

GMHB EXHIBIT 240

2024-05-29 Planning Commission Transcript

0:00

and we are live okay good evening and welcome to the May 29 2024 special

0:08

hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike Murphy the chair tonight's hybrid

0:13

Planning Commission meeting is being brought to you courtesy of Zoom welcome to all and thank you for joining us

0:20

tonight Commissioners please have your mics turned on for the roll call

0:27

Deb thank you commissioner accuse here commissioner bazo here

0:35

commissioner Bozman here commissioner gells here commissioner rashis here Vice

0:43

chair riam here and chair Murphy here thank you uh commissioners before we get

0:50

started this evening I'd like to take a moment to thank Commissioners Bosman and

0:55

GS for their work on the Planning Commission Chris GS was a apped to fill

1:00

an unexpired term on June 9 of last year Chris brought to the Planning Commission

1:06

a fresh perspective enthusi enthusiasm and a willingness to read work product

1:12

work the work product that we were handed off by staff carefully and with

1:18

an eye toward making it clearer and more concise the latter was not always

1:23

appreciated um but uh nevertheless uh it was well

1:29

received by by many of us um rather than being reappointed Chris is an

1:34

unfortunate victim of the restructuring of the Planning Commission um I'm afraid

1:41

uh that he is an example of the independent citizen volunteers that will be replaced by what I believe at least

1:48

some hope may be more malleable paid members Carolyn was first appointed to

1:54

the Planning Commission on June 5 of 2017 and reappointed again in

2:01

2021 in those seven years she worked on many many consequential issues for the

2:08

island in those seven years Carolyn also I have to admit frustrated more than one

2:14

Planning Commission chair uh and you know that that was sort of her job I think um and a few members too um has

2:23

several former Planning Commission members have shared Carolyn processes

2:29

things differently um it is not that she failed to read the material or came

2:35

unprepared for meetings has at least a few people believe um to the contrary

2:41

she does read everything very carefully she simply preferred a different method of reaching decisions not one shared by

2:50

everyone and a method that at times prolong discussion also due in part to

2:56

our less rigid process on the substance of our work however uh Carolyn was was

3:03

well informed always willing to contribute and most importantly was a

3:08

tireless advocate for protecting our Island's environment and quality of life

3:13

for that she deserves our thanks for her years of service my concern about these

3:20

two departures after watching the council ignore the outpouring of opposition to its restructuring plan is

3:27

that the city will have an even more difficult time finding qualified volunteers willing to serve on this and

3:35

probably other commissions as former mayor Alan Merkel observed if the city is not attracting

3:43

qualified candidates it needs to look at what it is doing to create that climate

3:49

I don't see that happening very soon but hopefully it will uh commissioner other

3:56

Commissioners and staff um do you have anything you'd like to add to that

4:06

Victor um so first to commissioner Bozman uh I have appre

4:14

appreciated your your passion around the Planning Commission your uh depth of

4:21

knowledge your historical knowledge and and the expertise that

4:28

you've brought to the commission um I think that you've been a a valuable

4:34

member of the commission and I appreciate your time with us um on a on

4:42

a more personal note in the brief time that we met in person uh my chair was

4:49

sitting next to commissioner Batman's chair and uh I appreciated the chocolate

4:54

that we would share pass back and forth between US during during these meetings

5:00

um so thank you thank you for your lengthy Service uh commissioner Dells uh

5:06

who hasn't been on as quite as long as commissioner Bosman uh I appreciate your

5:13

ability to jump in in the middle of a process uh where we had already begun

5:19

working on the uh call plan and I um I appreciate your enthusiasm to

5:28

jump in with both feet and get involved immediately I've always appreciated your

5:33

perspective and and appreciated your service as well so thank you to the both of

5:39

you Alison well a lot of nice things have already been said I don't need to repeat

5:46

that um I just wanted to say thank you to both Carolyn and Chris for your service to the city and to the community

5:52

it's been a pleasure to work with you both Carolyn for many years now Chris

5:58

meeting you more recently but I think you've both added a lot to the work of the commission and contributed

6:05

you know many valuable insights and I hope and expect that you both will stay involved with this work through you know

6:13

with a different hat on as a community member um hope to see you at public appearances sometime in the future thank

6:21

you Adam um well I didn't get to know commissioner gos as well um I will say

6:27

thank you to commissioner Bozman for yes the Brazilian chocolate it's wonderful um and also for just the the the

6:34

discussions and information that you've shared with me you know your willingness to consider information and viewpoints

6:41

that differ from yours and have a respectable a respectful of disagreement

6:47

some cases and sometimes we come to you know a a resolution in the middle so I I thank you for those discussions that

6:53

information and and the chocolate like Victor

7:00

okay any other thoughts once again thank you both and

7:06

um hopefully we'll make this a show Carolyn yeah I did I didn't want to

7:11

respond of course I'm a little late to find my hand to raise but um I just want to say that you know I've just really

7:18

appreciated the opportunity to provide you know direct input to the city um

7:23

regarding L 's decisions all these years it's great to live in a country you know where you can do that without getting

7:29

locked up so um we're pretty lucky and um I really appreciate working with the

7:36

staff and very high quality professional output and and guidance for

7:42

Commissioners all the way through I've always felt like you know we really had

7:48

terrific information to work with it's been great really a privilege working with you and privilege working with all

7:55

of you and all the various Commissioners I've worked with over the years it's been really great uh good luck to

8:01

everyone thank you Mike for chairing so all right thanks thanks for your

8:07

comments everyone Chris yeah no I wasn't quite

8:13

sure what this uh was going to be on the Planning Commission and uh you know I was pleased to be part of the group uh

8:20

you know we had our our differences from time to time but I enjoyed working with everybody I think uh you know we're all

8:26

here for the same reason which is try to do our best for the City and uh and I really did appreciate I got a lot of

8:32

good support from the staff and and appreciate everybody's patience with me so uh you know I'll keep my fingers cross for you all and uh we'll see what

8:40

happens okay okay our first item of

8:47

business is public appearances this is the opportunity for anyone to speak to

8:53

the commission about issues of concern except those items scheduled for a

8:58

public hearing later this evening is there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the

9:07

commission chair as of 4M this evening we did not have anyone that signed up to

9:13

speak okay

9:19

okay then the first item of special business is the Planning Commission agenda Bill PCB

9:26

2411 comp plan periodic review public hearing this public hearing is to

9:33

receive comments on amendments to the comp plan as part of the 2024 2044 periodic review individuals

9:43

wishing to make public comment on this agenda item may do so in person or by

9:48

using Zoom the public hearing is now open as of 6:14 p.m. Deputy C clerk is

9:57

there anyone who has signed up for public comment that wishes to address the

10:03

commission yes sir we have one and that would be Mr goach

10:10

okay um those wishing to provide public testimony will speak audibly state your

10:16

name for the record limit and limit your comments to three minutes uh please

10:23

call uh Deputy C clerk will call on You by name or telephone number when is your

10:29

turn to speak so Deb go

10:36

ahead okay I've requested that Mr gbot join

10:44

us and

11:05

Mr goach are you with

11:11

us I see that you're unmuted

11:32

let me check in with somebody on the other side and see what is going on just

11:39

one moment please

12:25

believe that I believe Mr goach leave Mr Gold is at the community center

12:31

I have someone checking right now oh here we go

13:11

Mr goach we can you have audio but we can't hear you so I suspect something is

13:17

muted on your end you also appear to be showing us a

13:25

video as well but we cannot see you

13:38

there we go we can see you but we can't hear you so you must be muted on your end

14:25

we still can't hear you sir

14:31

no can you hear us okay he can hear

14:38

us Deb and I I can't see him either are we supposed to be able to see him or can

14:44

you only you should be able to see him I can see him on my screen um

14:50

as I'm sorry can you see him I can see

14:57

him I you might need to toggle the gallery to the right on the top of your

15:02

screen got that

15:10

thanks we still can't hear you Matt would you like to um try and call

15:18

in and use your phone I'm sorry sir I wish I could read

15:25

your lips

15:39

I want to give him an opportunity to speak if he'd like so sure

16:27

he's going to attempt to call us using the phone number

17:09

we can't hear you Matt

17:48

I have uh Mr GC on speaker and we're going to see if this works you tell me if you hear

17:55

him one two three can you hear me and now we've got some feedback so let me

18:01

fix that I try again Matt one two

18:09

three we still have feedback you do you hear the feedback or is Matt it's on your side on my side yeah you need to

18:17

mute your speakers I need you to mute the speakers

18:22

on your computer or on the bottom right hand

18:29

corner you see the little speaker on your

18:34

computer on my not on your

18:40

map you can go to the other room okay hold on I'll put you back on

18:47

speaker all right all right coming up with

18:54

Works can you hear me now they can hear you can hear you okay

19:00

all right anyway I I was just calling in to state that um I'm opposed to this

19:05

process as as it's going on I sent written comments to the to the

19:11

commission and

19:18

fundamentally Matt you went silent

19:43

hello okay try again but you need to leave get away from your computer I'm doing it right now all right don't go

19:50

too far because we lost you last time yeah I know I I don't know what where we anyway

19:55

but my statement was I I'm calling in opposition to moving forward without

20:02

more uh residents participation the the packet that came

20:08

out on Thursday last week with a with a holiday in the middle makes it

20:13

reasonably impossible the average person to take that in and make intelligent

20:18

comments right now uh I I think the uh

20:24

confusion amongst the residents right now is we understood this was going to be

20:29

a a surgical change and if if if a surgical change anticipated seeing these

20:36

are the things were changing specifically to meet State and County requirements and that would be pretty

20:42

easy for people to digest and understand that's what's happening it appears that we're doing something

20:48

significantly larger than that and I think they there in lies some of the

20:54

some of the concern and confusion uh the council meeting leted us to believe it was going to be this this activity was

21:01

going to be different than it seems to be right now uh so essentially that's my

21:07

my comment is I think that we we need to have a little bit more involvement of

21:14

the the residents before we move forward and with that I'll let you get back to

21:19

your meeting sorry for the confusion thank you

21:27

Matt okay is there any further

21:33

testimony I don't have anyone signed up we do have some individuals that appear to be in the Slater room at the

21:39

community center I don't know

21:46

if if there's a desire for anyone to speak

21:52

there do we have someone there that U can check that

22:04

I'm checking right now

22:30

[Music]

22:38

give us just one moment we do apologize for the technical issues tonight but I

22:43

appreciate everyone's patience and I will know whether whether or not we need

22:49

to if anyone wishes to speak in just a

22:57

moment

23:27

e

23:57

e

24:27

e e

25:16

I wish more about my name is Lucille Zar I'm a resident here on Mercer Island and

25:23

my only comment is that I think it would have been nice if we had had more

25:28

resident input prior to the decisions that were made in my understanding is

25:34

now that it's really too late to change some of those that's all I really have to

25:41

say did anybody else wish to speak Andrea can you get Lucille's the

25:48

spawn of her last name please I'll get it turns

26:06

for

26:44

good evening uh this is Senator Wellman Lisa Wellman um and I'm here with a few

26:50

people at the community center uh to have an interaction I assume about the

26:56

rep the um uh this Planning Commission report uh

27:02

this is an extremely vital piece of uh feedback to the legislature to the

27:08

planning for the state going forward for our community and and others will be

27:13

doing it for their communities um my in My Hope was that I was coming to a

27:20

meeting in person with all of you and would have an interaction with all of

27:26

you about the the report that you've put together um it doesn't sound as though

27:32

that was anybody's intention uh I think all of us in the room there's not that many but all of us in the room were

27:39

expecting to be with you and um actually given the importance of the report and

27:47

and this interaction um it's somewhat disconcerting and distressing that

27:53

we're not together and not really understanding why that would be the case

28:00

um this room certainly is large enough for all of us to be um in one place

28:06

anything else anybody want to say we're all in agreement about this um

28:13

thank you for your attention thank

28:25

you that is everyone uh chair thank you uh there being no further testimony

28:32

the public portion of this hearing is now closed as of 6:33

28:43

p.m. so now I will welcome Adam Zach Senor senior planner to give us a

28:50

presentation regarding the first of what should be uh

28:56

two motions tonight yes thank you want me to get my screen

29:02

shared here um so oh one more

29:16

thing here um so tonight we'll be taking a look at um the comprehensive plan

29:24

overall um and uh get through um this this process of uh the public hearing so

29:32

the purpose tonight is one to to hear the public testimony we just heard um

29:37

two to consider additional amendments to the comprehensive plan um and then three

29:43

we're we're ultimately driving toward reaching uh a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the city council

29:51

um so this is the all of the process that we've been engaged in um up to this

29:56

point has been kind of leading to to um your making a recommendation um to the city council um for them to consider um

30:05

uh later this year um we're updating the comprehensive plan because we're required to update

30:12

the plan under the growth management act um and the this update is required so

30:18

that we can extend the planning Horizon of the comprehensive plan um through the

30:24

next 20 years um So the plan will really cover 2024 through

30:29

2044 um another reason that we're updating the plan is that the the growth

30:35

management act or GA um has has some new requirements um particularly for housing

30:42

um that have been enacted by the legislature in the last few years um so a lot of the updates that are in the

30:48

plan are driven by those um those new requirements that have been um enacted

30:54

since the last time the city updated its comprehensive plan um and and all of this the periodic

31:00

review um needs to be completed before the end of the year um so we have a a

31:06

deadline of December 31st of 2024 um so this is getting us toward

31:12

getting uh a updated plan adopted um prior to that

31:18

deadline to I wanted to start by looking at some of the process that we've gone through to date um just as a refresher

