2:46:19

our attorneys to outline process for reviewing that quas judicial item and

2:46:25

kind of how that will slot in with our our typical process for the other items um so we'll be spelling that out in the

2:46:31

staff memo that comes out here in about two weeks um and we'll probably also set

2:46:38

up a meeting with the chair and vice chair to discuss that process and make sure you guys are clear on how that's all going to run um

2:46:46

I don't know I just maybe I'll pause there and see if there's any questions about the docket process or anything

2:46:52

going into that meeting

2:46:57

Can yes I wondered if um this year when the docket items come before us we will

2:47:04

have staff will have previously identified whether it meets the criteria and identifies the area in the

2:47:11

existing comp plan for example that supports the item in question yeah

2:47:17

that's part of the process question that I'm working through with one of our attorneys and I think in particular for

2:47:24

the Quasi judicial item um the commission will need to adopt findings

2:47:29

about each of those criteria individually so you know we we'll be coming up with the process to discuss

2:47:36

and you know you all will make a decision on kind of a yes or no whether each criteria is met and the staff

2:47:43

report will provide some background information to support that I think for the non quasi judicial items um we'll

2:47:51

probably use a more typical like kind of how we've traditionally done it the last couple of years where there's not as

2:47:58

much specific information about each criteria we can talk about them as a group um and the commission can you know

2:48:06

determine if if you feel they've been met and you would like to recommend the item for the docket or

2:48:13

not chis just to clarify November 8th that meeting is off the table we're not

2:48:18

doing that yeah since we completed the work tonight we will not need that November 8th meeting so that placeholder

2:48:26

can be removed um and we'll just go right to that November 15th meeting and then the final meeting for the year is

2:48:34

December 6th and I think I mentioned in an email we're working on getting a speaker from the Department of Commerce

2:48:41

um to come give us kind of a a guest presentation on all of the new legislation and laws related to the

2:48:48

housing element requirements to kind of start well to get us all on the same page and just start getting geared up

2:48:53

for when we begin to work on the housing element next year here

2:49:00

one yeah I think we will have a difficulty as a commission determining

2:49:05

whether things meet the criteria because you know in a meeting that is a that is

2:49:11

a a tall order for us to each of individually decide before the meeting

2:49:17

and it's inefficient for seven people to decide try to be figuring out in advance

2:49:23

does this proposal meet our comp plan what aspect of the comp plan does it meet what aspect of the comp plan does

2:49:29

it not meet that that it conflicts with does it meet our code these are things

2:49:35

which I don't think us seven people should have to do I think we should be able to come to the meeting with those

2:49:41

docket items and be presented with staff's best estimate of whether they

2:49:46

meet the criteria and then let us make a decision whether we agree with that

2:49:52

based on whatever nuances might pertain to the particular

2:49:58

item yeah I mean each of the proposals from the applicant or the submitter

2:50:03

includes their analysis and so maybe we can look into whether we have capacity

2:50:09

to provide you know whether the staff concurs with that or if we have different viewpoint that would be great

2:50:16

thank you yeah I think Carolyn's uh you're

2:50:21

recognizing that that um in the past many of these um proposals and in fact

2:50:29

some of the ones that come around again really don't do that analysis

2:50:36

internally and so that does create a challenge um you know for for us to to

2:50:43

make that analysis is um but on the other hand I don't think we given the

2:50:49

nature of our role and the purpose of the docketing process for the citizens

2:50:55

I'm not sure if I'm comfortable you know kind of Outsourcing our decision on all

2:51:01

the criteria to the staff um and it sounds to me as this you know with the

2:51:08

number of items in the docket and the um

2:51:13

other things on everyone's played that might be a tall order to do that type of

2:51:19

detailed analysis Victor so one question that I have is I believe that one of the