31:26

um you know this this has been a process that's been ongoing since uh the spring of 2022 so I think it's helpful to just

31:33

kind of see where we've been and how we've gotten to to where we're at tonight um so it as I mentioned we we

31:40

began this project in March of 2022 when the city council adopted the scope of

31:46

work the Public Public participation plan and the schedule uh for the project

31:52

and that really kind of laid out the track that we were going to get on for this um this process um at the same time

31:59

or shortly after um the uh scope of work was adopted we began doing some public

32:05

Outreach for the economic development element um that's a new element that was

32:10

added um to the scope of work um we were requested to draft an economic

32:15

development element through this process and because it's a new element uh we we

32:20

took undertook some additional public Outreach um for that element um which

32:26

that really led into the summer of 22 where we held a community Workshop related to the economic development

32:33

element and we held an online survey um that summer to gather some input on

32:38

economic development um and then in that in that time too we began meeting uh

32:44

holding meetings with the Economic Development workg Group which was a subcommittee of the Planning Commission

32:49

and city council and they that subcommittee the economic development work group they really were the ones

32:56

that uh put together that initial draft of the economic development element so we wanted to get them in on um the the

33:03

initial draft um from the get-go um get the input from Planning Commission and

33:08

City Council on that um at the same time we convened the housing work group um

33:13

which was um also um included in that scope of work to develop a housing

33:19

element um an updated housing element um because of uh the legislation um namely

33:26

uh House Bill 1220 which was enacted in 2021 um we knew that we were going to

33:31

need to do some pretty substantial updates to the housing element and so in

33:37

that scope of work and public participation plan um that included the

33:42

creation of this housing work group to work on that draft of an updated housing element um the summer of 22 um also saw

33:50

the beginning of the planning commission's review of these elements um it at that time uh you took up the land

33:58

use element and the transportation element um looking at those elements because they were they didn't

34:05

necessarily need as substantial uh amendments to um keep up with uh our um

34:14

or stay up to date um as we found out later in the process there were some consistency amendments that needed to be

34:21

made to the land use element in particular um so we picked that up later but we we'll get there

34:26

soon um then in in the fall of 22 uh we continued to um you continued to review

34:34

the land use and transportation element um the economic development work group really start started to dig into uh that

34:41

drafting process um on the economic development element and then also the city council and Planning Commission

34:48

received a joint uh briefing on an economic analysis and a housing needs assessment those were two reports kind

34:55

of summarizing some of the data uh around um housing needs and um the local

35:02

economy um and then um following that in the winter of 22 um heading into

35:09

2023 the economic development work group um continued to their work um and

35:16

refined that draft element and then the Planning Commission reviewed the capital facilities element and the utilities

35:22

element um then leading into the spring of 2023

35:27

um the economic development uh work group was still uh plugging away on that

35:33

draft element um and eventually at the end of of that spring they delivered a

35:40

uh a an initial draft for the planning commission's review in the summer of

35:45

2023 um also in the summer of 2023 the city council approved uh an addendum to

35:52

the scope of work which which added additional tasks to the update of the housing element

35:58

um primarily in response to the guidance that was issued from the Department of Commerce around um House Bill 1220 and

36:07

complying with some of the targets that were set in that bill so once we saw that guidance from the Department of

36:13

Commerce uh it became clear that we needed to expand the scope of work specifically for the housing element and

36:19

so the city council reviewed that and gave us Direction um in the summer of

36:24

2023 um moving forward in the fall of 23

36:29

that's when the Planning Commission took up the economic development workg group's draft of the economic

36:35

development element and they um continue to refine it you you reach a um the

36:40

public review draft the draft that we're um looking at tonight um in the fall of

36:47

2023 then in the winter of 2023 the city council received a briefing on the land

36:53

Capacity Analysis supplement and the racially disparate impacts evaluation these were two of the reports that were

36:59

added by the scope of work addendum that was adopted in the summer of 2023 um and those those two reports are

37:07

are based on that Commerce guidance um and they gave us some additional information about how we might

37:13

accommodate our housing needs um as assigned by King County um and also how

37:19

we can address the new requirement from House Bill 1220 that the housing element

37:24

address um racially disparate impacts and housing policy the winter of of uh 2023 and and

37:32

into 2024 also saw the housing work group resume its work on the housing element um they began drafting um based

37:40

in large part on the findings from the land Capacity Analysis supplement and the racially disparate impacts

37:46

evaluation the housing work group began putting together that updated draft of the housing element um and then that uh

37:54

eventually came forward to the Planning Commission in March then the Parks and Recreation

38:01

Commission also in 2023 uh it's actually the winter of 24 the Parks and

38:06

Recreation Commission began reviewing the open space Zone um which the Planning Commission just was reviewing

38:13

in its last couple of meetings um and that brings us up to now to today um so through through the

38:20

spring um the Planning Commission worked on that housing work group draft of the housing element um refining that a bit

38:28

um they you also took a look at the O parks and open space elements um in I

38:34

guess that was April now um and then the open space Zone at the end of April and leading into May um there also um we had

38:43

the openhouse on May 1st which was a an open house to gather public input on the

38:49

comprehensive Plan update before us today and that included uh an online survey that was available May 1st

38:56

through May 20th um which uh PCB 2412 actually had the the results from that

39:03

included the results from that online survey um and that brings us all the way up to literally today on May 29th we're

39:10

we're conducting um the comprehensive plan public hearing um we plan the

39:16

legislative process uh we expect to continue at least till June 5th um but

39:22

can it can continue all the way through June 12th uh June 12th is our Target uh

39:27

to to arrive at the recommend at your recommendation to the city council um

39:32

regarding the comprehensive Plan update um but that's not the that's not the final step in the process so we still

39:39

have some additional process once the Planning Commission uh once you make a recommendation to the city council um

39:45

there's the city council review of that recommended draft um so they're uh

39:50

currently we're planning to have um an initial look with them in uh in July um

39:57

um and then they would have their uh two at least two touches um following that

40:03

in um in the fall of this year there's also this other piece um where there are

40:11

some additional code amendments that are going to be required to implement some of the uh policies in the housing

40:17

element and so this summer we're going to reconvene the housing workg group and begin working on those draft code

40:23

amendments the development code amendments so that they can be adopted concurrently with the plan um and then

40:29

our code and our development or our code and our comprehensive plan will then be

40:34

consistent um and the Planning Commission will take up the that those that recommended draft of code

40:41

amendments we're expecting um to bring that forward to you all in um

40:46

September um and then um that'll lead through to um adoption of the entire

40:53

plan before the um before the deadline on December 31st so we're we're at a

41:00

pretty major Milestone now but we still have quite a bit of work left to do um particularly on for you it'll be on the

41:08

code Amendment part but we also have the council review um through through the process

41:15

here so as I mentioned uh and feel free to stop me at any time if any of you

41:20

have questions um I'm I'm kind of rolling here but um if if there are any

41:25

questions please let me know yeah

41:32

Angie hi Adam um I think just building on what you just presented to us about

41:38

our timeline and what's happened and also kind of responding to um kind of comments or questions

41:46

about the volume of information that people have had the opportunity to

41:52

review um just a quick question like let's just take the economic development

41:57

element for example the version that's up on the let's talk site right now um

42:03

that has been available for review how long has that particular version been available for review the public review

42:11

draft was uh the Planning Commission arrived at that draft in November of this year okay wait that's not possible

42:20

because November of this year November of 23 I'm sorry okay great so so that

42:26

version is the version that's been up on Le let's talk after we deliberated had

42:31

our back and forth and and landed on the version that we landed on before we moved on to our next

42:37

element right so for that element in particular um that's a good example so

42:43

um you the Planning Commission took that up in June of last year um and then

42:50

there was a touch at July September and October um on on that um draft and at

42:58

each point along the way it was available for public comment too okay uh

43:03

that that I remember um you know I think one of the things I'm just uh both asking to make sure I

43:11

understand but also potentially providing Clarity for folks who are paying attention um is are the versions

43:20

of the documents that are up that contribute to the volume of work are those versions those versions have been

43:26

up since we've basically finished our work and I recognize that for example housing was recent so the version of it

43:34

probably only been up for a month um it didn't just go up this week uh I'm just

43:40

I'm just curious to make sure like I know when Deb sends out her permit

43:45

bulletin or her weekly bulletin I go click and I go go look and I try and keep up with it it's a lot of

43:51

information but I just want to make sure I understand that as we've been progressing as a Planning Commission and

43:56

we've completed these elements that we've been reviewing for the better part of a couple of years that the most

44:02

recent version that's been summarized for both us as a commission and the public to look at this month have been

44:10

up there for longer than just our agenda length yes um all of the public review

44:17

drafts um have been on the um on the project website the let stock page yeah

44:23

they've posted on there and on the older agendas too yeah okay I figured as

44:29

much you know I did spend a fair amount of time trying to cross check some things while I was

44:35

reviewing um and recognize that I just don't didn't want to look back at like three versions over the last year so I

44:41

was just going to ask you to answer that question for me rather than CR check all of them so it sounds accurate I just

44:48

want to check on that that's all that's all for now but I will be back later thanks

44:54

okay uh Kate hi thank you for recognizing me chair um

45:02

and I I'm a little bit concerned about again having read the public comment um

45:09

I'm a little bit concerned about how some of the work here is being characterized um as whose product and

45:17

what product and when and for example um in in the timeline we just went through

45:24

we talked about the housing work group beginning In Summer of 2022 we really didn't do any work until

45:31

the beginning of this year we had three meetings that were less than two hour each materials came a day in advance

45:39

um and those uh meetings were led by Council those meetings were led by

45:45

Council they had a strong voice from the mayor and three council members the two planning Commissioners I was one of them

45:52

um had very few comments and what I'm seeing is I'm seeing this housing

45:57

element characterized as uh something drafted by the Planning Commission but

46:03

it wasn't it was drafted by staff and Commissioners had a very small amount of

46:09

time to respond to those drafts and statements and reviews um and the

46:16

housing me was moved forward by three council members so seeing it's it's confusing to me I think and it's very

46:22

confusing to the public um and and not very transparent

46:28

to suggest that it's a Planning Commission Draft when it was largely

46:34

written by staff and approved by three council members to move forward in this

46:39

process um given the change to the Planning Commission by the mayor and

46:45

that the mayor was a leader on this process um I find the

46:50

characterizations in in the emails online and whatnot just very interesting

46:56

um I will say two uh related to what uh commissioner Baza was just talking about

47:02

um the draft housing element that seems to be the source of most of the comments was published on March 28th um one of

47:09

the members that spoke to or one of the residents that spoke tonight um attended

47:15

that meeting and made comments on that draft so again very confused about some of the feedback we're getting about lack

47:20

of transparency um these have been open documents folks have been invited to

47:25

meetings uh um on March 29th the comprehensive plan open house was

47:30

announced um and it's been two months that the housing elements been up online

47:36

so I I'm very confused by the tenor of comments um I'm very confused by the

47:42

characterization that this is a uh these are commission written plans we

47:47

are responding and reviewing and approving and making suggestions and

47:52

looking for consistency um yeah it's it's interesting I'm a little confused

47:58

but um maybe I'll be enlightened later we'll see thank you for listening to my

48:05

comments all right I'll keep rolling here um so a as we've touched on a

48:11

little bit um there was also on your agenda was Planning Commission Bill

48:17

2412 uh this that bill pretty much just provided some of the um background

48:23

information to help you make an informed decision um as we move forward um and

48:29

one of the key pieces of that was the uh the information about that public

48:34

participation um that we conducted earlier in the process um so exhibit one

48:40

of that Planning Commission bill um was the online survey results um that were

48:46

this is the survey that accompanied our um openhouse on May 1st um and that

48:52

survey was open from May 1st to May 20th and gathered 87 respond

48:57

and most of the questions on that survey were focused on implementation so we um

49:02

we were asking the questions were designed to get at a little bit more of like what are we going to do with this

49:09

next step um as we implement the plan U moving forward so you'll see that some

49:14

of the uh findings the draft findings that um staff has recommended um are

49:20

tied back to those survey responses um and they're really directed at kind of how we how we'll implement the plan

49:27

moving forward and I'll touch on findings here in a minute um the other

49:33

um piece of public input that was included with PCB 2412 was the multifam

49:39

housing online survey results um this was a survey that we conducted earlier this year from February to March and it

49:47

was focused on getting some input to supplement the findings in that racially disparate impacts

49:53

evaluation um directed at some of the displacement findings that were in that

49:58

report so um we found that there were some places at risk of displacement and

50:03

we wanted to find some more information about the nature of that displacement risk again kind of focused on as we

50:11

implement the plan how should we go go about implementing it what are some of the things that we can do um to address

50:19

some of that displacement risk uh Angie

50:26

thank you um Adam one of the pieces I noticed just in the public feedback in the last few

50:34

days has been well even tonight um concern about the lack of public

50:40

participation um a and I wonder because

50:46

like even I'm concerned about the lack of public participation although I can't fault the city or anybody for it because

50:52

it's a lack of the public participating um you know I even Lobby my own neighbors asked people please

51:00

come provide comment or get online and just fill out the survey I couldn't even get my 13-year-old to fill out the

51:07

survey actually she she politely declined um for another conversation

51:12

some other day but uh you know I I've noticed uh a lack of public

51:17

participation I read through the results I noted that 80 plus or minus people

51:23

participated thank you to every person who did deeply appreciate hearing that feedback and looking at it and uh the

51:31

city parsing it out and I wish I heard more voices I am curious um if you could

51:37

just recount very quickly if you have the information available the variety of different ways that you guys engaged in

51:44

Outreach to recruit folks to give feedback like I know there was an online survey I know commissioner accuse

51:51

pointed to a public hearing we had um I know I talked to like 30 people with which is not close what is that 1% of

51:59

the 30,000 people that live here um but I I'm curious if you can give just quick

52:06

stats um because I'm very curious as a commissioner who was really trying to recruit public opinion um you

52:14

know I I'm sure I know you did Outreach I saw and I was able to forward it or try and attempt recruitment myself but

52:21

can you recount for us what you guys did so in terms of the open house um we

52:29

we published notice um in the Mercer Island reporter um we published notice

52:35

on the um on the S the project website there was also uh we put notice in our

52:42

weekly bulletin uh the CPD bulletin and the um and the Mercer Island Weekly

52:50

Newsletter that the city distributes um there were also several social media

52:55

posts promoting the May 1 um open house

53:00

and um the same can be said for the for the survey itself um we had some social

53:08

media posts uh for the survey and then also um put it in the uh Mercer Island

53:14

weekly um so that's that's for just for that open house uh we did similar

53:19

efforts for when we held the economic development openhouse or Community Workshop
in June of 2022

53:26

um and then also for the online survey that we conducted then um I I would also

53:32

say you know that um there was also a public participation plan that was adopted with the
scope of work and that

53:38

kind of guided all of our um public participation out um output that we um

53:45

that's not the right word our public participation efforts uh through the process um do you do you know if it was

53:51

uh I know the city doesn't officially utilize next door um nor nor do I necessarily

53:58

advocate for it but do you know if it was unofficially uh linked or passed around

54:03

in next door um I don't I could find that out though our our social Medi is

54:08

handled by I see Allison jumping on here I was say I believe it was posted both on next door in

54:14

Facebook time okay great just questions thank

54:20

you Adam is it uh it's correct that uh the growth management act Lays out

54:26

statutory requirements for outreach to promote public participation correct it

54:33

does yes and I assume the city complied with all of those

54:39

requirements yes okay uh as far as I know I should say I I'm not a lawyer so

54:46

I'll say as far as I know in my opinion yes okay uh Kate go

54:51

ahead um yeah I just wanted to share that I did post the meeting I did not receive social media hits on it but I

54:57

don't engage in a lot of social media um I did personally post it because I wasn't seeing things

55:04

on um Mercer Island neighbors and I know that um and and I know that some

55:12

folks posted it out on other sites as well shared my post on other groups um

55:19

so there was quite a bit of social media um advertisement about it so I don't

55:24

think it's a lack of advertisement I just want wanted to State also um I do a lot of public engagement with my job at

55:31

King County and there is extremely low public participation these days and I

55:36

think it's ubiquitous problem it's not for lack of trying um and I will just

55:41

share that the one success I've had recently was sending a mailer to every single home within 500 feet of a river

55:49

body which was quite expensive um but we got a 50% particip Pati response 300

55:58

people out of or no not 50% it was 20% 20% response which is huge it's a lot

56:03

better than um I think we have one tenth of 1% here Angie to do that math on

56:09

Tenth of 1% of the community responding is a not a Target that I think uh is is

56:15

is a good sign so either people are happy with the way the city is doing

56:20

their work um they don't feel a crisis um or folks just aren't interested in

56:26

the public process it's uh again like Angie I uh Angela sorry commissioner

56:34

bazo I I tried to get people to come and people had other things to do so it's

56:41

not for lack of trying and it's not for lack of Outreach uh

56:46

Adam um yeah I mean I I I see we've got some public comments I think we've had a

56:53

chance to kind of Comm put our comments here but my impression I'd like to

56:58

politely suggest that we move along uh we do have public comments to look through um from the review um and look

57:07

at the comprehensive plan whether or not the rules were followed or whether or not those rules are suitable I I think

57:13

that's outside of our purview um as a Planning Commission and definitely not on today's agenda so I kind of

57:21

respectfully like to suggest we move along

57:26

well I think we're about prepared to do that Carolyn did you have a comment or are you okay Adam all right move along

57:38

yeah um so the other thing that was uh included with PCB 2412 was a consistency

57:46

review um and so this was made up of three documents that looked at um

57:51

potential policy gaps between um the policies in the comp plan the proposed

57:57

policies and the comprehensive plan and then the regional and countywide

58:02

planning policies um that uh apply to the city um it looked it went through

58:07

each of those multicounty planning policies and this and the countywide planning policies and checked to make

58:14

sure that we had addressed um those in our policies um and it did I identify a

58:20

couple of gaps a couple of places where we might be able to um increase the consistency or or make strengthen the

58:27

consistency between our plan and the regional and countywide plans and that

58:33

was what was included in that policy Gap summary which was exhibit three of the Planning Commission

58:39

bill and the consistency review is is important because we're required to make

58:44

sure that our plan is consistent with our neighboring jurisdiction's plans um

58:50

this is a requirement under the growth management act um and that's really what those
cpps the countywide planning

58:56

policies and the multicounty planning policies which are adopted by Puget Sound Regional
Council both of those

59:03

sets of planning policies are intended to make sure that um you know neighboring
jurisdictions within that

59:10

that area have consistent plans that are we all um that all of the cities and the

59:15

counties are kind of pulling on the ore together um and so again that

59:20

consistency review looked at those cpps and mpps to make sure that we were consistent
with that and then um you'll

59:27

find in PCB 2413 um in table one there are some

59:33

staff recommended uh amendments that would close those gaps that were identified um
so we provided those in

59:40

the table there um and you'll see we can we can look at that a little closer uh when we get
to the recommended

59:48

motions um there was also um an internal consistency review that was included

59:54

with um 412 um oh I'm sorry I got I have duplicate

1:00:03

uh slides here but there was an internal consistency review as well um it's not on the slide here um but that was

1:00:10

looking at our policies within the plan to make sure that none of them were conflicting so we didn't have say like a

1:00:18

policy telling us to do one thing and then a policy telling us to do the opposite um so our Consultants from Kim

1:00:24

Le horn took a look at our policies throughout the plan and identified

1:00:31

places where there might be um some conflicts there um in general um there

1:00:37

there were a couple of conflicts and there are some staff recommended um amendments to co to resolve those

1:00:44

conflicts in again in table one of PCB 2413

1:00:52

um included with uh PCB 413 was a set of

1:00:58

draft findings and the findings really describe why the city is acting on the

1:01:03

matter before it and and also provide some of the expectations for

1:01:09

implementation um so there they're a nonregulatory piece of your recommendation that you can forward to

1:01:15

the city council so if there's something that um as we go through the plan if

1:01:21

there's something that you feel needs to be memorialized but doesn't necessarily need to to be a policy within the plan

1:01:28

um you can make that as a finding if the if the Planning Commission um agrees to make those findings um in in the draft

1:01:36

you'll see sections one through three of those findings were prepared by staff and they M map out how the comprehensive

1:01:43

plan satisfies the procedural requirements in our own city code and then also um how they how the comp plan

1:01:51

addresses all the content required by the growth management act so goes through those staff findings kind of go

1:01:58

through and say you know the RCW requires us to do this and we have this

1:02:03

in the plan um and it goes through through the whole plan there um so uh I

1:02:09

also included uh seven recommended findings that can address some of the

1:02:14

public input and some of those policy gaps um and those were included in

1:02:20

2413 table two and when we get to the recommended motions you'll see motion

1:02:26

number two would would um address those recommended

1:02:31

findings um so throughout this whole process as I mentioned you can make your

1:02:36

own findings in section four of that document and those can appro provide that additional context um that you may

1:02:43

want the the city council to know about the process or about um how you would

1:02:48

like to see something implemented and then those get memorialized and we can use that to help kind of put together

1:02:54

our implementation plans in the coming year um and throughout this process you

1:02:59

can propose those amendments or additional findings by

1:03:04

motion now moving to the comprehensive plan elements um there are um four elements

1:03:12

that had um like relatively minor amendments to remain consistent with um

1:03:19

the updated growth targets and some of the changes throughout the rest of the plan um so those are the land use

1:03:26

Transportation Capital facilities and utilities element um so land use was

1:03:32

updated primarily just to remain consistent again with changes to our housing element and the economic

1:03:37

development element and the Parks and Recreation um sorry parks and open space

1:03:43

element then Transportation element was updated to make sure that our infrastructure will keep Pace with our

1:03:49

projected growth over that 20 years that includes like looking at the level of service impacts that can be expected

1:03:56

from um increased uh population as the city continues to grow um then the

1:04:02

capital facilities element looks at how our facilities will keep placed with the projected growth again there was some

1:04:09

level of service analysis in there that needed to be conducted because we have uh you know growth targets uh for

1:04:16

employment and housing um that can affect our facilities and then utilities it's the same it's to make sure that our

1:04:23

utilities infrastructure keeps pace with our projected growth now there were three elements

1:04:30

that received there were two new elements drafted during this comp plan update um per the the scope of work

1:04:37

adopted by the city council and then there was also an updated uh a significant update to the housing

1:04:43

element as we've talked about a bit so far so the economic development element is the first of the new elements that

1:04:49

we'll look at here um this this was drafted over a pretty long process as I

1:04:56

mentioned when we were looking at the Timeline um that began with some public input and data collection um and that

1:05:03

that took place in the second half of 2022 um and that culminated in a

1:05:09

workshop an online survey and that economic analysis report and then from

1:05:15

there we began drafting um the um Economic Development element with the

1:05:20

Economic Development workg Group um and that was um that process when went from

1:05:26

October to June um of 2023 and then that kicked off the Planning Commission

1:05:32

review um where you refined that um work group draft

1:05:38

element um so that's the other so that's the first of those new elements that's exhibit seven of PCB

1:05:47

2413 the other new element of the comprehensive plan or the other proposed new element is the parks and open space

1:05:55

element which is which is exhibit 8 of PCB 2413 this is a new element that um

1:06:02

primarily is is there to adopt um the part the pros plan um by reference make

1:06:09

sure that that's um adopted as part of our comprehensive plan and then it also

1:06:14

provides some policy direction for the adoption of some new zones um the first

1:06:20

phase of that would be during this comp plan update and will be the open space

1:06:25

Zone um which the Planning Commission was looking at at the end of April and into early or I guess it was just early May

1:06:32

that the Planning Commission was looking at that um the other new Zone that's uh

1:06:37

that has some policy Direction in the Parks and open space element is the the

1:06:42

parks Zone um but that is planned for to follow after the comprehensive Plan

1:06:48

update um and is not expected to be adopted with the comprehensive Plan update it's just there's some direction

1:06:54

to undertake that work following the comp plan update

1:07:00

here so the housing element really was um we're we're proposing a repeal and

1:07:06

replacement of the housing elements um so the the draft in exhibit three of the

1:07:12

Planning Commission bill um is proposed as a replacement of the existing element

1:07:18

and that was primarily because that Statewide legislation um really really

1:07:23

altered the GMA requirements um specifically House Bill 1220 and House Bill 1110 really made it so that

1:07:31

um we needed a a new policy Direction in that housing element um specifically um

1:07:38

under house bill 1220 for example um we're required the city is required to plan for um nearly all of its uh growth

1:07:47

Target um its housing growth Target to be um affordable to households with

1:07:52

incomes below the Ami um and this new housing element was really

1:07:58

drafted specifically to address those requirements and uh do it consistent

1:08:03

with uh the guidance from the Department of

1:08:11

Commerce um so there were some uh technical reports uh that fed into this

1:08:16

process that really informed the housing element um the drafting of the housing element there was the housing needs

1:08:22

assessment which was uh prepared in the second half of 2022 presented to the

1:08:29

city council in September of 2022 um the land Capacity Analysis

1:08:34

supplement which again was drafted based on the Commerce guidance um at the second half of

1:08:40

2023 and that was presented to council at their very first meeting of this year

1:08:45

2024 along with the racially disparate impacts evaluation which is another uh

1:08:51

report that was prepared based on the um the Commerce guidance that took a look

1:08:57

at um or was there to evaluate um how housing policies may have had a racially

1:09:03

disparate impact and then identify some potential amendments to address that um

1:09:09

the draft as as was pointed out um earlier the draft of the housing element

1:09:14

was um prepared by uh the housing work group um which was a joint Planning

1:09:20

Commission and city council subcommittee um so it was a it was

1:09:26

uh the council and the Planning Commission U members uh kind of drove

1:09:31

that process um and um arrived at their recommended draft um in March of 24 um

1:09:39

and then the Planning Commission reviewed that housing workg group draft um and made some refinements um through

1:09:47

March of this year um so that's kind of how we got to the housing element I I see a hand yeah Victor yeah so just a

1:09:56

quick question on that just for clarification so the housing workg group

1:10:03

graft that you that you referred to in the previous slide that takes into

1:10:09

account uh Department of Commerce

1:10:15

recommendations that is reflected in the housing workg group draft from March

1:10:22

2024 yes the Commerce guidance was the the the housing element draft reflects

1:10:28

the Commerce guidance um that was kind of our um

1:10:34

main source of of guidance for drafting that housing element got it thank

1:10:41

you all right keep rolling here um so that's a very quick overview of the last

1:10:50

two plus years of work with the commission here um so I wanted to I

1:10:56

provided some recommended motions in the Planning Commission Bill 2413 um and and these are recommended

1:11:04

primarily they're they're a road map to how we kind of get from A to B um in

1:11:09

this process so the first two are addressing those policy gaps that were identified the consistency topics that's