2:51:25

criteria is Staff capacity so are we going to have input

2:51:31

on on an individual proposed docket item

2:51:36

basis on whether there's staff capacity or what the what the proposed impact on

2:51:43

staff capacity would be I think we'll give you this from the staff's Viewpoint

2:51:49

we can give you an idea of sort of what's the size of this proposal is this

2:51:54

a small easy lift or is this a bigger item that's going to take a lot of Staff

2:51:59

time a lot of commission time we'll give you a gauge on that and we'll also give you information about kind of what's

2:52:06

already on the work plan with Comprehensive Plan update primarily and other projects that are already

2:52:12

scheduled so you know the idea would be to give you that bigger Viewpoint in

2:52:18

terms of you know we have X capacity certain amount of that is

2:52:24

already spoken for and then we've got all these other potential ideas and we

2:52:30

can kind of gauge what size they are so that we know you know would they fit or would they not fit in the capacity

2:52:36

that's available and I think then there's a question

2:52:41

about kind of the approach that the city would like to take um some cities are

2:52:47

very disciplined and they don't like to docket items unless there's capacity to do them in the coming year other cities

2:52:55

tend to docket all the things that they think are good ideas that they'd like to get to eventually and then sometimes

2:53:02

that leads to a backlog that takes multiple years to get through sometimes

2:53:07

even like three or five years um the downside of that is it sort of

2:53:13

constrains future commissions future councils to do this work that's been

2:53:18

docketed and and sort of stacks up in this backlog um so you know I think that's a

2:53:26

question for you all and for the city council is is how do we want to manage this

2:53:34

work Adam Adam um Al on the topic of the resources

2:53:41

I'm looking at docketing criteria um and it also has that know the city can provide the resources or

2:53:48

resources can be provided by an applicant for an amendment how what how

2:53:53

does that how does that work so primarily um when someone submits a

2:53:59

docket request they have the choice between submitting a suggestion or

2:54:05

submitting an application and an application has a fee um it's around a

2:54:10

little over \$20,000 for a code Amendment um and so some of the proposals that'll

2:54:17

be coming to you were applications and they've paid that fee and so that's the primary Avenue for an applicant to

2:54:25

provide resources so it's Financial Resources not their time do okay understood thank

2:54:33

you for the clarification Marilyn yeah I I certainly

2:54:39

agree it's it's important that we don't Outsource our decision as to whether the criteria are met but what I was getting

2:54:45

at was um our staff they know our comprehensive plans quite in detail and

2:54:51

for them to be able to tell us whether this proposal you know meets it and to

2:54:56

identify what parts of the comprehensive plan I I I think that's a staff task rather than for seven other people to

2:55:02

try to decide themselves but it is really important that we do identify

2:55:08

whether the criteria are met because too often the commission devolves into a

2:55:13

discussion as they like the proposed or not and that's not one of the criteria GE I like that one H I don't like that

2:55:20

one so we have to be very careful not to do that um also in regards to the

2:55:26

proponent explaining why they feel they meet the criteria um I would hope that

2:55:31

if a proponent comes forward with a proposal and they haven't shown how they meet the criteria that they would be

2:55:38

rejected so we don't have to consider proposals that don't meet the criteria

2:55:44

um obviously don't meet it also in regard to the possibility of hanging on

2:55:51

to proposals that are considered favorable by the commission or by the council

2:55:56

ultimately um and the concern that those might cause a backup in the future my

2:56:01

understanding is that the growth management act allows you to drop those items subsequently the council can

2:56:07

decide two years later hey this is no longer a high priority for us let's take this off the off the list that's

2:56:14

incorrect If an item is docketed it needs to go through legislative review okay well I'll I'll do my dig up what

2:56:21

I'm thinking about and see you know why I have that you know possibly erroneous viewpoint but thank

2:56:30

you okay any more

2:56:37

questions any planned absences for the

2:56:42

15th or or

2:56:47

Beyond okay there being no other business to come before the Planning Commission the

2:56:54

time is now 8:58 p.m. and the meeting is adjourned as a remind reminder to

2:57:01

Commissioners please stay seated until the Staff has terminated the broadcast good night
and thank you for