1:11:17

the first um recommendation is is amending those po like some of the

1:11:22

policy language within the plan um as outlined in um table one um of Planning

1:11:30

Commission Bill 2413 the second motion is making findings um again those are directed

1:11:37

primarily at the um at the public input that we received

1:11:42

during the openhouse and the online survey um so we can we can address those

1:11:49

findings and through this process again if there's other amendments or to or additional findings that you like to

1:11:55

make we can we can address those with motions as well um and then once we've gotten to a point and I I think there

1:12:02

was some confusion I I don't think we're going to arrive there tonight but eventually we want to arrive at this

1:12:08

third motion which is um moving forward the recommendation of the overall

1:12:13

comprehensive Plan update um to the city council um so once we've once we've gone

1:12:19

through the rest of the plan and you feel comfortable making a recommendation that's where that that third motion

1:12:26

would come in um and I can I can bring these back up if you'd like oh sorry

1:12:32

there's one more just kind of looking ahead um the next two meetings uh we

1:12:38

expect will continue deliberations the F the at the next meeting on June 5th we expect the the

1:12:45

focus will be on Transportation Capital facilities and utilities elements and

1:12:51

we're asking for you to provide written comments by next Monday June third um so

1:12:56

that we can get those distributed to the council or the commission um ahead of the meeting and then on the 12th that's

1:13:03

our Target to conclude deliberations and that's where we'll focus on land use housing and economic development and for

1:13:10

that meeting we're asking for comments by the

1:13:15

10th Victor uh so a process question for you

1:13:22

chair and and vice chair um obviously as Adam laid out lot to

1:13:30

cover um between now and in June 12th um and I'm just wondering what your

1:13:38

thoughts are um for stopping points for each of these meetings that we have

1:13:44

scheduled for tonight tomorrow night and or I'm sorry tonight June 5th and then June

1:13:53

12th um well I haven't thought about stopping points uh I think the question

1:14:00

tonight's meeting I believe the two motions that we want to get

1:14:06

through should not be too difficult so I would expect those to go relatively

1:14:14

quickly um I think the question for the June meetings is whether there

1:14:22

will be any significant further amendments to those elements um and

1:14:29

given all the effort that's gone into them to date I would expect there wouldn't be um significant amendments um

1:14:38

so I don't I don't really Envision a problem um but maybe I'm missing

1:14:46

something uh Angie thanks chair Murphy

1:14:52

um well I I think I'm following up on Victor's question and I want to aim a

1:14:59

couple of questions at Adam to help me understand process and also resolve that

1:15:04

point you just made about you don't expect um amendments um

1:15:11

Adam um one of the things I think I'm noticing both in public comments and in

1:15:18

process is that we've received a lot of public comments over the last couple of years during this process

1:15:25

um I feel like actually there's a fair number of comments that were received

1:15:31

that people probably don't know exactly how their comments were treated and I'm

1:15:36

curious what the city's plan is for do you intend to specifically and

1:15:41

explicitly respond to comments so for example Patty Smith submits comments on

1:15:49

the housing element do you plan to respond to Patty Smith very explicitly with explanations about how you did or

1:15:56

did not incorporate her comments or answer her questions that's my first

1:16:01

question to you like what is the city's plan to explicitly address comments

1:16:07

we've already received up till now and comments we've received during like the

1:16:13

last 24 hours so we don't typically respond directly to public comments um that's um

1:16:23

I think if there's uh if you like we can keep track of changes made to the draft

1:16:29

that are made in response to those public comments um but I unless there

1:16:35

was a need for a clarification we don't we don't typically um respond to those

1:16:40

comments okay um and while if I sat down clearly in your seat I would probably

1:16:47

recognize the amount of sub substantive effort it would take to do that one of the things I'm also recognizing is that

1:16:54

when people give comments I don't think they know or understand what we do with them like I'm not even sure they know if

1:17:01

you came back and you made a change you be in the city or if the city came back and made a change and the Planning

1:17:06

Commission voted on it I'm not sure that people would know how to articulated are

1:17:11

just what happened with their information and so what I'm interpreting in public comment is that there seems to

1:17:19

be a um a tenor of we keep telling you things and you're not doing it anything

1:17:25

with it which I don't in some instances agree with because I feel like we did do stuff with it but they don't see it or

1:17:31

they don't recognize or we're not getting back to them and so I'm I'm speaking to that because I noticed that

1:17:38

and I want as a as a planning commissioner I want to make sure people understand that I'm actually reading

1:17:44

what they're sending and I'm thinking about it and I'm looking at it um as a participant with you as a city partner I

1:17:51

you know like I'm trying to connect the dots here and also just from a process perspective moving forward we're going

1:17:57

to get comments now um and people are going to want changes made or amendments

1:18:04

you know some folks have already pointed to changes fellow Commissioners have submitted and and feeling like that's

1:18:10

either unfair or out of process I actually do have some question about that I'm like I I do have some question

1:18:17

like if everyone submits a I think you should change it to be this how are we going to let them know we will or won't

1:18:23

do it and what is our discernment around that I I think that's actually important for us to make sure we're clear about

1:18:30

regarding process um and we've been doing this for two

1:18:35

years and we've been doing it piece by piece so we've made a lot of changes already but herity process this was also

1:18:43

this time frame was the time frame where we were giving the public an opportunity to give us more feedback it was another

1:18:48

touch and we were going to make changes that said I want to understand

1:18:54

what my role is as a commissioner if we're getting feedback right now is it my job as a commissioner to propose an

1:19:01

amendment to make changes based on public feedback or will you as the city be

1:19:08

coming back next week and saying hey we reviewed the 47 comments we received and

1:19:14

we're going to recommend this change because the policy review and GAP closure analysis doesn't address that

1:19:19

that addresses the Gap closure analysis the findings kind of start to to address

1:19:25

it but not really or if it is supposed to address it I think we need to make more explicit how does that make sense

1:19:31

MH okay so so I will in advance of the

1:19:36

next meeting um we I'll be providing you with a matrix of the comments that we've

1:19:43

received um in terms of responding to those comments again it's not necessarily uh staff doesn't necessarily

1:19:52

make recommendations based on the public comments unless we unless we're asked unless you could request that staff

1:19:58

develop a recommendation or recommended language based on a comment or but if

1:20:03

you if you're reading those public comments and would like to move forward with one of those comments uh making one

1:20:10

of those amendments you you can you could make that motion as a planning commissioner okay I I guess I just

1:20:17

noticed though that and this might be a relationship thing like this this might be a

1:20:22

relationship thing between City and commission and my neighbors which is if

1:20:29

people don't if people feel like they keep giving the same comments over and over and nothing is happening it's

1:20:36

because the loop isn't getting closed and I you know like I just want to I'm

1:20:41

not saying we have to attend to everything um sometimes we just have to say we we're not going to do your

1:20:47

comment because it doesn't meet state law or a political there's a political piece that doesn't or it actually

1:20:53

doesn't doesn't fit here but I do want to acknowledge that you know I hear a lot

1:20:59

of I keep telling you something and I'm not getting feedback and even I'm trying to figure out what to do with some of it

1:21:05

like oh they keep giving us some feedback am I as a commissioner supposed to make a motion or speak to it or not

1:21:10

so I think that's one thing I just I think it's a it's actually process piece

1:21:16

for me in understanding what are we doing tonight and what are we doing next week and do I need to make sure I do all

1:21:23

of the comment review to make motions or are you going to do it or we do we need to have a discussion about that so thank

1:21:30

you I think what I heard you say is you're going to make some recommendations as they make sense

1:21:36

you're not going to do it for all of them you'll give us a matrix and we're welcome to submit motions as we as

1:21:43

Commissioners see fit yes and I I think that one of the things that we can do is

1:21:49

we can keep track of those those comments if they do lead to uh an amendment we can note that in the Matrix

1:21:57

um that that's a comment tracking thing we do for U or we can do um for this

1:22:04

process thank you uh

1:22:10

Kate thank you for recognizing me chair um I I was expecting to see a matrix of

1:22:17

comments and I think um given that the sea decision here by the city as lead

1:22:22

agency was a DNS s which is Shand for determination of

1:22:27

non-significance um that's not required as it is with an e but I think what I

1:22:32

heard from commissioner baz and I'm inclined to agree with is that um before taking any action on proposed

1:22:39

recommended uh motion number three that Commissioners would need a table of comments and if and how they've been

1:22:47

responded to um from my read of many of the comments they're in conflict with uh

1:22:54

the Mandate from the house bills regarding the housing element um I think

1:23:00

it's going to be a real challenge for us as Commissioners or staff to respond to

1:23:05

several of those comments without um having some kind of conflict with state

1:23:11

law um and and we used primarily um what I understood the staff to use was the

1:23:17

recommendations from the State Department of Commerce which we are now required to Monitor and have

1:23:23

accountability for so um so I think that commissioner bazo is on

1:23:30

the nose I would I would like I don't know how if this like we are directive or if the chair asked for it or what but

1:23:37

um that table of comments would be great um also I am ready to move on

1:23:44

recommended action one and two um and I would actually like to make a motion to close the policy gaps and resolve the

1:23:50

internal consistency topics as recommended by staff in p CB 2413 table

1:23:56

one as presented um reason being they make sense they're simple um

1:24:04

and and I'm ready to move forward on that one I will second that okay uh

1:24:10

before we do that Victor had his hand up and I want to get his comment in before

1:24:15

we address that motion thank you so I was just going to

1:24:21

say plus one to commissioner bazo's comments um there was

1:24:28

a fair amount of hand ringing earlier in this meeting about lack of public

1:24:33

participation and there seems to be a disconnect with the people who are

1:24:40

trying to participate um who may not feel that

1:24:46

they're being hurt um while commissioner Baza was speaking I brought up the

1:24:52

comments of Mr Alo Spence Perez Jr who very clearly

1:25:00

spent a lot of time dissecting um the comprehensive plan and providing very

1:25:07

specific comments to it um I would hate for those comments to

1:25:12

just go in a black hole and and be ignored um I think it's

1:25:18

important certainly if I if I was commenting and I felt like my comments were going in a black hole eventually I

1:25:24

would um I would stop commenting um so but further further to

1:25:32

that we've heard a number of comments uh or seen a number of written

1:25:39

comments uh both today and previously about the Planning Commission exceeding its

1:25:47

um original scope and so what might be helpful is also Adam if we could provide

1:25:54

what the original scope was I actually went back earlier today and tried to find it and we don't have we don't

1:26:01

have um agendas and comments or video going back to March 2022 which is when

1:26:08

um when this process actually started and so it would actually be helpful to

1:26:14

see what the commission commission was originally charged with and then to use

1:26:19

that as a lens for um some of these changes that have been made to see if um

1:26:26

these changes meet that meet that criteria or

1:26:31

not yeah there has been especially in the area of housing there has been a

1:26:36

pretty radical change in scope um based on the state law requirements and that's

1:26:43

really where most of the what I'll say negative comments um

1:26:49

circle around so I'm not sure if looking at the original scope of work um is is

1:26:58

very determinative of whether we're on track um especially in the housing

1:27:05

area well if I recall correctly it was only what is required

1:27:11

by state law um I think and I'm paraphrasing going back more than two

1:27:17

years um and so certainly I think we should be able to capture what was in

1:27:23

housing bill you named the housing bill I can't I can't remember the number and if

1:27:29

that's if that's a requirement by state law well then certainly that's that's something that we would need to change

1:27:35

as well

1:27:40

Adam yeah I just wanted to point out I'll I'll provide the scope of work um

1:27:46

or at least links to it um the housing piece of that there was an addendum to the scope of work that was adopted by

1:27:53

the city council last summer um that specifically addresses housing and is

1:27:58

where a lot of the housing element um components that we put together in this

1:28:03

last year came from um and so well I'll provide all of that um for the next

1:28:09

meeting that would be super helpful thank you uh

1:28:15

Kate I believe Carol ER commissioner Bozman had a hand up no it was done it went away um

1:28:24

I was going on to ask Adam in response to Victor's comment when we were on the housing work group you had shared

1:28:32

a uh draft document and some tables and whatnot that had very efficiently

1:28:39

crosswalked every single item that was proposed to be added to the housing element with a requirement in state law

1:28:47

and as well as referencing um Department of Commerce guidance on those topics was

1:28:54

that made available on the public website because if not I think that's a very straightforward way um it was very

1:29:01

easy for me and the reason I made very few comments on the staff draft of the housing element um was because they were

1:29:08

so clearly crosswalked to the state law in that uh document you gave us was that shared online already it was it so there

1:29:16

was a Planning Commission bill in March that had that um it was the the first uh

1:29:22

bill that brought forward the housing work group draft and it it it had that crosswalk between the policies and and

1:29:28

the requirements and it was not just state requirements it was multicounty planning policies and cpps too so tsrc

1:29:36

okay thank you very much appreciate that um maybe it would be helpful to send that link to those materials to the

1:29:41

commission so we can revisit those and um revisit those in the light of the comments that we've received thank

1:29:51

you uh Victor and Andrew I think I I share your concern about the lack

1:29:58

of sort of official response to comments and the concern about people

1:30:05

making comments and having them go into a black hole um so I do think that

1:30:10

having something that um pulls that together to have in the record would be

1:30:18

very good um and if if there are things in there that

1:30:25

lead themselves to an amendment um that could be brought

1:30:30

forward by any of the Commissioners or staff um I am a bit concerned about the

1:30:36

notion of going back and trying to um revisit the entire

1:30:43

housing uh element to see if if we're strictly complying um in in someone's opinion

1:30:52

with the state law um that that ground's been covered and and if there's some

1:31:01

glaring error or problem there I think that should be brought brought out but

1:31:07

my read albe it a quick read of many of the comments that just come in over the

1:31:12

last day or two um is that they are consistently simply objections to what's

1:31:21

being required of us by the state um and people don't like it or some

1:31:26

people don't like it and and so and they have a right to their opinion um but

1:31:33

it's not going to result in a change because we have to comply with the state

1:31:40

state legal requirements uh Victor so just just to clarify I'm not

1:31:47

I'm certainly not requesting a revisit of decisions that have been previously

1:31:52

made by the commission that's two years worth of work and that's just um that's

1:31:57

a bridge too far um yeah but uh with that said a number of people have raised

1:32:05

the issue that um we've gone beyond what

1:32:10

was chartered which would have been March 22 and then as you mentioned there

1:32:15

was um an additional Charter around the housing bill that happened and so it

1:32:22

would it would be useful I think to Simply kind of provide the original

1:32:27

charter as well as the amended Charter or Charters and then uh use that as a

1:32:34

potential lens to um to allow the public to evaluate the

1:32:41

changes that have been made yeah I agree with that

1:32:49

Angie thank you um plus one about what

1:32:55

Victor was saying I'm not recommending we go back and revisit I think that the process the Planning Commission engaged

1:33:00

in was both transparent and rigorous at least the as far as I've been involved

1:33:06

and I'm certain the process prior to my involvement um I I don't think it's

1:33:13

important for us to argue with people who have opinions that are frustrated

1:33:18

I'm not trying to argue but what I notice is a clear and distinct lack of

1:33:24

actual response to the engagement and as a planning commissioner who is supposed

1:33:29

to be supporting and representing my neighbors um or at least trying to help support and bridge the

1:33:36

gap between the city and the voice um I think it's important for us to be able to at least provide some context or some

1:33:44

reasoning or some acknowledgement to what I see is some high frustration and

1:33:49

consistent feedback without actually letting people know I don't even know if the word is why but

1:33:56

at least just responding with some information and some acknowledgement and what I will say is like I'm happy to

1:34:03

support moving forward on policy Gap closure but I actually think especially

1:34:09

if it's going to follow on Planning Commission shoulders to make a recommendation to the city that I would

1:34:15

like to reserve the opportunity to make some findings and allow comments and our

1:34:21

findings to potentially speak to that if the city is not going to be able to do a full crosswalk in comments that perhaps

1:34:28

in our findings we're going to need to be able to come up with some language or

1:34:33

some acknowledgement or some reference to we heard you we recognize your frustration and here's where we made the

1:34:40

change because there are places we probably did make a change we just didn't tell them and then there's places we we're like ah sorry we actually have

1:34:47

to comply with the grow man growth management act and I hear that it's unbelievably frustrating let's get

1:34:53

coffee and I'll listen to you be really frustrated about it or whatever that might have to be I I'm not saying we put

1:34:58

that in the Matrix but I am saying I think it's an important Loop we have to close and as planning Commissioners if

1:35:04

the city's not going to do it I actually think we need to in our

1:35:11

findings okay so now we have a motion

1:35:16

that's been seconded to approve their proposed policy Gap amendments

1:35:24

is there any discussion of that motion

1:35:34

Carolyn yeah I'm I'm generally in favor of the motion I mean I've read through all of the uh um uh proposals from staff

1:35:42

to close the policy gaps and compared that to what Kim Le horn recommended and

1:35:48

and also the um consistency issues with within the the

1:35:54

comp plan and I I think the proposal is is quite good um I would like to

1:35:59

recommend one Amendment however so can we take can you take an

1:36:05

amendment right now to the um staff's proposal to close the

1:36:11

policy gaps is it a friendly

1:36:18

Amendment well it's it's just an amendment to the language language in the

1:36:24

um policy gap for number four process-wise I think you would just need

1:36:30

to make a motion to amend the motion that's on the table okay well I Mo I

1:36:36

move to amend the emotion the motion by uh inserting the word light

1:36:44

after the word noise in the resolution for policy Gap number four

1:37:01

second because it's my Amendment do or because it's the motion I put on

1:37:08

the table do I say that's fine with me that we change the motion in that way

1:37:14

because it's fine with me okay well if was fine with you then I

1:37:19

I say we go ahead Angie um I just just want Clarity of what we're amending because I am I

1:37:26

looking at table one reference for because that that doesn't line up to me

1:37:32

or does it Adam would you be able to put it up on the screen please yeah I'm

1:37:37

getting it here okay thank you

1:37:49

uhhuh okay

1:38:00

okay so here's policy Gap four um can't really see the whole thing

1:38:07

there

1:38:12

uh uh can't see the okay that's get yeah that's I can see it now okay and you're

1:38:18

saying after air you want light after the word noise the word

1:38:25

light oh

1:38:32

okay just highlighted on the screen here and now I'll zoom in so that you can see it maybe
okay thank you

1:38:39

Adam the reason I am proposing it if I may chair shall I explain continue yes

1:38:46

okay um the consultant kimley horn had recommended in um

1:38:55

their summary of vision 2050 multicounty planning policies in environment number

1:39:02

seven that um that we have policies that

1:39:07

reduce and mitigate noise and light pollution caused by Transportation Industries public facilities and other

1:39:14

sources now the staff has already included one change in fact if you look just up to

1:39:20

the next box you will see the word light added to the transportation element

1:39:25

policy 3.1 which is great but that's only to do with light

1:39:31

coming from Transportation sources so I wanted to add the word

1:39:37

light to um this policy that it has to do with light coming from many other

1:39:47

sources please take note that this policy is directed toward uh

1:39:54

um people in areas that have been disproportionately affected so that is

1:40:00

why I have proposed another amendment to the actual comp plan which we can take up later but these two changes right

1:40:07

here are good one you know pertains to Transportation noise the other one

1:40:14

pertains to disproportionately affected people in areas those are both good not

1:40:20

quite enough to deal with these things should be also addressed for everybody

1:40:25

in all neighborhoods and that's why I have proposed another amendment but okay

1:40:30

so that's my reason for the amendment right here okay any further

1:40:40

discussion uh

1:40:45

Victor um how do we determine um areas

1:40:50

that have been disproportionately affected

1:40:56

my understanding is that the Studies have shown that these

1:41:02

sources of pollution are greater in places where you have people living that

1:41:07

have lower incomes so it's going to be in your multif family areas your your housing that's mixed up with commercial

1:41:14

property um so those are the areas that typically are are disproportionately

1:41:20

affected I I think and I don't have it in front

1:41:26

of me but I believe that we had a map in front of us a few

1:41:31

months ago about economic distribution I don't remember a low

1:41:37

seeing a low income area on rer island I'm doing that from memory I seem

1:41:43

to remember the entire map was green so how do we determine low income well this

1:41:48

doesn't say low income it just says you just said I'm going off of what you just said okay well I'm I'm trying to refer

1:41:57

to that you asked where the the people would be more disproportionately affected or the areas and they're the

1:42:04

areas where we have multif family

1:42:09

housing um in mixed with commercial Pro

1:42:14

commercial development those are the those are the areas so that's what this policy is directed to

1:42:36

y further discussion Deb would you please call the

1:42:45

role so chair I think the cleanest way to do this is to vote on the amendment which is specific to the policy number

1:42:53

four yes that's what I was assumed you were going to do okay there was some

1:42:59

discussion around that so we'll stick with that yes correct so the amendment

1:43:04

is uh to amend policy Gap four to read reduce impact to people in areas that

1:43:10

have been disproportionately affected by noise adding in the word light air pollution or other environmental

1:43:18

impacts okay commissioner Gils

1:43:25

hi Vice chair RAB I commissioner bazo

1:43:32

I commissioner RIS name commissioner Bozman I commissioner

1:43:40

ke I and chair Murphy I okay some passes

1:43:48

61 so now we move on to the original motion to approve

1:43:55

the to close the policy gaps and resolve the internal consistency topics as recommend by staff and PCB 2413 table

1:44:03

one is presented yes um

1:44:10

Victor are we having a discussion uh well if if there's more discussion

1:44:16

needed uh you're correct yeah I think we we did

1:44:21

not have discussion of the main motion yet so you're right so go ahead um so on item number

1:44:30

one uh a question for Adam what does it mean to prioritize

1:44:39

Services uh so it would be pres prioritize services and access to Opportunities so we want to make sure

1:44:46

that those uh communities of color um and people with low incomes are um

1:44:53

getting those service and access but that's just repeating what's said here what does that mean right um well so

1:45:01

what that would mean is that as we're implementing the element um and we're considering actions that might affect

1:45:06

services that would go to those communities that they would that we would make sure that those communities

1:45:12

have access as we make those decisions can you give me an example of a service that would be

1:45:18

prioritized um sure as we were looking at maybe um decision that would affect

1:45:24

wireless service um and like wireless internet service um we would want to

1:45:29

make sure that we were maintaining that access and um prioritizing keeping that

1:45:35

service uh going um or that our actions weren't going to jeopardize that yeah uh where

1:45:44

do we have a definition of people of color in the comp plan uh we do not Define the term so who's responsible for

1:45:52

defining the term people of color uh typically when the comp plan or the code

1:45:57

does not establish a definition you would use the um average def like the

1:46:03

the dictionary definition of the um of the term got

1:46:14

it any further discussion or questions on the motion Adam um I just you know I I

1:46:23

expanding on that reference number one I think one of our public comments was this is not a you know a race issue but

1:46:32

it's really a socioeconomic issue so I I I think there's enough momentum for this

1:46:38

to just be past but I do want to state that I think we ought to add some language to articulate that it's

1:46:45

preferable to Prior prioritize services to based on socioeconomic status not you

1:46:52

know not skin color those are some of the comments we had I think some of those comments you know their words not

1:46:58

mine um use the words racist and patronizing um and then you know in

1:47:04

addition on reference number seven and 10 I just wanted to communicate

1:47:10

my opinion that you know these words inequities and underserved areas are

1:47:16

just they're they're they're quite vague like you know 10 you know okay we're talking about tell

1:47:23

Services when you say an underserved area is that a place that does not have line of sight like I know you know if we

1:47:30

don't have a line a site there there's a few Hills on Mercer Island and what do we mean underserved um so I just wanted

1:47:36

to I said I'm not going to blur the point or try to break them out but I think seven and 10 are vague and I

1:47:42

wanted to articulate that we have received some public comment on on number

1:47:50

one okay any further

1:47:57

comments okay let's call the

1:48:08

roll Vice chair regab nay commissioner bazo

1:48:16

I commissioner accuse I commissioner RIS

1:48:24

name chair Murphy I commissioner gills I and commissioner

1:48:32

Bozman I main motion passes

1:48:43

52 so now the question is um moving on

1:48:48

to the findings um commissioner bazo spoke earlier to

1:48:55

the notion of um reserving the ability to supplement those findings before the

1:49:03

end of this process uh to address comments and any changes made by

1:49:12

Amendment um the way this

1:49:18

is worded at least the staff proposal is worded is is were recommended approving

1:49:24

the findings um the question might be should

1:49:30

we provisionally approve these findings subject to changes uh in lie

1:49:37

of a definitive approval of these findings as

1:49:42

presented uh Carolyn well I was just going to move

1:49:48

that we adopt the findings subject to further amendments to said findings

1:49:54

prior to the recommendation before to the

1:50:01

council do I have a second for

1:50:06

that let's discuss it second okay uh

1:50:13

Victor excuse me chair just a moment if I may I'm going to slow you down for a second make sure I captured that last uh

1:50:21

portion of commissioner man's motion which is subject to excuse me subject

1:50:30

to amendments prior to the final

1:50:37

recommendation to the

1:50:44

council thank you uh Victor can we put up uh the findings

1:50:52

that were approving here I'm having a hard time finding the the exact Link in the agenda packet I've got a bunch of

1:50:59

tabs open yeah I'll get it here one second

1:51:28

and yeah it won't quite

1:51:43

fit there they are

1:51:55

and what item is that in the agenda packet this is exhibit one of PCB

1:52:03

2413 okay so it just further down I see I got it

1:52:08

okay yeah the findings are about 20 pages and then the rest are of that

1:52:14

exhibit our attachments to the findings that are got it things from the record

1:52:20

yeah okay I've got it now thank you okay uh

1:52:26

commissioner bazo thank you chair Murphy

1:52:32

um it's 80 it's 79 pages of findings 20

1:52:37

of which are content 18 of which are statutory uh recounts of what we did and

1:52:45

when we did it and why we did it and whatnot with a couple pages of bullets

1:52:50

of here are some findings here are some rough summary findings based on feedback

1:52:55

from the community um in my mind just based on reviewing

1:53:01

this I think this is a great first draft and so I want to acknowledge the city for having done it
um I I think we have

1:53:07

a great start here and I don't really have any basic arguments other than it needs more like I
think based on my

1:53:15

review of public comment um and just listening to thematically the comments that keep

1:53:22

coming up and what seemed to me to be a general lack whether it's on the part of council the mayor the commissions or the

1:53:29

city to actually respond to some of the stuff that comes up regularly I think it

1:53:35

would be important for us to add into these findings just a little bit more

1:53:40

content recognizing what we hear and recognizing where we are or are not

1:53:46

taking action um so I I'm in opposition of moving the findings forward but I am

1:53:53

acknowledging that this is a great initial first draft and it's something that I would like to build upon um and

1:54:00

hopefully to some degree close the loop on by June 5th de

1:54:06

depending on how much we think we have to review and how much the city is going to be proposing uh amendments to all of

1:54:14

these elements um you know it seems like something will'll be able to close

1:54:20

quickly uh but it's not something I'm going to vote for

1:54:27

tonight commissioner

1:54:38

cuse the findings I understood that we were voting on were the seven or eight

1:54:47

items uh enumerated by staff in the first document in our agenda

1:54:53

packet so if it's something that's not that I I would like clarification because my understanding was this is a

1:54:58

very very simple vote and um we could add a

1:55:04

finding that says Wordsmith something pretty quickly that says track um public

1:55:12

comment and responses to public comment so maybe I can as an additional

1:55:18

finding yeah or are there actually 80 pages of finding that I'm not um so

1:55:27

as what sorry what's what's shown on the screen here is is those eight findings

1:55:33

from table two um these are just in the document with the staff findings as well

1:55:40

and certainly throughout throughout the process the Planning Commission can continue to add to this list um before

1:55:47

finalizing their recommendation um As I understood the motion I what it was to

1:55:53

move forward with these seven um these seven items here um which are from table

1:56:02

two of the this is just an easier way to look at it in one go okay so we the vote is do we approve

1:56:09

these seven items on these two pages and we can add more if we need to in the

1:56:15

future that's what we're voting on as as I understand it thank thank

1:56:26

you uh commissioner R um I guess yeah I wanted to I was I

1:56:33

think yeah Adam's clarified the first question is yeah we're voting on F1 through

1:56:38

F7 um I would like to propose a friendly amendment to break out F2 and F5 for

1:56:46

further discussion I'm happy to Greenlight the

1:56:54

remaining

1:56:59

five so to help with that F2 would be B here yeah Bravo and Echo yes sorry I'm

1:57:06

I'm looking at the table too I know I'm

1:57:18

sorry so is that a motion Adam

1:57:24

uh sure yes that that is a motion to break out yeah F2 or bf2 and E Echo F5 for a

1:57:34

separate discussion is there a second for

1:57:40

that I will second it for discussion

1:57:46

okay uh bris yeah you know I think

1:57:53

Adam sent around I also would like to if we're going to discuss these uh breakout C sometimes known as F3 for a little

1:58:01

discussion too second I'm going to have to slow all of

1:58:09

you down because I'm sorry I can't see the screen

1:58:15

and sorry so I would I would make a motion that we also uh discuss

1:58:23

um F3 among the

1:58:32

findings

1:58:40

seconded um

1:58:45

okay I'm I'm curious the the findings that are being called out are seem to

1:58:52

all be related to the housing element um and I'm curious the reason I

1:58:59

did not have a problem with them is because they are consistent with the housing element um as drafted and

1:59:04

approved by the mayor to council members Etc um

1:59:12

so I'm curious about process here uh and and order of operations because if

1:59:19

we're if there's a decision made to modify these it needs to be done in

1:59:25

the context of the housing element review so perhaps that needs to be done first um and
and we need to figure out

1:59:33

if there going to be any amendments to the housing element first uh before

1:59:38

addressing these findings because if we remove these findings or modify them in

1:59:44

some way they will then become inconsistent with the mayor and council and two
planning Commissioners

1:59:50

recommendations for the housing

1:59:57

element Carolyn well I was just going to ask what is meant by taking them out for

2:00:03

further discussion does that mean the discussion tonight or in regard because we're

2:00:09

considering a a motion to adopt this thing as

2:00:17

is so when you when you say to pull it out for further discussion I just wonder

2:00:22

if that means go ahead and adopt everything but those three things or if we're going to
discuss it tonight so

2:00:27

just what does that mean uh

2:00:36

Victor I'm I'm trying to understand the context in which this

2:00:42

will be used I I realize that it's going to be presented as a part of the comprehensive

2:00:49

plan is it is it like a Prelude to the comprehensive plan that's going to be presented to as as a part of it because

2:00:56

I I'm in Reading in Reading um the packet it said

2:01:05

the findings will be presented and um basically I I'm trying to trying

2:01:12

to find the exact quote but it b i I thought it was going to be in response to public

2:01:19

comment we just got public comment tonight so I'm unclear as to how we can

2:01:25

provide findings having just heard public comment and and maybe if I'm

2:01:31

understanding uh commissioner bazo's comment maybe that was her comment as well I don't know I'm just I'm a little

2:01:37

confused about context and process here sure so I can uh I I heard two questions

2:01:44

in there first the findings um the the findings will be

2:01:49

presented with your recommendation to the city council um findings are usually

2:01:55

an exhibit to a um an ordinance and they provide that additional information or

2:02:02

context to the legislation um it primarily these will

2:02:08

guide our preparation of implementation um plans for um implementing the

2:02:15

comprehensive plan so they give us some direction about how to do that um so that's the answer to the to answer your

2:02:21

second question you know these are um going to be helpful as we put together

2:02:28

our implementation plans to know kind of where you're coming from as you recommend this draft of the comp plan I

2:02:36

hope that clears that up and oh and yes throughout this process the you can add

2:02:43

Mo you can add findings to this document um as you would like to in response to

2:02:49

public comments so if if comment if if a comment says X and you want to do you

2:02:55

want to respond to it but don't necessarily want to put in a policy you could provide that additional context

2:03:01

here um and pretty much until you complete your recommendation um the findings will be more or less open these

2:03:08

are this is really your document your your chance to say give the council that additional

2:03:15

context that you want so accepting if I'm understanding your answer your

2:03:21

second answer that correctly accepting the FI the the

2:03:26

findings tonight is not final it's a we're accepting a working document is that is

2:03:35

that accurate yes and then you could amend it throughout the process by motion okay

2:03:42

that that helps thank you Adam um yeah I guess the intent of my

2:03:49

friendly amendment was to um propose you know adopting Alpha

2:03:57

Delta foxtrot and golf as a group and then breaking out Bravo and Echo Plus

2:04:04

Charlie um per commissioner goals is recommend recommendation for separate

2:04:11

discussion um as regards any inconsistencies with the housing element

2:04:18

um you know looking at the table I mean this is this is kind kind of the exactly

2:04:23

I think what was asked for earlier in the meeting um for the the public comments

2:04:30

that were received through the that online survey so you know obviously we've received a lot of public comments

2:04:36

through email where we haven't gotten you know we haven't processed that but I

2:04:41

see this as processing that that chunk of the what 80 87 uh pieces of public comment that

2:04:49

came through the um that came through the online survey so

2:04:56

that yeah just I guess yeah clarifying my intent and then I think the way I'm reading the table is that this is

2:05:03

staff's boiled down version of those 87 survey responses uh

2:05:09

Carolyn yeah I just wanted to add that my understanding is as as U Adam was just saying that this was in response to

2:05:17

the two surveys that were done and while you may have a policy you know that says something very specific or or in some

2:05:24

cases General uh when you go to write the regulations you have the opportunity

2:05:29

to you know take prioritize certain things or or go about it in a certain way and it seems to me that the survey

2:05:38

guided the staff in order to as um Adam Z was saying uh this will help in

2:05:45

determining how to write the regulations based on what people said in those surveys

2:05:52

uh Kate yeah thank you

2:05:59

um Adam it might be good for you to go over all the sources of information that

2:06:04

led to this I it sounds like we're really not ready to vote on this I I wouldn't vote on it peace
Meely it

2:06:10

sounds like the Planning Commission is not like uh fully fully immersed in what this
actually is and need some time to

2:06:18

more time to consider it um because my understanding is that these findings come not just
from public

2:06:24

comment but also from comments made either in the housing work group or in

2:06:29

Prior Planning Commission meetings where Commissioners or council members made a

2:06:34

comment um such as the parking issue and we're told by Steph that's not a policy

2:06:41

that that's not a comp plan policy that's an implementation strategy and so um many of the
items reflected here for

2:06:49

example um parking on neighborhood streets I live on 86 it's a nightmare

2:06:55

you know people are parking all over the place you've got kids riding bikes in the middle of
the road um that's

2:07:01

something that I discussed uh in the housing work group meetings and um and I

2:07:06

know that was a concern of a lot of others so I think the source for these is is pretty wide I agree that we

2:07:15

haven't addressed all of the public comment um and my understanding is that these comments here mainly come from us

2:07:24

and uh the council members who participated in um the housing work

2:07:29

group and and economic element so um yeah it's clear we're not ready to

2:07:36

vote on this at least in my opinion um from hearing discussion and it's clear that um most folks uh are not clear

2:07:45

where these findings came from

2:07:55

I think that was a question for me um or a question just to summarize my rambling

2:08:01

thought here because I was a little bit confused when I was hearing my fellow Commissioners talk um this the because I

2:08:07

was like I recognize several things that council members or staff or planning Commissioners had said in these comments

2:08:13

so if you could clarify where did these findings come from um and uh have you

2:08:20

fully in Incorporated the 84 public comments in them because my understanding is these comments came

2:08:26

from us as in City uh Council and Commissioners and that um a future

2:08:32

amendments would be based on that public feedback that we've just had a chance to look

2:08:37

at yeah so um the the majority of these findings were

2:08:43

drafted based on the results of the survey um now the the survey questions

2:08:49

and some of the things that we were getting at were based on discussions that we've had in the housing work group

2:08:55

and and elsewhere I mean obviously we wanted to get public input on what what we've been hearing kind of

2:09:03

from the council the workg group the commission we wanted to get a little bit more input on that um so that was the

2:09:11

where that kind of came from um so the the findings here are drafted based uh

2:09:17

primarily on that the survey results and the second part of that question yes as we go through and respond to I I

2:09:26

I'll be providing a a matrix of the public com the written comments we've received as you go through and respond

2:09:32

to those we can certainly make findings in response to those as well um you know

2:09:37

a as we go through that Adam what I'm

2:09:43

hearing from quite a few people here is that trying to

2:09:51

peac meal that by starting off and maybe approving some and pulling

2:09:57

some is just not a real workable process and that we would be better served to

2:10:05

deal with the findings once we get through the actual substantive elements

2:10:12

and have all the comments and have had the opportunity to see your Matrix and

2:10:19

to thoughtfully consider any additional

2:10:24

amendments that might be appropriate or findings that might be appropriate based

2:10:29

on that uh Angie thanks chair Murphy um I think I

2:10:37

do want to just add to what you just said about recalling what you've heard from

2:10:44

fellow Commissioners um we have a set of

2:10:49

findings in front of us from staff it's titled staff recommended findings um I

2:10:56

Heard commissioner qes maybe others just try and clarify where they came from I think it's multiple

2:11:02

sources um I I do want to make sure that we spend time tonight if there's debate

2:11:08

which I've heard a couple of Comm Commissioners pull up and say I want to talk about this one this one and this

2:11:13

one especially given that we're going to be down a couple of Commissioners after

2:11:18

tonight's meeting you know if there's something valuable for us to debate and talk about tonight regarding these

2:11:25

findings it'd be great to have that and then close the loop and have those open

2:11:31

um as we continue to add to them like I want to make sure we talk about it because I don't want to talk about all of it at once if we have some good stuff

2:11:37

in front of us um I'm just not ready to approve holistic findings under the

2:11:43

document Adam has on the screen it's an 80-page document comprehensive put

2:11:49

together a good start but it doesn't doesn't include commission findings it's staff findings let's debate staff

2:11:56

findings um but I'm not approving the document um so I want to make sure we

2:12:02

actually debate what we need to debate tonight with the Commissioners we

2:12:09

have can we take a bio break first yes we

2:12:16

can okay let's take 10

2:12:50

e

2:13:20

e

2:13:50

e

2:14:20

e

2:14:50

e

2:15:19

e

2:15:49

e

2:16:19

e

2:16:49

e

2:17:19

e

2:17:49

e

2:18:19

e

2:18:49

e

2:19:19

e

2:19:49

e

2:20:19

e

2:20:49

e

2:21:19

e

2:21:49

e

2:22:19

e e

2:23:02

bless you

2:23:13

Kate uh Carolyn you had a hand up from the last time do you still have your

2:23:18

hand up or is that an old hand that's a that's an ongoing hand um I just wanted

2:23:25

to ask um about the how we're spending our time for the rest of the meeting

2:23:30

here so we were told that if we had amendments for the comprehensive plan to

2:23:35

get them in by last night it was by close of business yesterday so I did

2:23:41

send several in so I had the under I thought we were going to be looking at

2:23:46

those amendments this evening um so and I think Chris has one as well so

2:23:54

I just wondered are are we going to get a chance to look at those because when I sent them in I sent them with the idea in mind that I was going to be here to

2:24:00

explain them but if that's not the case I would need to probably do something

2:24:06

different with those amendments um yeah I think I'm a little bit

2:24:13

confused about that uh Adam and maybe you can clarify my understanding was

2:24:19

that amendments to the findings um was for

2:24:27

tonight but amendments to the elements were before the meetings on the 5th and

2:24:34

the 12th I think the issue is commissioner Bozman and commissioner gills won't be

2:24:40

here for those meetings right I agree with I understand that and so the question is do we want to consider their

2:24:48

amendments um and and the other question I have in light of commissioner bazo's

2:24:54

comments her last comments is are we do we want to discuss certain findings out

2:25:03

of the list the 20page list or the F1

2:25:09

through F7 findings um you know one's obviously a

2:25:14

much longer discussion um or probably is

2:25:22

so so I think the question is uh we can look at Carolyn's amendments and Chris's

2:25:29

amendments and deal with those while they're here and then decide the issue of what exactly

2:25:37

we're going to discuss regarding the findings as a as just a point of order

2:25:45

um there were there's already three motions on the on the

2:25:51

um regarding the findings I think if before we move to another thing we can I

2:25:57

mean we could table that discussion for later but I think just figuring out what we're going to do with those emotions is

2:26:04

probably the right process um

2:26:10

now well the motion that I recall

2:26:16

being the amendment to the motion to approve the findings was uh to was

2:26:23

from uh Adam to withdraw certain findings and then uh Chris

2:26:31

added uh F3 to that um I believe um and so we can address that

2:26:41

motion of whether we're going to approve those findings subject to those deletions or if we if we want to approve

2:26:48

those deletions and and then address the motion to approve the findings but based

2:26:54

on what I'm hearing we are not going to approve the there's not a consensus

2:27:00

building to approve the findings so I'm not sure whether it makes a whole lot of sense spending time deciding to withdraw

2:27:08

three items from the findings I'm inclined to withdraw my motion you know to approve the findings

2:27:14

if that's the simplest way to get to things here

2:27:20

um yeah I I think Adam did you second that I was I think I seconded yeah and

2:27:27

I'm I'm fine with that okay so let's withdraw that so then then your motion

2:27:33

really becomes moot the amendment to that motion becomes

2:27:39

moood we have two amendments to the motion the original motion so if

2:27:45

everyone's agreeing to withdraw their emotions I'll just strike it from the record

2:27:51

any objections

2:28:00

okay oh you're

2:28:07

mute oh I was saying sorry I didn't I had a different um process question so

2:28:14

I'm gonna I think Carolyn's hand is up about Deb can you tell us we have Adam

2:28:19

and Carolyn's agreed to withdraw their motion who's the third motion that needs to be withdrawn you have the main motion

2:28:26

that was made by uh commissioner Bozman seconded by commissioner Vice chair RAB

2:28:31

and then you have two separate motions that amended that one motion was made by

2:28:37

Vice chair regam and second by commissioner Bozman the second was made by commissioner gails and seconded by

2:28:42

Vice chair ream you have three motions on the floor presently so we need GS to agree to

2:28:49

withdraw a motion to complete this activity that's correct right which which is fine with me I guess I mean the

2:28:56

only I don't have a proposed uh Amendment to the comp plan my only

2:29:01

proposed amendment for this meeting was for the finding uh F3 and so but if you

2:29:08

know that's not something that's being discussed tonight I mean that's not that big a deal well it may be discussed

2:29:15

tonight yeah if we get around to it great but I'm happy to withdraw my motion to since I think your point mik

2:29:21

that it's mood is uh is uh probably the right

2:29:26

Point um not sure who was next Carolyn yeah I I did want to follow up

2:29:33

on what amendments were due by five o'clock yesterday because I did

2:29:38

specifically ask Adam Zack about that because it sounded to me like our

2:29:45

Direction was that if we had any amendments to the comp plan they were due by 5:00 and I did specifically ask

2:29:51

that in an email and I thought Adam that you told me that's indeed what was due is there is there some

2:29:58

misunderstanding or we not meeting in the middle there no um I mean that's if

2:30:05

if there's a this is a the commission's process and so if there's if you would

2:30:13

like to propose an amendment or make a motion to make one of your amendments um

2:30:19

you could do that now that would be okay okay yeah all right I guess but that

2:30:25

doesn't really answer my question I thought all of our I thought you told me in the email that all of our amendments

2:30:31

for the comp plan for all commiss Commissioners were due at five o'clock yesterday any amendment that you wanted

2:30:37

to propose today we were asking that you would get it in by five yesterday so that we could get it to the commission

2:30:43

ahead of the meeting uhhuh and and I asked you if that had to do with just the things that had to do like with the

2:30:51

um the policy Gap analysis and the findings and all that and you said no it was for the whole comp plan so what

2:30:58

corre what was meant there and what should the other Commissioners know if we're not on all on the same

2:31:04

page uh I I don't know that we are not on the same page I think you you submitted your comments and we can we

2:31:11

can consider those at the meeting today uh there will be two more meetings yeah

2:31:18

because I only saw comp plan amendments from Mr Gs and I and so we're presuming

2:31:24

that all the rest of the Commissioners have no comp plan amendments that they're proposing no Carolyn he's saying there were three opportunities to give

2:31:30

amendments and he was saying that yours would be due today because this is the last meeting well that's not what it

2:31:36

said in the email but that's fine I can I can think that way I just want to make sure that it's clear okay I didn't

2:31:42

submit my comments because I wanted a little more time to review yeah okay ibe

2:31:48

that's what was meant okay very good thank

2:31:54

you uh yeah I'm I'm concerned about uh some

2:32:00

of the topics we about to lead into discussion um based on uh differences in

2:32:08

like whether you make decisions based on belief systems or data or whatnot or whether or

2:32:16

not you believe that Department of Commerce was correct or whether you agree with the state law or disagree

2:32:22

with the state law and particular on the topic of institutional racism and

2:32:27

whether you think that's a thing or not a thing um and I would like to request that City staff that we table that

2:32:34

discussion until the city can provide a facilitator for that discussion perhaps somebody from Department of Commerce who

2:32:40

has expertise in this matter um am my experience with this commission it's uh

2:32:46

it's a difficult and fraught topic and we we don't all have the same background

2:32:53

um and I think it is does harm to people of color to have these discussions um in

2:32:59

a public form without them being facilitated and I also think that it would

2:33:05

be good for our team all of us together to

2:33:12

revisit the department of commerce's definitions and the materials around this topic because that is where those

2:33:18

words come from they don't come from the housing workg group they don't come from staff they come from the Department of

2:33:25

Commerce so rather than having a debate about our personal values or the lenses

2:33:30

through which we see the world um on the topic of racism I I would like it to be

2:33:37

uh in order to avoid harm to people of color I would like to request that we

2:33:42

have a facilitated discussion of that topic is that possible

2:33:50

was that a question for me it's a question for uh whoever is in

2:33:55

charge of the content of these meetings and facilitating these meetings sure so

2:34:01

the the Planning Commission can request that I don't know I honestly I don't

2:34:07

know what that would entail for us to provide that and I don't know if we would be able to provide it but you can

2:34:14

you can make that request by aemotion and it's not something that I have uh a ton of other

2:34:20

information about but if you make that and I think that I think you're identifying the problem right there is

2:34:26

that staff doesn't even have the information or background to discuss this issue or to understand what

2:34:32

resources are available to discuss this issue that was my experience when talking about this issue with staff that

2:34:39

many of us and most of the people on this call do not have the lived experience of institutional racism so we

2:34:46

don't have the personal experience of it and we don't have the educational background in it which makes it very very difficult to

2:34:52

have a conversation about it and a public forum without doing further harm um and I I'm very concerned about that

2:35:00

I'm very concerned about doing further harm to people by having a discussion without um any lived experience at the

2:35:11

table I could comment on that I think it may be possible to it is possible to get a facilitator

2:35:18

for such a discussion that's what the commission wishes to do the concern I have is around the timing with two

2:35:25

remaining meetings on this topic in two weeks time probably be really difficult to get someone who is available in that

2:35:31

time frame and that is why racial topics are always given short shrift because we

2:35:36

don't plan for them and our communication processes and we don't educate our staff or our commissioners

2:35:44

or the public about these topics so I'm I'm really frustrated with the fact that

2:35:49

this has come up again we've debated this topic before and people are not referring to the Department of Commerce

2:35:56

materials um instead we're talking about belief systems that's extremely frustrating to

2:36:02

me as a commissioner um and I wish that uh I wish that staff could figure

2:36:08

something out or rely on a consultant that's on hand or try to get someone from Department of Commerce to come to our next meeting to discuss this topic

2:36:23

uh Carolyn would it help if and and if

2:36:28

staff could do this when you hear this type of discussion going on and you know

2:36:33

that we're dealing with Department of Commerce language

2:36:39

multicounty planning policies countywide planning policies if you could just reference say this comes from that place

2:36:47

so we don't really need to put our you know just tell us where it comes from um

2:36:52

maybe maybe that would suffice if staff felt comfortable doing that it's been done it's been done in the written

2:36:59

documents and people are still debating it well it could be it could be continue to be done throughout the course of two

2:37:05

more meetings I was thinking maybe that might work

2:37:22

well we need to move forward tonight I'm not really interested in

2:37:30

deferring things forever um especially if it's difficult for staff to Corral

2:37:37

someone to assist us um Kate Are

2:37:43

there specific staff recommended findings in the F1 through F7 group that

2:37:52

you believe are fraught that we should table

2:37:58

for this evening and are there similar ones in

2:38:05

the 20 Page list of findings that you believe

2:38:10

are touch touch that third rail as it were and that you think should be uh

2:38:17

treated differently um I think we should probably figure out

2:38:24

if there is anyone else on the commission that cares at all about this topic because the the two that I heard

2:38:31

commissioner RB call out are on the topic of race um and then the parking

2:38:37

one I that to me is uh tangentially related there's one Topic in it that um

2:38:45

you know that I I I seriously doubt the majority of the commission wants to go

2:38:51

in this direction um so I'll just probably end up making my comments for the record so if we're going to move

2:38:57

forward um without facilitated discussion or without other Commissioners choosing to read the

2:39:02

materials that were provided to them I will just make those comments for the

2:39:08

record uh Adam I'm gonna say a point of order here on a clarification I was

2:39:14

responding to public comments not my belief system and I want that to be very

2:39:20

clear um for this meeting my comments were been raised in previous as a personal belief system so it's a it's

2:39:27

the second time we've heard

2:39:32

it okay point of order here let's not no personal attacks are appropriate so I

2:39:40

would appreciate both commission members standing down on that issue thank you

2:39:47

chair

2:39:53

Angie um I've heard two things that are being actively discussed

2:39:59

right now um we have a findings conversation um I think commissioner

2:40:05

accus was pointing to uh a potential conversation around finding two three

2:40:12

and five if I am remembering accurately and noted accurately that those are the

2:40:18

three that Commissioners have pointed out that they want to

2:40:24

discuss uh commissioner Q's if I'm tracking accurately I think what you're

2:40:29

raising is a yellow flag about making sure that whatever discussion comes from pulling those out and discussing it is

2:40:38

within uh the scope of our conversation a and within the scope of

2:40:44

what we're being advised to consider as defined by

2:40:51

state county and Municipal law and that in those places where um it gets

2:40:58

challenging for some that we refrain from bringing in belief systems but we're trying to keep that conversation

2:41:05

around the findings within that context does that sound like an accurate you can give me a thumbs up if that's

2:41:11

accurate great um the second piece I'm hearing out there is that

2:41:20

uh commissioner gells has proposed an adjustment to a

2:41:26

finding and that commissioner Bozman has proposed uh an amendment to the comp

2:41:34

plan um so there's findings and there's comp plan and I just would love some

2:41:39

structure around are we going to complete and close findings and are we capable and able

2:41:46

to and then are we going to close commissioner batsman's Amendment before

2:41:52

we move on for next week chair Murphy uh I would hope to

2:42:00

deal with the proposed amendments from the two Commissioners that are

2:42:05

transitioning off this evening and if we need to defer

2:42:12

finding discussions we could but I'm seeing at least

2:42:19

for findings that don't appear to implicate concerns

2:42:27

about um racial issues that we could either discuss or simply approve if

2:42:34

there's no objection so I think we can make some progress here so my point in trying to

2:42:44

get the issue of the findings off is so we can move to the proposed amendments from Carolyn and

2:42:59

Chris can we reverse the order of the

2:43:05

agenda and so we can address carolyn and Chris's comments tonight do we have that option

2:43:11

sure I don't see why not it's our process

2:43:24

Carolyn oh you're mute that might be a good idea because

2:43:29

the other discussion could be very very long and might not get completed even in this night so that would help thank you

2:43:39

okay um so Carolyn um if there is no objection let's move forward to discuss

2:43:47

your proposed amendments um

2:43:52

okay I'm of Chris you know my only amendment isn't

2:43:58

comp plan it's finding and it's pretty simple I just wonder if we should just knock that off and you know and maybe

2:44:05

the thing to do is not even to decide it just maybe I'll just make my point and when you guys do findings later I will

2:44:10

have said what I said so we don't have to do an amendment or anything maybe just give me a minute to comment on what

2:44:15

I'm suggesting for finding three and then we can move on to comp plan amendments does that make sense uh yeah

2:44:22

that would be more expeditious great so yeah all I'm saying you know I think as I understand F3 it was responsive to the

2:44:29

87 respondents who put something in and seem to be concerned about the impacts

2:44:34

of middle housing on sort of the residential neighborhoods and you know for me the I don't know of a Nexus

2:44:41

between mature trees and middle housing I think you know the tree thread is really from the size of structures and

2:44:47

not the nature of who's living in them and so you know my inclination was to take that out and then the other thing I

2:44:53

I was a little concerned about about F3 was it you know seems Seems like it assumes that we're going to need

2:44:59

regulation and what I proposed the language I proposed was simply to which

2:45:04

you know was sent out so people have it it'll be around is just simply to try to mitigate through regulation any impacts

2:45:10

of moderate density housing on traffic on site on street parking and pedestrian safety especially in those areas close

2:45:16

to Transit so I guess that was my only point you know I don't think we need to do anything on it tonight but uh when

2:45:22

you get around to findings I just wanted to make that point okay okay thank

2:45:27

you okay Caroline okay um I would like to make a motion to amend Transportation

2:45:35

element goal 12 um maybe it be good idea to get that

2:45:41

up on the screen if you can Adam yeah um I'll I'll second to promote

2:45:49

discussion oh sorry yeah thank

2:45:57

you so I Carolyn I just pulled all three of your oh okay recommended changes here

2:46:04

thanks all right uh the first one here Transportation element goal 12 um that

2:46:11

is in the let's see it's the definition of the goal right okay or it actually States the goal so I just thought um

2:46:20

that we should probably also be referring to uh linking these things

2:46:26

with Transit just probably an oversight to not have it in there so that was my

2:46:31

my motion there the reason for it okay let's address that one at a time um

2:46:40

this motion been made and seconded do we have discussion of that

2:46:54

seeing none Deputy K clerk can you uh call the

2:47:00

role

2:47:09

please hey commissioner GS hi Vice chair rean I

2:47:18

commissioner cues hi commissioner bazo

2:47:24

hi commissioner Bozman hi commissioner

2:47:29

VES hi and Sher Murphy hi thank

2:47:35

you Amendment passes unanimously okay Carolyn your second one

2:47:44

um shall I wait for Adam to put it up on the screen it might be a little bit more helpful oh good

2:47:52

yes okay so the second one is just you know um well first I'll make the motion the

2:48:00

motion is

2:48:06

to add the words meet its adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals after the

2:48:14

word travel to deleting some text uh you know

2:48:19

actually this is probably silly for me to just try to put it in words what I'm moving is what's on the screen is that

2:48:30

sufficient I can make that work in the minutes if it works okay okay

2:49:09

um I'll second didn't know anyone in second yet

2:49:21

commissioner gills was that you yes it was thank

2:49:27

you okay moved and seconded discussion uh Angie well can commissioner bman

2:49:35

please explain why she's proposing this before I comment

2:49:40

sure okay so um the climate action plan

2:49:45

um was entirely developed and fabricated to meet pre

2:49:53

previously adopted greenhouse gas reduction goals that the city has had for many years so
um to say that

2:50:04

the cap establishes strategies just to address climate

2:50:09

change is kind of vague and I think that we should be more clear um here that

2:50:17

we're actually um is designed to meet certain goals and then reason I propose deleting

2:50:25

the next sentence is just I just thought it just didn't say much but um that was

2:50:31

it was just a little bit uh meaningless or duplicative so that's the reason I

2:50:38

proposed it

2:50:59

uh Angie is that an old hand or are you ready to come no no it's now a current

2:51:04

hand based on the comment um I think this is a an interesting example of something

2:51:11

I've pointed to before you know as someone who is currently making a living helping the

2:51:19

general public work through a variety of instruments with municipalities on public process and comprehensive plans

2:51:27

and making sure that cities or counties or people follow what they say they're going to do in order to deliver on

2:51:33

behalf of the people um I also argue that um kind of the level of granular

2:51:41

editorializing that we do doesn't really make docu these documents stronger or make someone like me more or less able

2:51:48

to argue or defend uh future implementations um it just feels it

2:51:55

feels like making editorial changes that don't make strong adjustments to a document and I think I just

2:52:01

get a little bit fussy about that um I did want to hear what she had to say but

2:52:08

I just don't hear something compelling that suggests that we need to change it that would strengthen it or ensure that

2:52:14

the city is making better choices in the future with the change

2:52:21

Adam um I mean I'm indifferent to that meat's adopted part I'll I'll Trust

2:52:26

commissioner batsman's more expert knowledge of that but I think it does add some info here I'm looking at the

2:52:31

public review draft and it's got a yellow highlight saying a note note a list of amendments made in response to

2:52:37

the climate action plan will be inserted here and this proposal inserts that list goals 26 27 and 28 so I think this

2:52:45

resolves like a a yellow highlight in the in the publicly presented drafts so

2:52:50

I'm I'm all for it uh

2:52:57

Carolyn yeah I just wanted to add um maybe just a a little more detail of the the importance of this is that the

2:53:04

climate action plan you know as we go through the years and conditions

2:53:11

change um you know those goals of two two times

2:53:17

the city council has passed resolutions adopting greenhouse gas reduction goals um they were most

2:53:24

recently amended probably about maybe five years ago or something like that so

2:53:30

it it really is the Bell weather as to what our climate plan does and so I

2:53:35

think it's kind of important to note and as things change over the years this

2:53:41

policy should really say the cap is supposed to meet the goals other things

2:53:46

may change but the goals remain so I think it would be

2:53:53

useful any other comments

2:54:00

Andie oh no okay um I tend to um agree with

2:54:08

Angie's overall approach that words smithing for Words smithing sake is not

2:54:15

always worthwhile but I think in this this case um the change is really

2:54:22

substantive and ties ties the issue to

2:54:28

concrete um goals and so I think it's it's worth

2:54:33

making the

2:54:40

change seeing no further hands uh Deb do

2:54:46

you want to call the roll on this one

2:54:57

hey chair Murphy I'll start with you

2:55:02

I commissioner Gils I commissioner r

2:55:10

n commissioner vazo nay commissioner vman I commissioner Q

2:55:19

hi and vice chair regam I motion passes

2:55:28

52 okay number three okay my last Amendment um is to housing element

2:55:35

policy 1.4 um as is stated on the screen um

2:55:41

adding the more specific language about noise and light pollution

2:55:52

is there a second

2:55:57

second okay moved and seconded Carolyn you want to speak to

2:56:03

this or do we think it's been covered enough I would like to add um a little

2:56:08

something more about it um again the the Kim kimly Horn

2:56:14

analysis uh indicated they recommended that our policies be improved to address

2:56:22

these concerns for everybody but so far our policies via

2:56:29

the um policy Gap analysis which we looked at earlier so far our policies

2:56:36

are only amended for transportation noise or for racially disparate impacts

2:56:41

it so far doesn't have it for everybody so I just felt that um we should be more

2:56:47

specific here and include it for all neighborhoods Adam a quick question

2:56:55

context wise I'm hoping that commissioner Bozman could provide some more information on this wasn't a light

2:57:03

ordinance didn't that make it in front of the city council in the recent past

2:57:09

and it kind of died could you provide a little more yeah info about that just to

2:57:16

help guide my like I'm I'm quite ignorant on this I like I like that it's got examples but if it's something

2:57:24

that's been visited in detail already I don't want to you know reopen it well

2:57:30

first of all big difference this is policy and that was an ordinance so um it was on the docket

2:57:38

probably in the fall maybe three years ago or so there was a lighting ordinance

2:57:44

um uh that would apply to residential areas and the council even though they

2:57:49

approved it for the docket when they got the ordinance from the Planning Commission who recommended it with

2:57:55

amendments they didn't want to go there because they hadn't had a public process so it was kind of like H why did you put

2:58:01

it on the docket if you didn't want to have a public process so anyway it did not get passed but um that was an

2:58:07

ordinance and and this is just a policy setting up the um you know the possible

2:58:14

need to look at these types of situations going forward for for people living

2:58:20

anywhere all neighborhoods and that was consistent with what kimley horn tells us is in the

2:58:28

multi multipl planning multi-county planning policies these types of pollution um

2:58:34

should be addressed according to them so for consistency I thought we should have it

2:58:40

here um without restriction

2:58:49

okay any other comments or discussion seeing none let's call the

2:59:03

roll commissioner Bozman

2:59:09

I commissioner bazo I chair Murphy

2:59:15

hi Vice chair reab hi commissioner accuse hi commissioner

2:59:24

gills hi and commissioner Rees

2:59:29

n motion passes 61 okay thanks for considering these

2:59:35

these amendments tonight so that I could explain them thank you and Adam I'm sorry if I didn't understand your

2:59:41

directions in the email were specifically for that purpose so thank you very much

2:59:51

okay so the question now

2:59:57

is do we proceed with discussion of

3:00:03

the findings and if we do which findings

3:00:08

will we discuss and which do we want to avoid or do we want to just proceed with

3:00:14

all the findings what's the consensus of the

3:00:27

group Victor again I'm GNA go back to a

3:00:33

conversation that we had probably over an hour ago my

3:00:39

understanding of that conversation that we had with Adam

3:00:44

was we're adopting a working document um and so I'm I'm happy to adopt the the

3:00:53

the document as it is tonight and then continue to edit and add to it if

3:01:03

necessary Carn if that's a motion I will second

3:01:11

it uh it wasn't it wasn't a not a motion okay I'm just trying to see what the

3:01:17

consensus is here on on a proceeding but sounds like you're in

3:01:23

agreement I mean yeah I feel like it seems to me

3:01:28

that that it would do everyone some good to look at it a little more carefully

3:01:34

and study it more carefully study it in consideration of the comments that people have gotten

3:01:40

today and you know previously and

3:01:45

um uh continue to work with it it's not critical when it gets adopted is my

3:01:52

thought okay uh K yeah I'd like to my opinion stands

3:01:59

that I'd like to request that we table discussion till staff have had opportunity and planning Commissioners

3:02:05

have had the opportunity to um read staff's Matrix Matrix of public comment

3:02:11

and um how staff has responded to them based on laws and policy

3:02:21

so how does that Adam's planning to put together a matrix of the public comments and I

3:02:29

understand that Matrix would indicate more than one column and that there would be a staff

3:02:34

comment column about just like you would with a sea uh enir sea public comment

3:02:42

you know Matrix you would you would say what the public comment was um what relevant polic policies were and whether

3:02:49

or not staff was able to address the comment it doesn't need to be highly

3:02:54

detailed um it could even be a yes no the comment was was addressed but I think it's important to have this

3:03:01

conversation um the conversation about all of these really in the context of the policies um that are relevant to the

3:03:08

public comments so what I hear you're saying is we shouldn't adopt a working document we

3:03:15

should simply keep working with it w with the Matrix once we get it

3:03:21

I I'm with Vicor I have no problem adopting a working document um and

3:03:26

moving forward I I don't want to debate the content of the working document

3:03:31

until we've had a chance to see staff's Matrix of public comment and the

3:03:37

relevant policies okay I think it would be very nonproductive to do so okay Adam a quick

3:03:46

question of clarification for findings are we is are are are those survey

3:03:53

results and like public email comments are those automatically included as like an appendix to our findings is that

3:03:59

something we can suggest adding before you know by that June 3

3:04:06

deadline um it is something that you could propose adding as an attachment to

3:04:12

the findings okay it's a little bit duplicative because those comments are already in the record and so usually

3:04:20

what you would do at that point so the next Planning Commission bill that includes that Matrix will include um the

3:04:29

a copy of those comments just to get them into the record so you can refer to that Planning Commission bill um and

3:04:37

instead of in including it as an attachment okay got it that that

3:04:42

clarifies thank you uh Victor

3:04:48

sorry oldan okay so what I'm hearing is that there

3:04:55

is a consensus to adopt this as a working

3:05:00

document with discussion to be continued but no discussion

3:05:07

tonight is that fair to

3:05:13

say so moved second

3:05:19

okay um that's been moved and seconded uh

3:05:26

Angie well I'm just trying to understand what the purpose or value is of adopting

3:05:34

it as a working document now I'm not sure either frankly so I

3:05:41

don't understand why we're taking an action if we don't even understand what we're taking an action around or how it

3:05:46

moves us forward so as as the person who made the

3:05:53

motion when we originally talked about this I was also unclear as to what

3:06:00

adopting these findings meant and what the explanation that was given by Adam

3:06:08

was effectively it's a working document that can still be modified edited and and all

3:06:15

that that was the original intention and if that was the original intention I'm

3:06:21

happy to move forward with it I I I I take into account Kate's uh or I'm

3:06:28

sorry commissioner accuses uh concerns and and I think they need to be addressed and they probably

3:06:35

should not be addressed tonight um if if the original intent was to

3:06:42

adopt this and then continue to work on it happy to do so if we don't think that's productive and we just want to

3:06:48

continue to work on it I'm happy to do that as well

3:06:54

um either one moves the ball forward kind of moves us

3:07:04

along okay we've had a motion that's been made and seconded to adopt this as

3:07:10

a working document uh any further discussion

3:07:18

seeing done let's uh call the

3:07:23

role sh I'm going to repeat the mo motion just for my own clarification I have a motion by

3:07:30

commissioner Rashid seconded excuse me by commissioner boatsman to adopt the staff recommended findings in PCB 24-13

3:07:38

table two as a working

3:07:44

document okay commissioner gills

3:07:53

Nate commissioner pazo he RAB

3:08:02

May commissioner Bozman I commissioner kuse I commissioner

3:08:10

rashis I and chair Murphy I motion passes fourth

3:08:32

three so Adam is there anything else that you have to present tonight

3:08:39

regarding the either the findings or any of the other material uh no that wraps it up uh for

3:08:47

me we'll just uh plan on taking up the transportation Capital facilities and

3:08:52

utilities element uh next week and I'll get the uh comment Matrix out um as well

3:09:01

okay so now we move on to other business uh is there a deputy director

3:09:08

report I do not really have a report tonight I think we've already talked about the dates of the next two meetings

3:09:13

pretty extensively and that's really all I had to say okay um if there are any planned absences for

3:09:21

future meetings please advise Allison Deb Estrada and me by email uh no need

3:09:28

to announce them at meetings any anything else for the good of the

3:09:33

order Carolyn I I didn't get a chance to thank um commissioner gz for his service and I

3:09:40

really appreciate working with you in the last year Chris and and uh you know really appreciate your emphasis on on

3:09:47

bringing climate into many of our deliberations so thank you very much and

3:09:53

thank you chair thank you for for serving and getting us through this this

3:09:58

evening thanks Carol so far you're almost there Commissioners

3:10:04

the next meeting is Wednesday June 5 at 6: PM there being no other business to

3:10:10

come before the Planning Commission the time is now 9:14 p.m. and the meeting is

3:10:16

adjourned as a reminder please stay on screen until staff has terminated the

3:10:22

broadcast good evening and thank you for joining us